

**Report to  
VECAP/VEWAA Boards**

**From the Joint Task Force  
on Alternative Certification**

**October 2009**

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents .....	2
Convening and Charge.....	3
How CVE Developed, Current Status and Lessons Learned.....	3
Lessons Learned.....	4
What Options Are Available to Current CVEs and Those Seeking CVE .....	6
What Alternative Certifying Organizations Can Teach Us .....	6
NOCA.....	6
Other Rehabilitation Commissions .....	7
Education and Guidance.....	7
Center for Credentialing and Education and Workforce Professions .....	8
Registries .....	9
Summary .....	10
Recommendations.....	11
Appendix A: Vendor Conversations .....	13
Appendix B: Sample University Program, UW- Stout:.....	14

## Convening and Charge

The Joint Task Force on Alternative Certification convened in May 2009, with the charge to research three issues and produce a final report with recommendations by fall 2009. The three issues are:

- a. How CVE got to its current status and the lessons learned
- b. What options are available to CVEs and those seeking CVE in our current status
- c. Recommendations to VECAP, VEWAA and any other group requesting data on how to guide professionals seeking CVE certification

The members of the Task Force represent the two major professional associations for vocational evaluators. Each member is named below with their CVE status so noted, their state of residency, and the professional association they are representing.

Karen Pell, Chair, VECAP Representative, Columbia MD

Paige Tidwell, CVE, VEWAA Board Member, Athens GA

Randy McDaniel, CRC, VECAP Representative, Auburn AL

Shawn Zimmerman, CVE, VEWAA Board Member, Manassas, VA

Deborah Veale, CRC, VECAP Representative, Hampton VA

## How CVE Developed, Current Status and Lessons Learned

The profession of Vocational Evaluation (VE) has a formal history spanning more than forty years. Over that time, federal funding launched a number of university-linked resources to develop the profession, primarily in the rehabilitation community. There were dollars targeted to master's level degrees and coursework, training in-service for practitioners, research and development dollars, and tuition reimbursement for students/trainees. In the later 1970s and early 1980s, there was a federal push on accountability for public monies expended and later a push by consumers for a higher quality of service provider. The development of certification in many fields including vocational evaluation was a professional reaction to these demands in addition to the normal development of the profession.

CCWAVES (the Commission on the Certification of Work Adjustment and Vocational Evaluation Specialists) was formed in 1983, following a certification model predicated on a master's level degree in vocational evaluation and successful completion of a standardized examination. Other professionals were required to demonstrate candidacy for certification through specific courses and years of experience in lieu of a master's degree in vocational evaluation. Certification was defined as "minimally competent" and tied to ethical practice. Over the years, there were a small number of cases reviewed where practice was deemed not ethical by someone with a CVE designation.

Presently, there are approximately 1000 CVEs, across the USA and Canada, with more than 900 based in the US. For financial reasons, the CVE application process was suspended in September 2008; maintenance of current CVEs was transferred to CRCC in April 2009. At this time, persons seeking CVE have no option and it is the understanding of the Task Force that CVE is not available. Any new process would need to adopt a new name other than CVE.

To distill lessons learned, nine former commissioners of 2008-09 CCWAVES Board (of eleven total) were contacted and interviewed. Of the nine, two were former chairs, one was a vice chair and one served both as a commissioner and as the examination contractor. The list of Commissioners are: Paige Tidwell, former CCWAVES Commissioner and member of this Task Force; Ron Spitznagel, former CCWAVES Chair; Ron Edwards, former CCWAVES Vice Chair; Michelle Hamilton, former CCWAVES Chair; Kim MacClassac, former CCWAVES Commissioner; Nancy Scott, former CCWAVES Commissioner; Bruce Reed, former CCWAVES Exam Contractor and former CCWAVES Commissioner, and Darryl Taylor, former CCWAVES Commissioner. Others who were contacted include Pamela Leconte, former CCWAVES Commissioner (1980s); and Danise Busic, former CCWAVES Commissioner (1990s). It should be noted that the chair of this Task Force and the primary author of this report was a CCWAVES Commissioner from 1987-1996 and was Chair from 1994-96.

Other data sources include extensive website searches, interviews with two vendors, Bill Chapman from Intec, Inc. and Jeff Davis from VRI, Inc., as well as informal conversations with colleagues in the field. Details of the vendor conversations are in Appendix A. Time and resources did not allow for extensive research and the process used would best be described as informal. Results should be interpreted accordingly with these limitations in mind.

### ***Lessons Learned***

The lessons learned from this data review process have several themes. The first and most critical is that employers did not require CVE for practice or for advancement. There have been brief periods when selected states through legislation around workers' compensation, vocational education and/or rehabilitation services have included language of CVE as a credential of merit. That means that there was preferred status for that level of professional (differentiated fee for service, oversight of other practitioners, etc). However, the momentum to spur practitioners to pursue CVE status did not happen. Without market forces at play, the CVE was a "nice to have" but not a "need to have" designation. One Commissioner reported that he has worked in all three sectors, private for profit, private not for profit and public. Never once was he asked for or rewarded for CVE status in his work history over twenty years.

The second major lesson learned was that the CVE was too elite a credential, meaning that it was not available to most. This contributed to the dilemma of low/no

market demand. Without access to coursework and degree granting institutions, there was no doorway to achieve the credential. Over time, two of the foundational courses, Introduction to Vocational Evaluation and Occupational Analysis, were dropped by many master's level curricula, including those funded by OSERS as programs preparing persons for Vocational Evaluation.

This leads to the third major lesson, which is that the education-based certification model only works when funded fully in all dimensions. That means that funds are committed by government and employers in public and private service to professional development. Government funding reached its zenith in the mid 1980s and has been on the decline since, such that the number of VE master's level programs has shrunk from a high of more than 20 to under 10. Among those programs, none has a stand-alone VE emphasis. All are allied with other departments and some even have no mention of VE on their websites. The funding has been absorbed fully into rehabilitation counseling, a much greater priority for the federal government. None are targeted to doctoral research and there are no research efforts funded as well. A sample university program, UW-Stout, is presented in Appendix B.

It would be good to insert the key dimensions of a profession at this point, to query the status of Vocational Evaluation as a profession. From the online Webster dictionary, a profession is defined as "a calling, vocation or employment requiring specialized knowledge and often intensive academic preparation." To qualify as a profession, these characteristics are expected to be present:

- A common body of knowledge
- Benchmarked performance standards
- A representative professional organization
- An external perception as a profession
- A code of ethics with enforcement
- Required training credentials for entry and career mobility
- An ongoing need for skill development
- A need to ensure professional competence is maintained and put to socially responsible uses.

These characteristics are echoed by other professions, such as APABM (business management), this HR website( [www.cchra.ca](http://www.cchra.ca)), as well as others in human services (counseling, education, allied health).

CCWAVES had most of these elements of a profession for the CVE; however, the credentials doorway was too narrow and the pipeline of applicants too lean. Without an employer mandate, the market for CVE was too challenging to create demand. There were many competing forces, which leads to the fifth and final lesson learned.

Many former CCWAVES Commissioners spoke of efforts over the years to create demand in related areas of practice, specifically education (career development, vocational and special), in workforce development (supported employment, social Services, DOL One Stop Career Centers), and in work recovery/insurance (occupational

therapy, disability case managers, life care planning). A Chinese proverb states, “a common hallway goes unswept.” Since assessment has a key role in all these professional areas, no one profession owned it and promoted it fully. Other professions appended it to their scope of work. In some cases, the more prestigious professions viewed the steps necessary to earn the CVE as beneath their professional stature.

CCWAVES efforts included the Interdisciplinary Task Force, the Undergraduate Rehabilitation Program Registry, and alliances with DCDT and with the National Career Development Association, to name a few. These efforts, despite hard work, determination and persistence, have yielded insufficient momentum to sustain CVE. After forty years, the cost of certifying the professional was greater than the demand.

## **What Options Are Available to Current CVEs and Those Seeking CVE**

There are approximately 1000 CVEs currently, including 50 in Canada; this pool will decline as certifications lapse or persons retire. This task force found statute or practice language in Florida (Qualified Rehabilitation Provider, Florida Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. Bureau of Rehabilitation and Reemployment Services), Maryland (DORS, Career Assessment Services) and Virginia (VA State Licensure – Dept of Education 8VAC20-22-680) that includes CVE specifically as a credential for professional practice. There is work to be done to protect those in practice and to broaden practice opportunities by updating the language as a new credential is offered.

The primary option for current CVEs is to make sure maintenance and continuing education opportunities are abundant, easy to access, and relevant to the field. For those seeking CVE, it will be important to create a new credentialing process, learning from the lessons of other certifying organizations.

## **What Alternative Certifying Organizations Can Teach Us**

### ***NOCA***

As the Task Force considers alternatives to certification, it is important to see how the field of certifying organizations has advanced over the last thirty years. There is a proliferation of certifying processes and organizations, many founded on the principle of “do no harm” to protect consumers of services from services delivered in less than standard ways. Their roots are often tied to legislation, as is the National Commission for Certifying Agencies, a subgroup of NOCA, the National Organization for Competency Assurance ([www.noca.org](http://www.noca.org)).

Since 1977, there has been a national mandate for standards in allied health fields, with which vocational evaluation, from its origins in vocational rehabilitation, should consider compliance seriously. There are 21 standards, and they fall into five sections: (1) Purpose, Governance, and Resources, containing five Standards; (2) Responsibilities to Stakeholders, containing four Standards; (3) Assessment Instruments [for applicants],

containing nine Standards; (4) Recertification, containing two Standards; and (5) Maintaining Accreditation, containing one Standard. To earn or maintain accreditation by NCCA, the certification program must meet *all* Standards with supporting evidence.

It is key to note that NOCA sees certification from a market-driven perspective. This means that they view the benefits of certification to be tied to higher wages and benefits, employment opportunities, hiring decisions, consumer choice and protections, as well as professional stature.

Fees are charged by NOCA to certify a certifying process. Membership fees at present are \$650 annually. Application to certify has a one-time cost of \$1000-1600; annual fees to maintain program certification are \$3500 at present.

### ***Other Rehabilitation Commissions***

Regarding certifying processes, there are many disability and rehabilitation related certification processes and commissions in place. These have grown and stabilized over the last thirty years, and have sufficient educational opportunities and applicant pools to sustain them. Most build on a strong pre-service educational base, in that applicants complete college or university coursework that is available across the country and on line. The list of these boards include National Board for Counselor Certification, Certification of Disability Management Commission, Commission for Case Manager Certification, Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification, and the National Board for Certification in Occupational Therapy.

### ***Education and Guidance***

In education and guidance, one certifying process includes an international market. The Educational and Vocational Guidance Practitioner was set up and is managed by the International Association for Educational and Vocational Guidance (IAEVG). The competencies were developed in 1999 and adopted by 38 countries in 2005 through the General Assembly of the International Association. The Center for Credentialing and Education (CCE) [see below] manages the Education and Vocational Guidance (EVGP) application process on behalf of IAEVG.

To be an EVGP, there are core and specialized competencies, which include career development, education, training, employment trends, labor market and social issues. Assessment is a specialized competency and is defined as:

Analysis of the characteristics and needs of the individual group to whom the program is addressed, and also of the context where they are inserted, including all agents involved. The aim is to integrate and evaluate data from inventories, tests, interviews, scales and other techniques that measure an individual's abilities, aptitudes, barriers, life roles, interests, personality, values, attitudes, educational achievements, skills and other relevant information. This specialization includes the related but distinct competency of test interpretation; that is, explaining to a client the results of an assessment and their implications.

<http://www.cce-global.org/extras/cce-global/pdfs/evgp/07appENG.pdf>

## *Center for Credentialing and Education and Workforce Professions*

There are other certifying bodies in similar roles of certifying others (programs and individuals). A prominent group within guidance and work force development is called the Center for Credentialing and Education (CCE) [www.cce-global.org](http://www.cce-global.org). It acts as a certifying body for several international organizations, including the International Association for Educational and Vocational Guidance (IAEVG) stated above, as well as the Center of Career Development Excellence (CoE). It appears that there are a number of certifications managed by CCE.

The CCE offers five certifications for individuals within workforce development; they are the Global Career Development Facilitator (GCDF); the Approved Clinical Supervisor (ACS); the Distance Credentialed Counselor (DCC); the Distance Credentialed Facilitator (DCF); and the Human Services-Board Certified Practitioner (HS-BCP). Individuals who earn these credentials have demonstrated that they have met established standards of professionalism in the specialized area in which they are certified. Their target market are: career group facilitators, job search trainers, career resource center coordinators, career coaches, human resource career development coordinators, intake interviewers, career development case managers, employment/placement specialists, occupational and labor market information resource persons and workforce development personnel. In addition, the Center of Career Development Excellence (CoE) recognizes career and workforce development programs that provide high quality services to individuals seeking career assistance.

According to statements by Sandi Myers, Training Coordinator, Maryland Institute for Workforce Excellence, she believes that there are about 200 + US based Global Career Development Facilitators. This process, while international in scope, has standards developed by each host country. The US certification was developed in 1997 jointly by CCE, the National Career Development Association, and the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee. There are 14 certified training providers, six who do face to face training, three on line and five that mix both formats.

It is clear that the functional skills recognized to certify Global Career Development facilitators overlap significantly with Vocational Evaluators, particularly in the areas of labor market understanding, occupational information and trends, career development assessments and career development theories, models and techniques. It is interesting that there is a caveat stated about the career development assessments, which states that the person must have proper training.

Applicants must complete 120 hours of training from certified trainers and then apply by educational level. Master's degree applicants must demonstrate 1400 hours of work experience; high school graduates must complete 5600 hours. Application costs are \$100.

Another workforce related group is the National Association of Workforce Development Professionals (NAWDP). Their Certified Workforce Development Professional (CWDP) was developed in 1999 and claims to be a nationally

recognized certification accepted throughout the country as a measure of quality services to job seekers and to businesses. The 10 core competencies are: History and Structure of the Workforce Development system; Career Development; Labor Market Information; Diversity; Customer Service; Program Management; Communication; Technology; Collaboration and Problem Solving; and Business and Employer Knowledge.

After receipt of the CWDP, individuals can specialize in one of four areas: Business and Employer Services, Job Seeker Services, Management Services and Youth Services.

Approved training for core skills is provided by several resources, most prominently Dynamic Works Institute, [www.dynamicinstitute.com](http://www.dynamicinstitute.com), based in Florida. Because Dynamic Works provides a curriculum directly aligned to the 10 NAWDP Core Skills competencies, NAWDP has recognized this Dynamic Works' training as fulfilling the competency requirements of their CWDP Core Skills certification. There is even a discount on application fees, set up through a reciprocity agreement between the training provider and the national association.

### ***Registries***

Two registries were explored as another type of credential. One is established and one is in the development phases. Each has unique characteristics to consider.

The Registered Vocational Professional (RVP) was established and is managed by the Canadian Association of Rehabilitation Professionals (CARP) in partnership with the Canadian Assessment, Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Society (CAVEWAS) <http://www.cavewas.com/credentials.html>. The RVP designation targets practitioners across settings who have “specialized vocational services,” specifically skills in career development, vocational assessment, labor market analysis, and interpersonal communication. Persons who are registered demonstrate to consumers, funders and employers that “members have achieved and demonstrated a recognized level of professional competence.” Applications are reviewed based on an approval process set by the National Registration Review Committee, a subcommittee of the National Standards and Credentials Committee of CARP. The process includes a review of education, experience and the written references of peers and supervisors. As of 2006, all must have completed at least a post-secondary degree (associate and above). Applicants must be members of both CARP and CAVEWAS as well as pay an application fee. Fifty hours of continuing education are required every five years for maintenance on the Registry.

The Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute, under the leadership of John Lui, is presently exploring a registry with a task force of professionals from VEWAA and VECAP. Of the eight members, three overlap with the Task Force authoring this paper. The discussions since June 2009 have paralleled the process this Task Force has undertaken, addressing questions of feasibility, market demand, credential options, and pricing. The standards for competent practice are based on the 2002 Role and Function study completed by UW Stout and SVRI faculty member, Michelle Hamilton. A pilot of

a registry process is being considered, to test demand and standards of practice. John Lui has great confidence in a broader market than just rehabilitation through a systematic marketing approach to professional associations.

## Summary

The marketplace offering credentials is dense. There are many certifying processes that attract segments of the same population that CVE is seeking now and has been seeking since its inception more than 32 years ago. For those well established (education, counseling, case management) the demand is high. For those more specialized (workforce development), some are seeing a slow growth in numbers.

There may be many factors to explain this; the primary one appears to be that neither the employer of the practitioner nor the consumer of the services demands certification of the persons providing services. This was acutely true for vocational evaluators. For these emerging or elite certifications, it appears that persons are seeking certification for professional status due to internally motivated reasons (personal goal, pride, confidence). For VE, it seems that the pool of potential applicants will remain small until a greater demand comes from the market (employers, consumers). The omission of Vocational Evaluators in the language of “qualified rehabilitation professional” weakened the profession significantly. The lack of political muscle within the community to fight for its inclusion was very apparent.

Demand comes from the market, which for VE, is not well understood. Identity and brand are weak and dispersed. The profession split formally with the creation of VECAP in 2003; VEWAA, a division of the National Rehabilitation Association, has been in existence since 1967. Membership numbers are small and often the two organizations compete for the same professionals. With the suspension/end of CCVWAVES, the profession diminishes again. This also appears to have had a psychologically damaging affect on the markets and practitioners as they both began to write VE off as a dying profession.

The advocates for Vocational Evaluation are few and not well positioned. Universities have diluted their programs to remain viable. Faculty members historically have not been strong advocates of CVE certification, seeing it as too elite and narrow. Without a strong pipeline of study (bachelor’s through doctoral), the profession remains vulnerable.

Money is a big factor. Salaries are low, so practitioners are not inclined to pay for expensive coursework or for certification processes. The professional associations are small and not well endowed. Universities are not generous with resources to invite more programs unless RSA funded. Training to working professionals is episodic and not available on demand easily and economically.

Vocational Evaluation is a part of a continuum of services. In rehabilitation, the primary funder of the profession through RSA and the NRA, VE informs counseling, the

other rehabilitation services, and ultimately employment. The services along that continuum are provided in part by specialists but most commonly by rehabilitation counselors. A small percentage of clients need specialized services. In lean times, the demand for specialists declines. The state/federal model of vocational rehabilitation has experienced that decline over time as resources are realigned to the primary/core function of rehabilitation counseling.

What might that certification look like? The lessons learned from CCWAVES suggest the following characteristics:

- Inclusive vs. exclusive (so that structure and pricing invites rather than eliminates)
- Market driven rather than product driven (consumers and employers are key markets; any model must be tied to market demand based on quality market research)
- Marketed more professionally to raise visibility and prestige
- Tiered to include those emerging in practice (new to field) and in profession (graduate at associate's or bachelor's levels)
- Flexible (invite partnerships across professions, perhaps allowing for certificate level credential to those having other certifications)
- Easy access to core knowledge (on line)
- More intimately linked to professional associations (so that mentoring happens across professional development, with more senior VEs mentoring more junior ones)
- Recognized as a measure of "minimal competence," not quality

## Recommendations

The following recommendations are offered as outcomes of the efforts of the volunteers serving on this Task Force. With the time allowed, it was not possible to look into all resources. Much that was collected was from websites and from personal communication with key informants to this process. Thus the recommendations should be interpreted with this understanding.

1. Research the VE market fully and develop a short-term marketing plan.  
Rationale: There is a long CCWAVES history of an untapped market out there. It is important to identify that market fully (who, what benefits seeking, feasibility of responses). It will be necessary to raise funds and contract for professional assistance to understand the CVE market (actual and potential) accurately and effectively. It will be important to include RSA and CSAVR in the market research, since there are state VR programs that are revisiting the need and value of VE in the state-federal vocational rehabilitation programs.

2. Explore low cost models of professional competence  
Rationale: The single greatest cost in certification is the examination (to develop, keep current, administer, and interpret). By removing the certification examination until the profession strengthens to include the recognized body of literature, the cost should be more reasonable.
  
3. Place any credentialing process within or strongly allied with the VE professional associations, which are key to support and funding.  
Rationale: With CVE it was mandatory that CCWAVES operate independently of the professional associations (VEWAA and VECAP). With the size of the field so small, it may be wise to align this process within the professional association(s) similar to Canada's RVP credential. Emerging professionals would be linked to the professional associations (currently VECAP and VEWAA) immediately. The professional association would be the fiscal agent, the deliverer of key training, and a source of mentoring relationships.
  
4. Build a stronger mentoring/internship program within the professional associations that would foster professional development of emerging professionals. These might be new graduates or persons selecting an emphasis in VE to complement their professional skills in counseling, teaching, workforce development, and other areas.  
Rationale: There should be a commitment by those currently in VE to "grow" their profession and to nurture its emerging professionals. If incentives are needed, perhaps there are ways to recognize those efforts through the professional associations or through credits earned toward continuing education. There are persons who came to VE through their relationships with other evaluators, which could be a powerful recruiting tool in any marketing effort.
  
5. Build deeper partnerships with allied organizations.  
Rationale: A registry effort is underfoot at present through the efforts of Mr. John Lui and the SVRI at UW-Stout. While that effort is ready for piloting soon, it will be important to look more broadly as well. Are there related professionals (rehabilitation counselors, educators, occupational therapists, workforce development professionals) for whom a certificate in addition to their other credentials is desirable? With a simple entrance process and low fee, these professionals may swell the ranks. Conversations with key leaders of these allied groups would start with the marketing plan (item #1 above). Consideration might be given to only allowing CVE certification to those who already possess a credential such as CRC or OTR in their major field.
  
6. Resolve language of CVE in law/ practice guidelines.  
Rationale: It will be important to continue to research language of CVE in state practice. The efforts of this task force are not presumed to be exhaustive. There should be key contacts established in each of the three states (education

in Florida, Virginia and Maryland) so that any questions about CVE are handled and any updates on new sources of credentialing are promoted. The goals are to protect consumers, ensure that CVE professionals are not compromised, and any new credential is put forward for consideration to write in with the CVE language.

## Appendix A: Vendor Conversations

The vendors who sell vocational assessment tools and the developers of those tools offer corroborating information about the status of the field and the professionals purchasing VE equipment. The task force contacted Bill Chapman, President of Intec, a mid-Atlantic based provider of products and tools for work force development, school to career transitions, vocational rehabilitation (including assessment), special education, corrections and independent living. In practice for more than thirty years, he has watched the market shift. The numbers of students seeking professional status and recognition have dwindled; less practitioners seek certification. While his company offers basic training to use the tools he sells, he has not heard these practitioners request additional training and he himself has never been asked to demonstrate any specific competencies as a trainer.

Jeff Davis, Vice President at Vocational Rehabilitation Institute in Philadelphia, has a line of products that assess interest and aptitudes, as well as skill levels of job seekers. He sees his current customer base as primarily vocational rehabilitation providers and the Veterans Administration. His concerns are that practitioners do not know principles of Vocational Evaluation and do not know that they don't know. The lack of awareness of this gap was described as scary. His measure of this unknowingness is that he receives little if any calls asking about the psychometrics and research of his tools and products. The providers buy the tool and use it without understanding any of its properties and how to use it most effectively with differing populations. It is a "one size fits all" understanding of the tools of assessment. Because there is no request for these data, there is no impetus for developers to undertake the costs of good research. Face validity is enough and is low cost to the developer. Because there are no apparent standards of practice for training, anyone can train someone to use the tools.

While the number of vendors contacted is small, their historical perspective spans thirty years in the profession. Both raise concerns about the status of the VE profession at many levels.

First there are concerns about the universities and the pre-service preparation. The number and rigor of academic programs is woefully inadequate. All eight programs currently funded (as of 2008 RSA website) by the Rehabilitation Services Administration appear to be hybrid, offering VE courses as "concentration" or elective courses embedded in rehabilitation, counseling or special education departments. In addition, there are no programs identified with vocational evaluation for doctoral study. While

persons can create that emphasis, the numbers of faculty with specific preparation in vocational evaluation is small and dwindling.

Second, there is no demand from purchasers and users of vocational evaluation tools to make the tool developers more accountable through research on validity and reliability of their tools. From the vendors' perspective, many purchasers appear to understand how to administer the tools they purchase but they are less aware of their psychometric properties and their application for specific audiences. The gap in knowledge puts the use of these tools at risk; the consumer is at risk and the vocational evaluator is as well.

Thirdly, they explain this lack of awareness in part to the rank of the vocational evaluator by pay. The prevailing wage and overall level of compensation for VE providers, from their perspective, is so low that it challenges certification in two ways. Persons who have achieved master's level status often select positions that are pay better and offer more status in line with their academic achievements. These positions may be administrative or in related occupations (special education, counseling). Many practitioners may desire certification but the cost of both application and maintenance may be beyond their financial capacity.

## **Appendix B: Sample University Program, UW- Stout:**

NB. Due to summer schedules and the timeline of this Task Force, there was limited success reaching and interviewing university faculty.

### **Curriculum:**

The MS-VR program offers concentrations in Rehabilitation Counseling and Vocational Evaluation. Students in the VE concentration must take the following courses: Rehab 723 Procedures of VE (3 cr); Rehab 724 Lab in VE (3 cr); Rehab 707 Practicum in VE (4 cr); and Rehab 783 Internship in VE (6 cr/300 hrs). Students in the RC concentration are introduced to VE in the general procedures course, Rehab 723 Procedures of VE. ALL students must take 620 Psychological Testing (3 cr) and Rehab 670 Work Adjustment.

### **Funding:**

For the past 15+ years UW Stout has have been awarded RSA long term training grants in VEWA. The RSA grants provide VE students with monthly stipends during their full-time enrollment in graduate school. Graduates of the MS VR program payback the RSA stipends via employment obligation i.e., for every 1 year of RSA funding graduates work 2 years in state/federal VR settings. In 2008 and 2009 UW Stout submitted proposals to the RFP for RSA long term training in VEWA; funding was not awarded either year.