

Enhancing the Vocational Evaluator Ethical Code and Guidelines by Comparison with the 2010 Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification Code of Professional Ethics

Susan G. Sherman

Martha H. Chapin

East Carolina University

Within the rehabilitation profession, national certifications serve to protect the public from unqualified individuals and serve as a basis for assuring that practitioners have the knowledge, skills, and experience necessary to practice. Certification organizations hold their certificates accountable to written, peer reviewed standards and have codes of ethics or guidelines by which the certificates must abide. These organizations require continuing education so that those who are certified can stay current in the field. The primary credentials for those practicing within the field of rehabilitation as rehabilitation counselors and vocational evaluators are certification as a Rehabilitation Counselor (CRC) or Vocational Evaluator (CVE), and registration as a Professional Vocational Evaluator (PVE). The history of these credentials is explored and a comparison of their respective codes of ethics and guidelines are made.

Keywords: PVE Guidelines, CVE Code of Ethics, CRCC Code of Ethics, vocational evaluation.

Enhancing the Vocational Evaluator Ethical Code and Guidelines by Comparison with the 2010 Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification (CRCC) Code of Professional Ethics

Vocational evaluation emerged during the latter half of the 20th century as a professional specialty in response to a demand for improved assessment measures for people with disabilities within the field of vocational rehabilitation (Hamilton & Shumate, 2005). Several studies (e.g., Coffey, 1978; Hamilton, 2004; Hamilton & Shumate, 2005; Leahy & Wright, 1988; Newman, Waechter, Nolte, Boyer-Stephens, 1998; Sankovsky, 1969) examined vocational evaluators' competencies and role and functions. Two of these studies (Hamilton & Shumate, 2005; Leahy & Wright, 1988) found that there were six distinct areas of competency unique to vocational evaluation (VE). Those areas included 1) Assessment Planning and Interpretation, 2) Vocational Counseling, 3) Assessment Administration, 4) Job Analysis, 5) Case Management, and 6) Personal Adjustment Counseling (Leahy & Wright, 1988). A later study in 2005 by Hamilton and Shumate updated those six key roles and functions of vocational evaluators to be 1) Analysis/Synthesis of Assessment Data, 2) Behavioral Observation and Evaluation Techniques, 3) Case Management, 4) Occupational Analysis, 5) Vocational Counseling, and 6) Professionalism. Sligar and Betters (2012) suggested that there may be differences in how vocational evaluation is perceived and practiced or that roles and functions of vocational evaluators may have changed over time. The Leahy and Wright study found that while 73% of vocational evaluators had masters' degrees, only 17% reportedly had a major in vocational evaluation.

A 2008 study published by the Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification (CRCC)

found that only 15% of certified rehabilitation counselors held the job title of vocational evaluator (CRCC, 2008; Sligar & Betters, 2012). Sligar and Betters (2011) effectively stated why we should look at vocational evaluators and their code of ethics and professional guidelines differently from rehabilitation counselors. “Vocational evaluation was considered a specialty within the field of vocational rehabilitation, neither above nor below rehabilitation counseling, but simply a precise practice governed by a specific philosophy, knowledge base, ethical code, and skill set” (Sligar & Betters, 2011, p. 68). Not all vocational evaluators are rehabilitation counselors. Many vocational evaluators are only meeting with clients a few times for the purpose of completing an evaluation and assessment and are not providing counseling services for clients; thus, many sections in the Code of Professional Ethics for Rehabilitation Counselors (CRCC, 2009a) would not be appropriate for vocational evaluators. Against this backdrop is a vocational evaluation profession that is evolving with numerous changes in federal legislative mandates, a changing employment landscape, service delivery systems legislatively mandated to work together, and a more diverse client population with significant disabilities entering the vocational rehabilitation (VR) and educational systems (Hamilton & Shumate, 2005). Certification and the professional standards of vocational evaluation must be maintained in this changing environment to assure the competency of providers and adherence to the highest ethical standards to protect themselves and the clients they serve. Since codes of ethics evolve over time, examining the evolution of the current codes of ethics within the profession of vocational evaluation can help assure the code’s relevancy and assist in developing future codes that are as thorough as the Code of Professional Ethics for Rehabilitation Counselors (CRCC, 2009a).

Historical Perspective

The history of vocational evaluation began in 1965 as a result of a conference held in Warm Springs, Georgia. The committee established a tentative constitution and named the organization the American Association of Work Evaluators (AAWE). In 1966, again at Warm Springs, Georgia, the constitution for the association was approved and officers elected (Hoffman, 2008). The association held three conferences, all in Georgia. Leaders of the association at the time believed that there needed to be a national organization for vocational evaluators, but did not have the resources to create such an organization. That same year, the Executive Director of the National Rehabilitation Association (NRA), E. B. Whitten, was approached to consider the possibility of developing a division within NRA for vocational evaluators. An ad hoc committee was formed in 1966 and in 1967, the name Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Association (VEWAA) was chosen. A formal request for divisional status was submitted to the NRA in 1967 and provisional status was granted. At that time, the process to move to a VEWAA division within NRA began, as did the dissolution of AAWE. At the NRA conference in 1967, VEWAA sponsored its first professional meeting of the newly formed association. In 1968, NRA granted VEWAA full divisional status under its organization and VEWAA’s first journal was published that winter. A committee was formed to draft a set of ethical standards and in 1970, the draft was presented to VEWAA members and approved. VEWAA today is still a division of NRA. In 1971, VEWAA began to form state units of the association as a division of NRA. The original ethical standards, published in 1971, covered Responsibility, Professional Competence, Confidentiality, Interprofessional Relationships, Publications, and Consultations (Hoffman, 2008).

The Vocational Evaluation and Career Assessment Professionals Association (VECAP) was borne from VEWAA. As VEWAA grew, other professionals working in the field became interested in joining VEWAA. These professionals (e.g., private practice, Workers' Compensation, education) did not work exclusively with people with disabilities, but included people who were economically disadvantaged and privileged. Because of VEWAA's affiliation with NRA, members had to first join NRA to join VEWAA. Because some members thought this was unfair, in 2000 the membership voted to become a separate entity from NRA. A split occurred in 2003 within the VEWAA organization due to member concerns with the NRA constitution and dues structure and after a struggle to retain the name VEWAA for the new organization (Sligar & Betters, 2011). In 2003, a name change occurred within the group that split off from VEWAA. VECAP is not affiliated with NRA or VEWAA, which is still a division of NRA. VECAP, as outlined on their website, comprises professionals who work in the fields of vocational evaluation, assessment, and career services, as well as others interested in vocational evaluation. VECAP is a non-profit organization and states it is "committed to advancing and improving the fields of vocational evaluation and career assessment and represents the needs of the professionals who provide those services" (VECAP, n.d.a.).

Certifications for Vocational Evaluators

Certified Vocational Evaluator

The Commission on Certification of Work Adjustment and Vocational Evaluation Services (CCWAVES), beginning in 1981, offered three active certifications, one of which was the Certified Vocational Evaluator (CVE; C. A. Chapman, personal communication, September 2016). In 1992, a position statement on vocational evaluation and assessment was developed by an interdisciplinary council that provided statements on the profession of vocational evaluation and assessment (Smith, Lombard, Neubert, Leconte, Rothernbacher, & Sitlington, 1994). Those statements provided the guiding principles for the Certified Vocational Evaluation Specialists (CVE), Certified Work Adjustment Specialists (CWA), and the Certified Career Assessment Associates (CCAA). The guidelines included using a *variety of methods* to complete an accurate assessment of a client, *information verification*, *behavioral observation*, seeing vocational evaluation and assessment as an *ongoing process* consisting of *integration*, and *collaboration*, and demonstrating *relevance* in the evaluation results (CRCC, n.d.a.).

CCWAVES discontinued the active application and examination process for CVE in 2008 due to expenses continuing to exceed revenues for the credential and a continued decline in certification applications and renewals (Joint Task Force on Alternative Certification, 2009; M. O'Brien, personal communication, September 9, 2008). This decline may be attributed to employers not requiring the CVE for practicing vocational evaluators and the credential being "too elite" (Joint Task Force on Alternative Certification, 2009, p. 5) because coursework and degree granting institutions were not readily available. CCWAVES dissolved on April 1, 2009, at which time maintenance of credentials was turned over to the Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification (Registry of Professional Vocational Evaluators, Inc. [RPVE], n.d.). Individuals can no longer apply for and obtain the CVE credential (RPVE, n.d.), though those who are already certified can renew and maintain their certification by demonstrating their professional development through continuing education credits every five years (CRCC, 2016). Since the CVE was no longer allowing individuals to apply for this

credential, vocational evaluators began exploring the development of an alternative credential, which became known as the Professional Vocational Evaluator (C. Reid & C. A. Chapman, personal communication, October 27, 2010).

Professional Vocational Evaluator

The Professional Vocational Evaluator credential evolved from the development of a task force comprising leadership of VEWAA, VECAP, Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute, and the Department of Rehabilitation and Counseling at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. This group met in the summer of 2009 to explore another process for the credentialing of vocational evaluators (C. Reid & C. A. Chapman, personal communication, October 27, 2010) since there was a gap in credentialing that demonstrated vocational evaluators' education and knowledge (RPVE, n.d.). This group conducted an online survey and received support for a new credential for vocational evaluators and agreement that the new credential should be called Professional Vocational Evaluator (PVE; VEWAA, n.d.b.). According to the RPVE brochure (RPVE, n.d.), RPVE is a registry for vocational evaluators who have demonstrated acceptable standards of education, experience, and knowledge. The organization is a non-profit and is managed by a board of directors (RPVE, n.d.). With the creation of a professional also comes the development of codes of ethics and professional conduct.

Codes of Ethics and Guidelines for Professional Conduct

Within the rehabilitation profession, national certifications serve to protect the public (CRCC, n.d.b.) from unqualified individuals and serve as a basis for assuring that practitioners have the knowledge, skills, and experience necessary to practice nationally (RPVE, n.d.). These organizations require continuing education, at various intervals, so that those who are certified can stay current in the field in order to maintain their certification (CRCC, 2016). Certifying organizations hold their members accountable to written, peer reviewed standards and have codes of ethics by which those who hold their certification must abide (CRCC, 2010). A code of ethics "exists to protect and promote the welfare of clients" (Remley & Herlihy, 2001, p. 8), while a code of conduct is "a set of conventional principles and expectations that are considered binding on any person who is a member of a particular group" (vocabulary.com, n.d.). The Codes of Ethics and Professional Conduct for vocational evaluators will be reviewed and compared to the Code of Ethics for rehabilitation counselors. This review is occurring in order to assist vocational evaluators to improve the PVE Guidelines so that these Guidelines keep abreast of the changes occurring in our technologically advanced world.

Code of Ethics for Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Association

The Code of Ethics for the Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Association (VEWAA) was developed during a VEWAA Conference (Hoffman, 2008) with adoption at their September 29, 1970 conference (Nadolsky, 1986). Standards for vocational evaluators and work adjustment professionals were needed because some states were trying to set lower standards for these professionals. The incoming president of VEWAA, Stanley Crow, was tasked with writing a letter to the Governor of Arizona stating that standards for vocational evaluators and work adjustment personnel had already been set by the Commission on the Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF) and the National Policy and Performance Council of the Rehabilitation Services Administration. The original VEWAA code addressed

“the areas of professional responsibility and competence, confidentiality, interprofessional relationships, publication, and consultation” (Cottone, Simmons, & Wilfley, 1983, p. 20). These same ethical areas were addressed on the VEWAA website with a re-adoption date of April 27, 2006 (VEWAA, 2006). There are only a few minor differences between the Codes of Ethics on the VEWAA (2006) and VECAP (n.d.b.) websites. Under the Responsibility section of the Code, VEWAA (2006) expects ethical and competent behavior whether providers are members of the *association* or not and VECAP (n.d.b.) expects these behaviors whether or not a person is a member of the *organization*. Under the Code categories of Professional Competence, Confidentiality, and Interprofessional Relationships, VEWAA (n.d.b.) used the term *rehabilitation process* while VECAP (n.d.b.) used the terms *evaluation and assessment process*. Under Consultation, VEWAA (2006) used *and* while VECAP (n.d.b.) used *however* when discussing accepting consulting assignments and insuring competency.

Certified Vocational Evaluator Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Professional Conduct for the Professional Vocational Evaluator

In April of 2009, a code of ethics was adopted by the Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification for vocational assessment professionals, which includes CVEs, CWAs, and CCAAs. The Code of Professional Ethics for Vocational Evaluation Specialists, Work Adjustment Specialists, and Career Assessment Associates (CRCC, 2009b) will, henceforth, be referred to as the CVE Code. This Code of Ethics for certified vocational evaluators was modeled after the Code of Professional Ethics for Rehabilitation Counselors (CRCC, 2009a). The CVE Code (CRCC, 2009b) consists of a Preamble as well as the following categories: Professional-Client Relationships; Confidentiality; Professional Responsibilities and Competence; Evaluation, Assessment, and Interpretation; Professional Relationships; Research and Publications; Resolution of Ethical Dilemmas; Business Practices; Forensic Applications; and an Addenda. While this code is no longer being updated, it still applies to those individuals who continue to be CVEs.

While the CVE Code of Ethics (CRCC, 2009b) maintains its maintenance mode (RPVE, n.d.), on April 1, 2011, the Registry of Professional Vocational Evaluators adopted the Guidelines for Professional Conduct for the Professional Vocational Evaluator (RPVE, 2011), henceforth, the PVE Guidelines. The PVE Guidelines are the most recent code of conduct for the field of vocational evaluation.

The current Guidelines for Professional Conduct for the Professional Vocational Evaluator (RPVE, 2011) include the following areas: Evaluator-Client Relationships, Confidentiality, Evaluator Responsibility and Competence, Interpretation of Evaluation Information, Evaluator Relationships, Research and Publication, Resolution of Ethical Dilemmas, Business Practices, and Forensic Applications. Unlike the previous code for CVEs (VEWAA, 2006), the PVE code does not start with a preamble (RPVE, 2011). As a point of comparison, the Code of Professional Ethics for Rehabilitation Counselors will be reviewed and then compared to the PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) and the CVE Code (CRCC, 2009b).

Code of Professional Ethics for Rehabilitation Counselors

Rehabilitation counselors can choose to obtain the Certified Rehabilitation Counselor (CRC) credential. The exam, renewal, and enforcement of the Code for the CRC are overseen by the Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification (CRCC). The CRCC has an extensive code revision process where a code revision takes place about every five years. First, the ethics committee establishes a code revision task force that combs through recent codes, looks at the role and function studies of its certificantes, conducts a survey of its members, holds public comment, and develops a draft that is approved by the commission's ethics committee. From there, the draft code goes to the board of directors for approval and then publication. The first code adopted by CRCC occurred in 1987 (CRCC, 2010). The Code of Professional Ethics for Rehabilitation Counselors (CRCC, 2009a), henceforth, the CRCC Code, was implemented in January 2010 (CRCC, 2009a). The CRCC Code is currently undergoing a code revision and the next revision of this code went into effect January 2017 (CRCC, personal communication, October 2016). As with the CVE Code (CRCC, 2009b), which was modeled after the CRCC Code (2009a), the CRCC Code begins with a Preamble. The CRCC Code includes the Counseling Relationship; Confidentiality, Privileged Communication, and Privacy; Advocacy and Accessibility; Professional Responsibility; Relationships with Other Professionals; Forensic and Indirect Services; Evaluation, Assessment, and Interpretation; Teaching, Supervision and Training; Research and Publication; Technology and Distance Counseling; Business Practices; and Resolving Ethical Issues. All parts of this Code are enforceable.

Comparison of Ethical Codes and Guidelines

Ethical codes are developed to govern the conduct of organization members (CRCC, 2010). While the Code of Professional Ethics for Vocational Evaluation Specialists, Work Adjustment Specialists, and Career Assessment Associates (CVE Code; CRCC, 2009b) most resembles the CRCC Code of Professional Ethics (2009a), CVE Code (CRCC, 2009b) is not likely to be revised and only covers those individuals who are in maintenance mode with their CVE credential (RPVE, n.d.). The CVE Code is enforced by the Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification (CRCC, 2012). The ethical guidelines that apply to all new and current PVEs are the Guidelines for Professional Conduct for the Professional Vocational Evaluator (RPVE, 2011). There was no information in the PVE Code or on the RPVE website to indicate whether the PVE Guidelines are enforceable. The introductory statement in the PVE Guidelines state the objective of the Guidelines is "to provide a structure for professional behavior and responsibilities ... and a standard for self-improvement and acceptable ethical conduct" (RPVE, 2011, p.2). As noted in previous paragraphs, professional associations often create or adopt codes or standards of behaviors for their members, and most of these codes adopt either current codes within the profession or general philosophical principles such as the code of ethics located on the VEWAA website, which was readopted in April 2006 (Early, 1989; VEWAA, 2006).

Table 1 shows a comparison of the sections of the CRCC Code (CRCC, 2009a), the PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011), and the CVE Code (CRCC, 2009b). While the three codes/guidelines in many cases show similar sections, the specific content under these sections varies considerably. The CRCC (CRCC, 2009a) and CVE Codes (CRCC, 2009b) have a great deal of specific guidance, but in most of the sections in the PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) specific

guidance consists only of a few general sentences. For ease in reading, specific recommendations for changes to the PVE Guidelines will be addressed as each section of the Codes and Guidelines are discussed.

Table 1

Comparison of Codes/Guideline Sections

Code Headings	CRCC Code ^a	PVE Guidelines ^b	CVE-Maintenance Mode ^c
Preamble, Ethical Principles	Yes	No section addresses this	Yes
The Counseling Relationship	Yes	Yes—Evaluator- Client Relationships	Yes
Confidentiality, Privileged Communication, & Privacy	Yes	Yes—Confidentiality only	Yes—Confidentiality only
Advocacy & Accessibility	Yes	No section addresses this	No section addresses this
Professional Responsibility	Yes	Yes—Evaluator Responsibility & Competence	Yes—Professional Responsibility & Competence
Relationships with Other Professionals	Yes	Evaluator Relationships	Yes
Forensic & Indirect Services	Yes	Yes—Forensic Applications	Yes—Forensic Applications
Evaluation, Assessment, & Interpretation	Yes	Yes	Yes
Teaching, Supervision, & Training	Yes	No section addresses this	No section addresses this
Research & Publication	Yes	Yes	Yes
Technology & Distance Counseling	Yes	No section addresses this	No section addresses this

Business Practices	Yes	Yes	Yes
Resolving Ethical Issues	Yes	Resolution of Ethical Dilemmas	No section addresses this

Note. ^a (CRCC, 2009a). ^b (RPVE, 2011). ^c (CRCC, 2009b).

A comparison of the 2010 CRCC Code of Ethics (CRCC, 2009a) and the current 2011 PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) show some stark differences. The 2010 CRCC Code (2009a) includes a Preamble that states that CRCs must provide services within their scope of practice and that the primary obligation is to clients. Within the preamble is a paragraph that discusses the basic objectives of the code, which is to promote public welfare, establish ethical principles, serve as an ethical guide, and serve as a guide for Code violations by CRCs.

Specific standards of practice are described as ethical principles. Kitchener, in his 1984 work, discussed applying ethical principles to the field of counseling psychology. Those principles include autonomy (respect client choice), beneficence (promote client well-being), fidelity (keep stated and implied promises), non-maleficence (do no harm), and justice (treat clients fairly) (Cottone & Tarvydas, 2007; Kitchener, 1984). The CRCC Code includes the aforementioned ethical principles and adds veracity (honesty) (CRCC 2009a).

In looking at the 2011 PVE Guidelines (RPVE), the only introduction is a statement of the objectives of the guidelines. The existing CVE Code of Ethics (CRCC, 2009b) includes a preamble and the first five ethical principles outlined above.

The counseling relationship. In the CRCC Code (2009a), Section A: The Counseling Relationship covered Welfare of Those Served by Rehabilitation Counselors, Respecting Diversity, Client Rights in the Counseling Relationship, Avoiding Harm and Value Imposition, Roles and Relationships with Clients, Multiple Clients, Group Work, Termination and Referral, and End-of-Life Care for Terminally Ill Clients. The PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) address Evaluator-Client Relationships, including respect for clients and avoiding discrimination, state that the primary obligation is to clients, that dual relationships should be avoided, and that evaluators should practice universal design to ensure accurate evaluation results. These statements provide very little specific information about their meaning. Within the PVE Guidelines, Multicultural Issues/Diversity in Evaluations Issues and Informed Consent— Explanation to Clients are addressed under Interpretation of Evaluation Information. PVEs focus on administration and interpretation of test results based on cultural norms and must explain the purpose of the evaluation. The Evaluator-Client Relationships section of the PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) could benefit from enhanced discussion around disclosure, diversity, and specifics about dual relationships with clients, group evaluations, and testing. The CVE Code of Ethics (CRCC, 2009b) has a more extensive section on Professional-Client Relationships and includes discussions on boundaries of services, client choice, sexual relationships, communication of information, and universal design, just to name a few of the enforceable standards of practice.

Confidentiality. Both the CRCC Code (2009a) and the PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) address Confidentiality. The CRCC Code (2009a) Section B contains more specific information

in the following subsections: Respecting Client Rights, Exceptions, Information Shared with Others, Groups and Families, Responsibilities to Minors or Clients Lacking Capacity to Consent, Records, and Consultation. In the PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011), under Confidentiality there are four statements that address disclosure, client privacy, and cultural and developmental boundaries, as well as a sentence on obtaining consent for electronic communication. Further, under Business Practices, the PVE Guidelines discuss “confidentiality in creating, storing, accessing, transferring, and disposing of case records in all media” (RPVE, 2011, p. 6). Much more information could be provided to PVEs regarding the handling and storage of records, sharing of information, legal exceptions, working with minors, informed consent, and privacy, which are areas included in the CVE Code (CRCC, 2009b).

Advocacy and accessibility. Advocacy and Accessibility are addressed in Section C of the CRCC Code of Ethics (2009a). Additional information under Advocacy includes addressing Attitudinal Barriers, and under Accessibility, issues of accommodations and Barriers to Access are addressed. The PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) do not include a specific area on these issues, except in the first section on Evaluator-Client Relationships that mentions practicing universal design and using techniques that are accessible to different individuals in order to produce accurate evaluation results. This is an area ripe for additional information for evaluators who hold the PVE credential. The Thirtieth Institute on Rehabilitation Issues (2003) discussed advocacy and accessibility. Vocational evaluators discussed the impact consumer advocacy groups have had on pushing for expedited services from rehabilitation service providers, which includes vocational evaluators. Further, the Thirtieth Institute on Rehabilitation Issues discussed that vocational evaluators provide direct consumer services such as encouraging consumers' self-determination and advocacy. This advocacy often requires the support of the consumer's counselor. Additionally, vocational evaluators have advocated for more realistic work and community based assessment practices. As previously mentioned, universal design for learning has had an impact on vocational evaluation. Universal design for learning is focused on creating “environments and tools that are usable by as many people as possible” (Center for Applied Special Technology [CAST], 2011, p. 3).

Additionally, the Thirtieth Institute on Rehabilitation Issues (2003) discussed accessibility of the evaluation site, the print materials provided to consumers, and using accessible Web development standards (Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board Electronic and Information Technology Accessibility Standards, 2000). The CVE Code of Ethics (CRCC, 2009b) also does not include a specific section on advocacy and accessibility.

Professional responsibility. Professional Responsibility section D of the 2010 CRCC Code (2009a) deals with Professional Competence, Cultural Competence/Diversity, Functional Competence, Professional Credentials, Responsibility to the Public and Other Professionals, and Scientific Bases for Interventions. The PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) have statements addressing open, accurate, and honest communication, boundaries of personal and professional competence, consultation from legal statutes, codes of

professional conduct, and consultation with others as appropriate. Beyond addressing those issues in statements, this area would benefit from more specifics, such as those addressed in the CVE Code (CRCC, 2009b), including continuing education and PVE credentials, diversity competence, impairment, issues of veracity, and use of techniques and assessment instruments that have an empirical foundation.

Relationships with other professionals. The 2010 CRCC Code (2009a) Section E addresses Relationships with Other Professionals. Within that section of the code are Relationships with Colleagues, Employers, and Employees, Consultation, and Agency and Team Relationships. While the PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) do have an area on Evaluator Relationships, there are only two sentences addressing this topic, discussing collaborative relationships and respect for other professionals by acting with integrity. This section of the PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) is in need of further development since vocational evaluators, by the nature of their positions, frequently engage with other professionals, many of whom are not vocational evaluators. The CVE Code (CRCC, 2009b) addresses this topic in its Section E Professional Relationships and touches on many issues regarding involvement with other professionals.

Forensic and indirect services. The CRCC Code (2009a) Section F addresses Forensic and Indirect Services. Within this section Client or Evaluatee Rights, information on forensic competency and conduct, Forensic Practices, and Forensic Business Practices are discussed.

Forensic Applications can also be found in the PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011). The PVE Guidelines in the area of Forensic Applications have two rather lengthy statements. The first sentence discusses the importance of following all applicable rules, regulations, policies, standards of practices, and codes set forth by other organizations. The second sentence discusses practicing within the professional's boundaries of competence. The field of forensic rehabilitation has been expanding in recent year and the PVE Guidelines would serve its certificates better by a much more expanded forensic section. The CVE Code (CRCC, 2009b) has Section I, which addresses Forensic Applications in a comprehensive manner, and could be used as a guide for this revision.

Evaluation, assessment, and interpretation. Both the CRCC Code (2009a) Section G and the CVE Code (CRCC, 2009b) Section D have specific sections on Evaluation, Assessment, and Interpretation. For the PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011), the section on Interpretation of Evaluation Information is the most comprehensive area in the PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011).

All of the Codes (CRCC, 2009a, 2009b) and Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) discuss informed consent, with CRCC (2009a) addressing this in G.1, the PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) in Interpretation of Evaluation Information, and the CVE Code (2009b) addressing this in D.2. Competence to use and interpret tests, conditions of administration, and test selection show up in all the codes (CRCC, 2009a, 2009b; RPVE, 2011). For CRCC (2009a), the areas are sections on Informed Consent, Release of Information to Competent Professionals, Proper Diagnosis of Mental Disorders, Competence to Use and Interpret Tests, Test Selection, Conditions of Test Administration, Test Scoring and Interpretation, and Assessment Considerations. In the PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011), the subheadings in this area include Multiple Techniques, Informed Consent-

Explanation to Clients, and Interpretation and Release of Information, which includes information on the Client's Right to Know, Written Release of Information, and Release of Raw Data. Additionally, this subsection of the PVE Guidelines discusses Competence: Use, Selection and Security of Information, which consists of Limits of Competence, Appropriate Use, Accurate Information, Appropriateness of Instruments, Norm Divergence, and Security. This section of the PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) also addresses Conditions of Administration with the subcategories of Administration Conditions, Computer Administration, Unsupervised Test- Taking, and Access to Evaluation Techniques. These areas are also addressed in the CVE (CRCC, 2009b). The PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) address Multicultural Issues/Diversity in Evaluations and contain sections on test norming, culturally diverse populations, and diversity in assessment techniques. The section on Scoring and Interpretation of Evaluation Results includes an area on Reporting Limitations and Reporting Techniques and Procedures. As would be expected, this is most comprehensive section of the PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) and does cover multiple issues in testing and evaluation. Multicultural Issues/Diversity in Assessment is also covered in the CVE (CRCC, 2009b).

Teaching, supervision, and training. Teaching, Supervision, and Training are Section H of the CRCC Code (2009a). Within this section are areas that include Rehabilitation Counselor Supervision and Client Welfare, Rehabilitation Counselor Supervision Competence, Roles and Relationships with Supervisees and Trainees, Rehabilitation Counselor Supervisor Responsibilities, Rehabilitation Counselor Supervisor Evaluation, Remediation, Endorsement, Responsibilities of Rehabilitation Counselor Educators, Student Welfare, and Cultural Diversity Competence in Rehabilitation Counselor Education Programs and Training Programs. Neither the CVE Code (CRCC, 2009b) nor the PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) addresses this topic. Considering that many educators teach in vocational evaluation or rehabilitation and counselor education programs, as well as supervise employees or students, this is a section that is needed for both current PVEs and those entering the field with the PVE credential. Further, in Hamilton and Shumate's (2005) role and function survey, seven percent of the CVEs who responded worked in university or college settings.

Research and publication. Section I of the CRCC Code (2009a) is about Research and Publication. Topics in this section include Research Responsibilities, Informed Consent and Disclosure, Reporting Results, Publication and Presentations, and Confidentiality. The PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) have a section called Research and Publication, recommending vocational evaluators participate in and be supportive of research and follow appropriate research protocol. Since some PVEs do research and publish in books and peer reviewed journals, this topic deserves more attention in order to provide appropriate guidance in this area. The CVE Code (CRCC, 2009b) has a Section F on Research and Publication, which provides content that could be added to the PVE Guidelines. For example, the PVE Guidelines could discuss the use of an appropriate research methodology, recognition of contributors to the research, veracity in the reporting of research findings, submission, and the peer review process.

Technology and distance counseling. Section J, which deals with Technology and Distance Counseling, was expanded in the 2010 CRCC Code (2009a). This section is not

in the current PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) and is referenced in the 2009 CVE Code (CRCC) under Section B: Confidentiality. The focus in this section is on protecting confidentiality of records and Limitations of Electronic Communication. Under the subheading “Limits of Competence” in Section D 5: Competence to Use and Interpret Assessment Instruments, technology assisted test interpretation is discussed. As previously stated, the CVE Code (CRCC, 2009b) will not be revised since the credential is in maintenance mode, for current CVEs (RPVE, n.d.). Technology is expanding rapidly and changes in this area will continue. Vocational evaluators need to stay abreast of technology, including technology-assisted assessments. As paper and pencil tests are replaced with computer evaluations and online assessments, issues of accessibility, confidentiality, and security become important. PVEs are strongly encouraged to include technology in future revisions of their PVE Guidelines. The CVE Code (CRCC, 2009b) Section B: Confidentiality and Section D.5.a. Limits to Confidentiality can be used as a starting point to update the PVE Guidelines. Consideration could also be given to adding many of the sections the CRCC code (2009a) addresses. Those areas include Behavior and Identification; Accessibility; Confidentiality, Informed Consent, and Security; Technology-Assisted Assessment; Consultation Groups; Records, Data Storage, and Disposal; Legal; Advertising; Research and Publication; Rehabilitation Counselor Unavailability, which could be revised and renamed vocational evaluator unavailability; Distance Counseling Credential Disclosure, Distance Counseling Relationships; Distance Counseling Security and Business Practices; Distance Group Counseling; and Teaching, Supervision, and Training at a Distance. While all of these subsections may not be appropriate for vocational evaluators, many of the subsections should be incorporated into the guidelines for vocational evaluators in today’s technologically advanced world. The Thirtieth Institute on Rehabilitation Issues (2003) reported that technology is now used by vocational evaluators to perform such routine tasks such as research, computer based assessments, and video conferencing.

Business practices. Both the PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) and the CVE Code (CRCC, 2009b) along with the CRCC Code (2009a), address the topic of Business Practices. In the CRCC Code, Section K deals with Business Practices and includes subsections Advertising and Soliciting Clients; Client Records; Fees, Bartering, and Billing; and Termination. The CVE Code (CRCC, 2009b) addresses many of these same topics. The PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) under the topic of Business Practices has significantly less information. Much more information should be given to PVEs in addressing business practices. Although having Business Practices in the PVE Guidelines is a good start, the topic of business practices still needs much more development in the guideline in order to assist the Professional Vocational Evaluator.

Ethical issues. The last section of the CRCC Code (2009a), Section L, is Resolving Ethical Issues. The CRCC Code has a number of subsections including Knowledge of CRCC Standards, Application of Standards, Suspected Violations, Cooperation with Ethics Committee, and Unfair Discrimination Against Complainants and Respondents. The PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) have an area titled Resolution of Ethical Dilemmas. This section deals with behavior and incorporation of ethical practice in work, learning and understanding the code of professional conduct and specific standards of practice where the PVE works, and striving to resolve ethical dilemmas, as well as seeking

consultation. The resolution of ethical issues is important to professionals. Professional Vocational Evaluators need to understand how to resolve ethical issues and what the process should be in resolving dilemmas. The PVE Registry needs to clarify how their guidelines for PVE professionals are enforced and if there is a grievance process for their Guidelines. More specifics are needed in this area to help PVEs resolve ethical conflicts. The CVE Code (CRCC, 2009b) addresses this topic somewhat in Section E: Professional Relationships. The focus on this section is on resolving ethical conflicts between professionals as opposed to client reported conflicts.

Recommendations

Ideally, a code should be a living document that establishes ethical practices for its certificates. This article has provided a brief review of the history and evolution of credentialing of vocational evaluators. It has compared the existing code sections of the current codes in effect for Certified Rehabilitation Counselors, Certified Vocational Evaluators, and Professional Vocational Evaluators.

One of the hallmarks of a profession is regulation of professional credentialing. Standards for a profession need to include education, experience, and knowledge competencies (Leahy, 2012). Members of vocational evaluation organizations came together at a difficult time in the profession's history to develop a registry, the RPVE, and credential, the PVE, to maintain a level of recognized proficiency for current vocational evaluators and those entering the vocational evaluation profession (RPVE, 2011). The RPVE created guidelines for PVEs that became effective in 2011 and that state within the body of their guidelines that "the objectives of the guidelines for professional conduct are to provide a structure for professional behavior and responsibilities for Professional Vocational Evaluators and to provide a standard for self-improvement and acceptable ethical conduct" (RPVE, 2011, p. 2). While this effort was needed due to the CVE credential ending and being continued only in maintenance mode for current certification holders (RPVE, n.d.), the PVE Guidelines should be a beginning effort, as a living document, to provide guidance to PVEs.

Now five years after the PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) became effective, consideration should be given to move those guidelines into a comprehensive code of ethics. The Registry of PVE, VECAP, and VEWA leadership must come together to embark on another role and function study of those working as vocational evaluators since the last study was published in 2005 (Hamilton & Shumate). These leaders may want to offer an incentive to a graduate student to accomplish this task, similar to the incentive VECAP is offering a graduate student to complete a systematic review of service delivery outcomes from receipt of vocational evaluation and career assessment services (Castiglione, 2016, September 21). Once this is accomplished and the voices of vocational evaluators are heard, development of a specific ethical code needs to be undertaken. Current sections must be revised and expanded to provide truly the ethical guidance needed for PVEs. As previously indicated, some recommended changes were discussed earlier in the comparison of the CRCC Code to the CVE Code and PVE Guidelines.

Needless to say, the relationship a vocational evaluator has with a client may be quite different from the relationship a rehabilitation counselor has with a client, unless the vocational evaluator is serving in a dual role of rehabilitation counselor and vocational evaluator. The suggested changes to the PVE Guidelines should be considered in light of these differences, the most significant difference being the length of the relationship a vocational evaluator has with the client versus a rehabilitation counselor. Thus, do the PVE Guidelines need to incorporate both roles or just the role of a vocational evaluator, since most rehabilitation counselors are also licensed and may have counseling credentials such as the CRC, which provides ethical guidelines for their counseling practice? Future PVE Guideline revisions could focus on the most essential areas discussed. Further, with many companies moving to online testing, the addition of guidelines for online test administration should be added to the PVE Guidelines. Also, with the decrease in available vocational evaluators and financial resources, agencies may need to have vocational evaluations handled online rather than face-to-face. Other areas currently missing, such as use of technology in evaluation, need to be developed. Computer technology is rapidly changing and shows signs of increased use in vocational evaluation. Virtual Reality applications are a reality today and have application to this field (Berven & Drout, 2012). PVEs need specific ethical guidance, as well adherence to ethical principles, to provide best practice in today's complex work environments. There also must be mechanisms that allow for grievances by consumers of VE services, as well as an appeals process for grievance procedure outcomes. Sanctions for ethical code violations should be clear to both practitioners and the public.

One suggestion is to combine initially the CVE Code with the PVE Guidelines as a starting point. For example, the reviewers would need to carefully compare Section D: Evaluation, Assessment, and Interpretation of the CVE Code (CRCC, 2009b) with the Interpretation of Evaluation Information section of the PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) as there is overlap in these sections, but some differences. For example, the CVE Code (CRCC, 2009b) has specific headings titled Validity and Reliability, Automated Testing Services, Obsolete Tests and Outdated Test Results, and Assessment Construction. These topics were not found in the PVE Guidelines. Further, under Limits of Competence, technology-assisted test interpretation was not discussed. The Research and Publications section of the PVE Guidelines (RPVE, 2011) also did not include information on disguising data presented in presentations or publications and on making decisions based on test results. Additionally, prior Codes should be reviewed to pull the best information from all codes that have been used by vocational evaluators to create the best PVE Guideline revision possible.

A schedule for periodic review and updating of the code needs to be developed next. Ethics credit hours must be built into professional development requirements for re-certification. To do less is to shortchange professional vocational evaluators and the clients they serve, as well as not move the profession forward, a profession with a lengthy history of much needed service. Yes, these are challenging times and professionals, especially volunteers, are very busy people. However, service to one's profession should be considered an ethical obligation to maintaining one's profession now and into the future.

References

- Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board Electronic and Information Technology Accessibility Standards, 36 C.F.R. Part 1194 (2000).
- Berven, N. L., & Drout, M. O. (2012). Assessment. In D. R. Maki & V. M. Tarvydas (Eds.), *The professional practice of rehabilitation counseling* (pp. 213–240). New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company, LLC.
- Castiglione, S. (2016, September 21). Re: Systematic review of research related to service delivery and outcomes following vocational evaluation or career assessment services. Retrieved from <https://vecap.org/>
- Center for Applied Special Technology. (2011). *Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 2.0*. Wakefield, MA: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.udlcenter.org/aboutudl/udlguidelines/downloads>
- Coffey, D. (1978). Vocational evaluator competencies and their relevance as perceived by practitioners and educators in vocational evaluation. (Doctoral Dissertation, Auburn University). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 39, 3364–3365.
- Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification. (2008). The CRCC salary survey. Retrieved August 9, 2016, from <http://www.crc certification.com>
- Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification. (2009a). *Code of professional ethics for rehabilitation counselors*. Schaumburg, IL: Author.
- Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification. (2009b). *Code of professional ethics for vocational evaluation specialists, work adjustment specialists, and career assessment associates*. Schaumburg, IL: Author.
- Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification. (2010). *The CRCC desk reference on professional ethics: A guide for rehabilitation counselors*. Athens, GA: Elliott and Fitzpatrick, Inc.
- Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification. (2012). *CRCC Guidelines and Procedures for Processing Complaints*. Retrieved from <https://www.crc certification.com/grievance-process>
- Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification. (2016). *Criteria for certification renewal and continuing education*. Schaumburg, IL: Author.
- Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification. (n.d.a.). *Guiding principle*. Retrieved from <https://www.crc certification.com/cve-cwa-ccaa-guiding-principles>
- Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification. (n.d.b.). *General FAQs*. Retrieved from <https://www.crc certification.com/crc-certification-general-faqs>

- Cottone, R. R., Simmons, B., & Wilfley, D. (1983). Ethical issues in vocational rehabilitation: A review of the literature from 1970 to 1981. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 29(2), 19–24.
- Cottone, R. R., & Tarvydas, V. M. (2007). *Counseling ethics and decision making* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.
- Early, J. K. (1989, March 9–11). Ethics in vocational evaluation: A foundation for future study. In R. R. Fry (Ed.), *Fourth National Forum on Issues in Vocational Assessment* (pp. 27–32). University of Wisconsin-Stout: Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute.
- Hamilton, M. R. (2004). The role and function of certified vocational evaluation specialists: A survey of practice in North America. U.S.: ProQuest Information & Learning.
- Hamilton, M., & Shumate, S. (2005). The role and function of certified vocational evaluation specialists. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 71(1), 5–19.
- Hoffman, P. R. (2008). History of the vocational evaluation and work adjustment association. *Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Association Journal*, 36(1), 9–17.
- Joint Task Force on Alternative Certification. (2009). *Report to VECAP/VEWAA Boards*. Retrieved from vewaa.com/profdev/uploadedmaterial/Report%20to%20VECAP%20Final.doc
- Kitchener, K. S. (1984). Intuition, critical evaluation, and ethical principles: The foundation for ethical decisions in counseling psychology. *Counseling Psychology*, 12, 43–55. [doi:10.1177/0011000084123005](https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000084123005)
- Leahy, M. J. (2012). Qualified providers of rehabilitation counseling services. In D. R. Maki & V. M. Tarvydas (Eds.), *The professional practice of rehabilitation counseling* (pp. 193–211). New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company, LLC.
- Leahy, M. J., & Wright, G. N. (1988). Professional competencies of the vocational evaluator. *Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin*, 21(4), 127–132.
- Nadolsky, J. M. (1986). Ethical issues in the transition from public to private rehabilitation. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 52(1), 6–8.
- Newman, I., Waechter, D., Nolte, D., & Boyer-Stephens, A. (1998, Fall Winter). An assessment of knowledge domains for vocational evaluators: A precursor to a national licensure examination. *Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin*, 72–79.

- Registry of Professional Vocational Evaluators. (2011). *Guidelines for professional conduct for the professional vocational evaluator*. Retrieved from <https://pvregistry.org/apply/guide/>
- Registry of Professional Vocational Evaluators, Inc. (n.d.). *Welcome*. Retrieved from <https://pvregistry.org/about/>
- Remley, R. P., & Herlihy, B. (2001). *Ethical, legal, and professional issues in counseling*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Sankovsky, R. (1969). *State of the art in vocational evaluation: Report of a national survey*. Pittsburgh: PA: Research and Training Center in Vocational Rehabilitation, University of Pittsburgh.
- Sligar, S. R., & Betters, C. J. (2011). VEWAA, VECAP and CVE: Where have we been? Where are we headed? *Vocational Evaluation and Career Assessment Professionals Journal*, 7(1), 67–72.
- Smith, R., Lombard, R., Neubert, D., Leconte, P., Rothernbacher, C., & Sitlington, P. (1994). The position statement of the Interdisciplinary Council on Vocational Assessment and Evaluation. *The Journal for Vocational Special Needs Education*, 17, 41–42.
- Thirtieth Institute on Rehabilitation Issues. (2003). *A new paradigm for vocational evaluation: Empowering the VR consumer through vocational information* (30th Institute on Rehabilitation Issues). Washington, D.C: Rehabilitation Services Administration, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://iriforum.org/download/IRI30.pdf>
- Vocabulary.com (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/code%20of%20conduct>
- Vocational Evaluation and Career Assessment Professionals Association (n.d.a.). *About us*. Retrieved from <https://vecap.org/about/>
- Vocational Evaluation and Career Assessment Professionals Association (n.d.b.). *Code of ethics*. Retrieved from <https://vecap.org/code-of-ethics/>
- Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Association (2006). *Code of ethics*. Retrieved from http://www.vewaa.com/?page_id=324
- Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Association (n.d.a.). *Code of ethics*. Retrieved from http://www.vewaa.com/?page_id=324
- Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Association (n.d.b.). *Certification*. Retrieved from http://www.vewaa.com/?page_id=31

Author Note

Susan G. Sherman, Ph.D., LPC, CRC, CPM, is an assistant professor and director of the Rehabilitation and Career Counseling Program at East Carolina University (ECU). She also coordinates the Rehabilitation Certificate program at ECU. Her research interests include Ethics, Evidence-based Practices, and Multicultural Counseling in Rehabilitation. Dr. Sherman received her PhD in Rehabilitation Counselor Education from Michigan State University. She earned her BS and MS in Rehabilitation Services from Florida State University. She is immediate past president of the Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification and past president of the National Rehabilitation Association.

Martha H Chapin, PhD, LPC, CRC, CDMS, NCC, is a professor and director of the Rehabilitation Services Program at East Carolina University in the Department of Addictions and Rehabilitation Studies. She has experience in private for-profit and state federal rehabilitation. Her research interests include employment for persons with spinal cord injuries and assessing how positive psychology techniques may be useful to facilitate employment of people with disabilities.