

Appendix 6-1

A Forum of National Organizations on Basic Questions Relevant to Vocational Evaluation

October 24-25, 1973

This report summarizes the testimony given by representatives of a number of national organizations to the steering committee of the VEWA Project in Washington, D.C. on October 24th and 25th, 1973. The forum and testimony were on "Basic Questions Relevant to Vocational Evaluation."

Each organization was asked to provide a prepared statement, which was endorsed by that organization, asking the following questions: (1) what does the organization see as its expectations and needs which will effect the vocational evaluation field; (2) what types of human needs and problems will require vocational evaluation; (3) what new groups are anticipated to be needing service within the next 5 to 10 years; (4) what specific issues should evaluation programs consider in order to be increasingly relevant to your organization's program goals; and (5) what premises and policy statements is your organization using as basis for its testimony.

The summaries of the testimony which follow were compiled from transcripts of the statements presented at the VEWA Forum in Washington and from the excellent and perceptive notes taken during the presentations by Gordon Krantz. Many of those testifying did not present written statements as requested; instead they opted to make oral remarks. Because those oral statements often tended to be discontinuous and sometimes rambling, the transcripts were sent back to the speakers for editing prior to being summarized.

American Academy of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation.

No response was obtained from this organization.

American Foundation for the Blind.

William F. Gallagher, Director, Program Planning Department

Mr. Gallagher was unable to attend the forum, so he submitted a letter and a policy statement from the American Foundation for the Blind.

The Foundation expressed a strong interest in vocational evaluation and work adjustment for blind and visually impaired persons. It employs four national specialists in areas connected with educational and vocational development, two of whom deal with rehabilitation and employment. The rehabilitation specialist gives counsel to staff in rehabilitation centers so that they will be able to assist blind persons to adjust to their disability and to obtain the skills, techniques, and attitudes to function independently. Whether the specialists now employed by the Foundation have training in vocational evaluation was not mentioned in Mr. Gallagher's letter. It is also clear from his letter that different evaluative methods are required for the congenitally blind and the adventitiously blind.

Mr. Gallagher suggested that persons who are involved in training and placing blind persons in jobs should be brought together to "arrive at an appropriate philosophy to be applied to vocational evaluation and work adjustment programs

for blind persons." He suggested that a national task force be formed to develop concepts of work adjustment.

Mr. Gallagher pointed to the vast need for services for the 50,000 people who are blinded each year and for the 18,000 school age children who must be prepared to enter the world of work. The Foundation sees VE as being most useful to those blind persons who have not established a vocational direction. A new population said to need specialized service consists of those blind students who have more than one disability. "We need a solid VE testing system if these students are to be placed in the job market." The need to approach VE from the standpoint of developing a course of action suitable to the individual rather than selecting people for a narrow set of outcomes was stressed.

The American Foundation policy statement attached to Mr. Gallagher's letter makes a strong plea for equal employment opportunities for blind persons, and supported efforts to break down barriers to employment. The Foundation policy statement made no mention of vocational evaluation and provided no specifics as to how VE might aid the Federation in meeting its goals.

American Occupational Therapy Association.

Laurence N. Peake

Mr. Laurence Peake indicated that a relatively small number of occupational therapists are engaged in prevocational and vocational evaluation per se; however, the basis upon which occupational therapy was founded is concerned with the meaning of work and its application to human dignity, health, and economic independence. Mr. Peake made a distinction between "pre-vocational evaluation" and "vocational evaluation," reflecting the definitions that were prevalent in the 1960's when the majority of vocational evaluators were occupational therapists.

The American Occupational Therapy Association (AOTA), for whom Mr. Peake spoke, endorsed vocational evaluation as an "integral part of the total rehabilitation process of individuals who may find themselves denied the opportunity to become economically independent. . . ." It was suggested that there should be a formalization of the skills, knowledge, preparation, and practice of vocational evaluation along with development of an adequate body of knowledge and training programs.

Mr. Peake's answers to VEWAA Project questions indicated that there is considerable overlap between the functions of occupational therapists and vocational evaluators, according to AOTA. One of the three major service areas of OT is:

primarily concerned with work adaptation and work role adjustment. . . . where the tasks chosen . . . will promote and teach independent functioning, develop and enhance the ability to work and/or fulfill age-specific life tasks and roles. This focus involves the identification and examination of those roles and skills essential for the individual's adaptation to his community; [and] assessment of the nature and level of his work capacities, attitudes and self-care skills, identification of what learning needs to occur and in what sequence.

Mr. Peake submitted a 1962 paper to the forum in response to the VEWAA Project's four major areas of emphasis. In it he concluded that different specialties have seized the opportunity to establish themselves in the field of vocational assessment. He stated that each discipline should develop its own particular approach, thereby contributing its unique concept and skill; on the other hand, however, Mr. Peake decried the unwillingness of each profession to "shed the cloak of its particular discipline."

The American Occupational Therapy Association expects growth in employment opportunities in the field of "occupational behavior." Some of this growth,

at least, will presumably come from occupational therapists' increasing participation in "prevocational exploration with clients preparing them for jobs." The exact role of the OT was not spelled out, however.

Mr. Peake's statement left the impression that AOTA understands the processes of vocational evaluation and work adjustment but sees these functions as belonging to the occupational therapist. There was little evidence of recognition of the role of the vocational evaluator.

One of the most prominent conclusions of Mr. Peake's discussion with the steering committee was that a link must be established between VEWA and the AOTA. As matters now stand, the two groups are performing similar functions and cross fertilization is urgently needed.

American Psychological Association.

Dr. Raymond Ehrle, Division of Rehabilitation Psychology

Dr. Ehrle stated that within the American Psychological Association vocational evaluation is not given a high priority level. He noted that his own monograph on careers in psychology does not make mention of VE and that may be an index of APA familiarity with the field. However, in the Division of Rehabilitation Psychology there is considerable interest in vocational evaluation, and many Division 22 members have made recognized contributions to VE.

His monograph indicates that there are many levels of employability, perhaps as many as 10. These levels range all the way from highly skilled competitive employment down to minimally productive work activity.

Dr. Ehrle sees VE as having a large role in the many social programs that require determination of employability (VR, Social Security, WIN, etc.). Beyond this, he sees the likelihood that VE will be a prominently needed technology in the future when society may provide periodic checkups in vocational competence. Dr. Ehrle foresees the possibility of community stations devoted to this kind of checkup. Aside from the traditional use of evaluation to determine employability, Dr. Ehrle also mentioned the possibility of evaluating for hobbies, alternative lifestyles, and use of leisure time.

Altogether, Dr. Ehrle's testimony was more reflective of his intimate acquaintance of the rehabilitation field than of the official position of the American Psychological Association. That organization has no established viewpoint with regard to VE. To the extent that it has, it has both the public espousal of differential staffing, and the territoriality of a professional union.

American Vocational Association.

Kenneth B. Hoyt

Dr. Hoyt's prepared statement, which he pointedly asserted as being his and not that of the association, briefly addressed questions that had been posed in the VEWA Project letter sent to him.

Vocational evaluation and vocational guidance for students who come into vocational education programs is made difficult by a number of complicating factors. First, many students enter vocational education not because they have clearly chosen it, but because they have either rejected, or been rejected by, the other elements of our educational system. They often lack any clear notion regarding career goals.

Second, the numbers and variety of vocational-technical-occupational training areas are increasing rapidly. Students at a very young age have to make fairly specific choices among training programs.

Third, few schools offer adequate career exploration opportunities for junior high school students even though those individuals are at an age when initial choices are considered and often made.

Fourth, almost all schools lack the "hands-on" means by which all students may be exposed to the range of occupations.

In response to a question regarding new groups of potential VE clients in the next five to 10 years, Dr. Hoyt stated that vocational education expected great increases in students who are (1) female, (2) disadvantaged, and (3) 25-39 years old.

Dr. Hoyt challenged the field of vocational evaluation to develop instruments and procedures that are: (1) more consistent with the programmatic structure of vocational evaluation; (2) useful for junior high school age pupils; (3) practical to use with large numbers of individuals; and (4) specifically applicable to vocational education.

Dr. Hoyt was very critical of vocational evaluation procedures developed under a vocational rehabilitation philosophy which are not practical for use with large numbers of students. He cited the cost limitations imposed by systems such as the Singer/Graflex and denounced any further proliferation of vocational evaluation programs that require several days for completion. He was not able to specify the characteristics of subgroups among the student body that would warrant this costly kind of job exploration endeavor.

The general subject of using more expensive technologies as a second resort was discussed. Dr. Hoyt pointed out the need for measures which will predict training success as well as outcome success. He was familiar with the problem faced by vocational education in that conventional normative testing is selective rather than useful in guidance.

Council on Exceptional Children.

Fred Weintraub of the CEC had scheduled himself for participation in this testimony, but a conflict arose and prevented his attendance.

Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation.

No response was obtained from this organization.

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

C. Samuel Barone, State Plan Officer

Some of the basic goals of the federal effort in education for the handicapped are quite similar in content to the goals of the state-federal rehabilitation program, e.g., to enable the handicapped to develop to their fullest potential and thereby reduce their degree of dependency. The Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) contends that it is cost-beneficial to society to help each handicapped child become as independent and productive as possible.

The Bureau will stress five new concepts over the next few years: (1) reduction of dependency of the severely handicapped; (2) reform in the traditional labeling and placement of handicapped children; (3) development of meaningful secondary and continuing education programs for handicapped youth and young adults; (4) integration of health, education and rehabilitation services for handicapped children; and (5) utilization of professional associates trained to work with handicapped children in regular classrooms.

One of the major objectives of BEH is to assure that, by the year 1977, every handicapped child who leaves school will have had career educational training that is relevant to the job market, meaningful to his career aspirations and realistic to his highest potential. Obviously, if that objective is to be accomplished there is a need for adequate assessment and vocational guidance services in school systems. Mr. Barone pointed to the need for earlier diagnosis and intervention with

handicapped children and to the lack of qualified teachers for vocational-technical education, physical education, and recreation for the handicapped.

In his prepared statement he made no mention of the methods used to assess students' abilities for placement into the vocational programs even though there is an increased emphasis in those programs upon more severely handicapped youngsters. However, under questioning Mr. Barone was emphatic in his assertion that techniques developed by rehabilitation including vocational evaluation and work adjustment were appropriate components of special education of the handicapped offered under public school auspices at the secondary level.

He mentioned specific issues which vocational evaluation programs need to consider in order to be of increased relevance to vocational education goals:

- a. Development of staff and other personnel having the necessary skills to provide vocational evaluation and training together with a positive attitude toward handicapped individuals.
- b. Development of techniques of evaluation which will provide for necessary profiles related to optimum vocational opportunities.
- c. Development of a philosophy which emphasizes employment potential rather than individual limitations and handicapping conditions.
- d. An increased leadership and financial role for federal, state, and local educational agencies in programs for the handicapped.

Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

David Pritchard, Senior Program Specialist for Career Development Guidance, Counseling, and Placement

Mr. Pritchard's organization administers vocational education, adult basic education, some parts of the MDTA training program such as institutional training; career education, and a new division of occupational planning.

The goals of the BOAE include those of preparing people for self-fulfillment, including vocational fulfillment. BOAE defines self-fulfillment as "maximizing potential for engaging in satisfying endeavors." The concerns of BOAE are with direct service, management support, staff development, and specific target groups such as the handicapped.

Mr. Pritchard stated that the mission and goals of the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education reflected the purposes, extent, and significance of vocational evaluation processes in educational programs. The extent to which vocational evaluation was being used by the schools to accomplish those goals was not clear from his statement. For example, one cannot determine how vocational evaluation is used by the schools to "provide educational opportunities to out-of-school adults to maximize their potential for self-satisfying endeavors."

Mr. Pritchard asserted that the term "vocational evaluation" is not widely used in the vocational educational realm. Instead, guidance people prefer the terms "assessment" and "appraisal" to describe the functions involved in vocational evaluation.

Mr. Pritchard indicated that a number of "education sponsored studies" had been conducted in recent years which revealed that well qualified students and poorly qualified students alike have difficulty in assessing their employment opportunities. Tests have often been used to limit rather than to enlarge disadvantaged and handicapped students' access to training and education.

He cited the need for vocationally oriented counseling for all students at all levels. He stated that research has shown that vocationally oriented counseling is the least available and most generally needed service in schools. He recognized the need for vocational evaluation as an integral part of vocational guidance, although he provided no specifics as to how the two might be integrated in a school setting. The need for assisting students in making realistic occupational

choices is recognized by educational leaders, but only about 50% of the nation's high schools provide any form of vocational guidance. This occurs even though 90% of the schools provide counseling services. He cited research done by the American College Testing Program (he wondered aloud if his audience, made up primarily of vocational evaluator educators, were familiar with the ACT Program) which indicated that 75% of high school students wanted help with their career planning, but half of them received little or no help with career planning.

Another broad research study, done by American Institutes for Research, was mentioned. The research established that women, minority students, and students from low income families do not receive adequate occupational information and assistance in relating their abilities and interests to career options and specific skill training programs. Cultural, class, and sex biases are inherent in many tests and interpretations. Mr. Pritchard concluded that reliable, valid assessment measures must be developed and standardized upon the target groups for which they will be used.

Under questioning, Mr. Pritchard noted that the federal administration now de-emphasizes the use of federal money for manpower training and this would likely include training of manpower in VE. Mr. Pritchard expressed a great deal of interest in learning that VE is a recognized part of vocational education in a number of places around the country and indicated that he wished to look into this further.

Mr. Pritchard asserted emphatically that the 1968 Vocational Education Act does allow the expenditure of vocational education funds for the preparation of students whose optimum goal is less than skilled employment. Specifically, Mr. Pritchard asserted that preparation in general employability for individuals who will enter work activity is a legitimate vocational education expenditure within the career education concept.

International Association of Rehabilitation Facilities.

Charles H. Roberts, Executive Vice President

Mr. Roberts offered several definitions of the term "vocational evaluation" but stated that the International Association of Rehabilitation Facilities has no official definition. IARF has no official position in regard to vocational evaluation, has approved no paper in regard to the subject, has taken no board action, and has no membership-approved resolutions concerning it. Mr. Roberts has published his personal views in *Journal of Rehabilitation* (Jan-Feb, 1970). There he distinguished between rehabilitation evaluation, work evaluation, and vocational evaluation. The last definition is very close to the VE definition adopted to date by this project.

Mr. Roberts conceptualized vocational evaluation as an emerging profession and felt that it met the standards of professionalism because college degrees were now being offered in that field of study. He pointed to the lack of clarity of the vocabulary of the profession. He is also concerned over the lack of a standard methodology and over the accompanying lack of widely applicable data regarding the effectiveness of VE programs. The only recommendations made were for vocational evaluators to address themselves to some means of determining whether different evaluation models should be applied to different kinds of clients. Mr. Roberts identified one group of individuals who would probably be referred more often for evaluation in the future, i.e., the severely disabled. He pointed out that Corbett Reedy, acting Commissioner for the Rehabilitation Services Administration, contended that the 1973 VR act, by its priority for serving severely disabled persons, moved the prominence of VE utilization ahead by 20 years. Mr. Roberts sees the law as having substantial teeth to enforce this priority. Under questioning, he agreed that a very basic conflict is posed by the new law's priority for the severely disabled together with other demands that penalize high cost service.

He did not provide data for making predictions as to numbers of severely disabled persons who might be referred to facilities having work evaluation services.

There was no specific mention of ways in which vocational evaluation might become more relevant to IARF or what relationship IARF might have to vocational evaluation in the future.

Manpower Administration, Office of Technical Service, Division of Counseling, Testing, and Special Worker Services, U.S. Department of Labor.

Robert Bonner, Personnel Research Psychologist

Mr. Bonner stated that the Manpower Administration is responsible for administering a number of programs that serve persons who require vocational assessment or evaluation prior to being placed in competitive employment. For example, he cited the Youth Services Programs, Older Workers Service Programs, and programs for handicapped persons.

The Division of Counseling, Testing, and Special Worker Services has reviewed a number of assessment techniques used by the Department of Labor (DOL). The General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB) is the principal assessment tool used by DOL in its various manpower programs. From the GATB, DOL has developed the Specific Aptitude Test Batteries (SATB) and a nonreading version of the GATB called the NATB. In addition, DOL is developing the Basic Occupational Literary Test (BOLT), which will eventually be used to establish minimum literary requirements for a variety of jobs, and GPULHEMP, an assessment technique aimed at older workers. Research is currently under way on all tests used by DOL.

Work samples are a new activity of the Manpower Administration. They are based on the JEVS system as originally designed in Philadelphia. Administration of the work sample system requires 2 weeks at 5 hours per day. It administers 28 tasks observed by a trained staff and derives 20 performance factors and 12 behavior factors. It yields worker trait clusters for further exploration. The use of work samples reflects a response to the needs of DOL counselors who concluded that clients with language difficulties, low reading levels, and different social backgrounds were not performing well on the other types of assessment techniques in use. In the late 1960's DOL funded a research project in Philadelphia using the JEVS system. The findings of that research indicated that people who were exposed to the JEVS work sample required fewer referrals in order to obtain jobs, and a larger number of them stayed on their jobs when compared to those who were not exposed to the work samples. Unfortunately, a much wider study, involving Work Incentive Programs (WIN), found no significant differences between individuals who were exposed to work samples and those who were not. Nevertheless, the majority of the DOL teams that used the work samples wanted to see their use continued because the work samples provided information that was heretofore unavailable. Mr. Bonner stated that the biggest problem with work samples was with training people in utilizing the information generated by the work sample assessment.

With the funding cutbacks in DOL sponsored programs, work sampling is not being expanded; and the number of vocational evaluations done in these programs is being reduced, in spite of the fact that "each individual in our program needs some type of an assessment." Counseling and vocational evaluation are considered "luxuries" that are no longer permitted in many DOL programs.

National Association of Social Workers.

Essie Morgan

Ms. Morgan is a social worker with vocational rehabilitation counseling experience. She says that social work defines vocation broadly so as to include self fulfillment and avocational activity. "One's own wishes for the individual should

not enter into the assessment.” According to her organization’s viewpoint, assessment is broad and includes the environment in which potential outcome will take place. Ms. Morgan’s testimony dwelt on that subject to a substantial extent, pointing out the need for VE taking into account the circumstances in which the client presently lives and the world in which he will later have to function. She contends that vocation is one slice out of the whole pie of life. Returning to her concern with the client’s participation in his own assessment, she said, “How does the client feel about facing life, first of all? Where is his head?” Her contention was that people often know more about where they want to go than could be determined by any form of testing.

National Rehabilitation Association.

E. B. Whitten, Executive Director

Mr. Whitten stated that NRA had supported vocational evaluation in the past because it promotes the primary goal of the organization to effectively serve handicapped persons in their vocational needs. NRA has shown its active support, not only by sponsoring the VEWA Project, but also by writing Section 15 of the 1968 Rehabilitation Act which would have greatly expanded the capacity for evaluating vocational potential. The 1973 Act keeps the content of that section but builds it into the basic definition of vocational rehabilitation. NRA will continue to support VE as long as evaluators can play an important part in achieving the purpose of making equal opportunities available to handicapped citizens. He stated that if VE should fail to do so, NRA would be obligated to end its support.

He raised the question of whether another full blown profession is needed or whether VE could be kept as a cross professional activity. Mr. Whitten stated that there are too many professions in existence already and that many were in some disrepute; therefore he was skeptical about the emergence of another narrowly defined profession. He challenged the VE profession and the VEWA Project to identify the uniqueness of vocational evaluation that is not shared by other rehabilitation specialties such as rehabilitation counseling and work adjustment.

He urged the development of standards of service and professional review and advisory boards. Mr. Whitten also urged the field of vocational evaluation not to exploit agencies that refer clients and pay for services, even though many clients are referred to evaluation as a last resort when no one knows what else to do with them. Pressure on rehabilitation agency budgets is causing some of the referring agencies to take a hard look at the amount of money being spent on expensive evaluation services. He urged evaluators to promote the evaluation of their programs rather than have such scrutiny forced upon them from external sources.

He stated that NRA could not give an estimate of the number of people who would be needing rehabilitation services in the future or the number likely to be served with available resources. He cited census figures and stated that there were ways to determine the number of severely disabled persons; however, there is no way to estimate how many of those persons could be expected to receive evaluation services. He indicated that there is vast potential for increases in the provision of VE services and that certain circumstances could bring about a sudden boom of increases on the order of 25-50% per year in needed services; however, he did not expect that kind of thing to happen.

The federal government recommends a 50% increase in WIN, and Mr. Whitten believes that VE will be substantially needed in connection with that program. AFDC may be transferred to Social Security, another place where there will be substantial need for expanded VE service.

The NRA position, in response to questions regarding eligibility for VR, is that rehabilitation service should be given to people in the full range of occupational outcome, not simply those who have reasonable prospect for competitive or sheltered employment.

In regard to a population base needed to support a comprehensive rehabilitation program with vocational evaluation services, he stated that at least 100,000 people in a geographic area would be required. He did not predict what percentage of such a population would need evaluation services.

Community Services Administration, Social and Rehabilitation Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Sheldon Bloom, Division Director, Division of Self Support Programs

Mr. Bloom is responsible for the WIN program in SRS. He pointed out that WIN is under joint administration of HEW and the Department of Labor.

When employability of a WIN client is at issue, the case is assessed by a team from the Manpower Agency and frequently by a vocational rehabilitation counselor. Vocational evaluation, as such, is not substantially used at present but may be used to a greater extent in the future. Instead of "evaluation," the Division of Self Support Programs uses the term "needs assessment." However, according to Mr. Bloom, "the [person's] need is determined by the resource." Presumably needs that cannot be met by existing resources are not classified as "needs."

In his discussion of the evaluation and placement of clientele served by the WIN programs Mr. Bloom stated that questions of the appropriateness of jobs are left strictly to the judgment of the WIN counselors: "[W]e could consider [that] appropriate work has very little to do with a vocational evaluation." The Division of Self Support Programs has no definition of meaningful employment: "We say a job is meaningful if you don't have a job."

Mr. Bloom discussed what he termed a "work sampling kind of program." Individuals go through a series of four two-week job tryouts in non-profit organizations in an effort to find work that is appropriate to their needs and capabilities. The use of these two-week job tryouts is not systematic, nor does it seem to be predicated upon prior evaluation of the client; instead it "... is much more of a chance situation as to how we do our vocational evaluation than anything that is specific."

He estimated that of the one million persons who are placed on the welfare rolls each year, 500,000 to 700,000 have "some quick screening done as to work capability." Mr. Bloom strongly endorsed vocational evaluation methods which are simple, can be quickly administered, scored, and interpreted, and are satisfying to clients. As far as the welfare program is concerned, the overriding issue is not the number of job placements but the saving of welfare dollars.

Rehabilitation Services Administration, Social and Rehabilitation Services, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Dr. William Usdane, Director, Division of Program Development

The 1973 Vocational Rehabilitation Act was very high in Dr. Usdane's attention and interest, and he pointed out the accountability which it requires in regard to the severely disabled. He was emphatic that the new law does not mean to change eligibility. In terms of RSA's priorities for all rehabilitation services, including vocational evaluation, the severely disabled will receive the greatest emphasis, and gainful employment will remain the ultimate goal of services.

Issues seen by Dr. Usdane were several. One had to do with the situation in which the eventual job was absent in the human services delivery system. He was also concerned with the participation by the client in his own assessment, the relationship of vocational rehabilitation to special education, the role of the employer, and the role of sheltered workshops as matters of concern rather than of clearly stated direction.

Dr. Usdane emphasized his interest in RSA program development leading to a "sturdy" vocational evaluation program. He also emphasized RSA's interest in sheltered workshops and stated that sheltered workshops have been concerned in

the past with extended employment and must now be more greatly concerned with VE and transitional roles.

Concern was expressed that vocational evaluators tend to overlook the overall responsibility for case management which belongs to the rehabilitation counselor, not the evaluator. He encouraged evaluators to make sure that counselors were present at team evaluation conferences when clients are discussed.

There is a lack of recognition in the field of the need for the extensive expansion of vocational evaluation programs that will be necessary in the future; for example, VE units are needed in such places as school resource rooms and special education programs. He also cited the need for "mini" evaluation units to be located in state rehabilitation agency district offices.

Dr. Usdane stressed the need for evaluators to use transitional employment—paid community jobs used as evaluation sites with the employer doing the evaluation—as an assessment tool.

Dr. Usdane stated that RSA felt that the field of VE lacked a scientific conceptualization and has not taken well to the standardized psychological testing approach. He was hopeful, however, that with the work of the VEWAA Project, VE would come of age.

According to Dr. Usdane, the evaluation process often raises client expectations which are not fulfilled if the eventual placement does not measure up to the results of the evaluation.

He questioned the use of training settings to assess clients because that type of evaluation often amounts to nothing more than rehabilitation facilities and sheltered workshops opportunistically filling vacancies in their training areas.

Social Security Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Robert Piazza, Division of Policy and Procedures

Mr. Piazza discussed the role of VE in the adjudication of disability claimed under Social Security. He pointed out that disability determination is conducted at three levels: (1) presumptive medical criteria of extremely low or extremely high disability requires an automatic adjudication one way or the other; (2) a medical-vocational evaluation, again presumptive, determines that an individual is disabled if he is of low educational achievement (e.g., has worked 35 or more years as a laborer, and has a disability precluding arduous labor); and (3) a final level that is not presumptive and requires individual study of the whole case often calling for VE.

The decision to use VE is made by the disability determination unit counselor and is invoked if the disability adjudicator needs it in order to make a decision. Federal guidelines recommend that this be done when the disability is subjective, such as reported pain, or when the individual has a varied or unclear work history or when the applicant has little or no work history. The concern of the disability determination unit is a simple "go-no go" determination based upon the applicant's present functioning and vocational capability. The adjudicator is not interested in client potential or in the opinions derived from the evaluation.

In the past decade 13,000 individual in-facility evaluations have been conducted at an average cost of \$156. Mr. Piazza anticipates a substantial increase in the need for VE. In particular he sees expansion in services to women, young applicants, and inexperienced applicants.

SUMMARY

Altogether, the majority of the invited organizations did come forward with testimony. There were several highlights in the testimony that deserve special mention:

1. Vocational evaluation needs to become more involved with organizations outside of VEWAA and NRA. In particular, it will be important to establish formal liaison perhaps in joint programming with the occupational therapists, the Vocational Education Association and Bureau, and the counterpart in the education of the handicapped.

2. The federal agencies tend to be simplistic whereas the voluntary associations stress the human side of human services. The directive end on the continuum seems to be occupied by government and the non-directive end by professional organizations. Somewhere in the middle it must be possible to accommodate both needs.

3. Top government officials are badly out of touch with field practice and are thinking mostly of the way things were operated several years ago. This is especially clear when people in charge of program development at the federal level are unaware that a flourishing technology is being practiced within their field of responsibility.

4. The leadership of two of the organizations with the greatest vested interest in the future of vocational evaluation—NRA and IARF—seemed to regard the VEWAA Forum as having little consequence. Neither of the speakers from those organizations prepared a statement for the Forum. Their extemporaneous remarks did not provide substantive answers to the questions posed to them. Although the members of the VEWAA Project steering committee had hoped to gain information and insights from their testimony which would assist the field of vocational evaluation to chart new directions for the future, it must be said that the testimony was of little help in that regard.

The greatest disappointment of the Forum, however, was the complete absence of the Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation (CSAVR). Although a letter of invitation was extended to CSAVR, and the staff indicated a willingness to participate, that organization did not present a paper to the Forum, or respond to a past conference request to submit a conference amendment.