THE EVALUATOR

Prepared by Task Force #3

Chairman	Jack Hutchison
Co-Chairman	Frances Mercer Baker
	Jack Genskow
	James Mack
	Jane Potyka
	Charles Richman
	Carol Salter
	Irwin Smith
	David Stone

The Task Force gratefully acknowledges the following groups and expresses thanks for their work which led to the preparation of this final report.

Year One Task Force

Chairman	David W. Smith
Co-Chairman	William Lamprell
	Doris Buhrmaster
	Ray Ehrle*
	Edgar Kopp
	Robert Mayes*
	Randy McDaniel*
	James Perry
	Jane Potyka
	Charles Richman*

*Forum Coordinator (yr. one)

Year Two Task Force

Chairman	Jack Hutchison
	Janice Feldman
	Mary Anne Keiner
	Frances Mercer
	Jane Potyka
	Charles Richman
	Irwin Smith

VEWAA FORUMS PARTICIPATING IN THE PROJECT

List of Forum Leaders

(Second name indicates change of leadership yr. two)

Auburn, Alabama:	Thomas Gannaway
Mobile, Alabama:	Myrna Ely
Tuscaloosa, Alabama:	Caroline Chamblis
Phoenix, Arizona:	Ray Wolseifer, Jane Potyka
Pueblo, Colorado:	Charles Gray
Rome, Georgia:	James Perry
Des Moines, Iowa:	Gordon Keyte
Decatur-Springfield, Illinois:	William V. Johnston
Louisville-Lexington, Kentucky:	Edgar Kopp
Baton Rouge, Louisiana:	Irwin Smith
Muskegon, Michigan:	William Ashbrenner
Columbia, South Carolina:	David Lever
Memphis, Tennessee:	Helen Travis
Lubbock, Texas:	Travis Brown

The Evaluator

The charge of Task Force #3 was to look at evaluators as they currently exist and to discern the trends that are shaping the future. This paper attempts to draw together the work that has been done by two task forces and a number of local VEWAA forums.

During the first year of the project, members of VEWAA forums responded to a series of questionnaires. These VEWAA forums consisted of evaluators, counselors, adjustors, and administrators. For the purpose of this report, we have confined our analysis to those responses from individuals who identified themselves as evaluators. There were 302 evaluators responding to one questionnaire, 229 to a second, and 140 to a third. Many of the same individuals responded to two or three of these questionnaires. The three questionnaires, however, will be treated as three separate instruments with three separate base groups for statistical purposes. For the most part, these questionnaires were answered at a forum meeting as a section of a planned agenda.

One might infer the following implications or bias of this instrument. These were individuals that were concerned enough about their profession to attend a voluntary local research session—some of them traveling 100 or more miles (as opposed to individuals who were "directed to fill out a questionnaire"). Secondly, these are individuals who for the most part come from facilities that encourage professional growth and training (a common complaint among evaluators is that they seldom get to attend training sessions or conferences because they must stay in their facility with their clients, yet 91% of this group reported that they are able to attend short-term conferences and meetings on evaluation and 33% reported they annually attend six or more such sessions where they get together with other evaluators). It can be assumed that a majority are VEWAA members-495 out of 957 forum participants (52%) whose names were received by the project were VEWAA members (three participating forums did not send us their participant rosters). Males outnumber females, making up 60% of the total evaluator respondents.

THE ROLE AND FUNCTION OF THE VOCATIONAL EVALUATOR

The title vocational evaluator is confusing. It can best be described as a general or a global term. It is used as a job title because at present there is no accepted vocational evaluation career ladder with job descriptions to delineate different positions and because most workshop administrators feel that it is good to have a "vocational evaluator" on the staff. There are

many other names that might be more appropriate for most vocational evaluators such as work samples administrator, workshop observer, psychometrist, situational observer, intake interviewer, workshop counselor, etc. Only 38% of the evaluators felt that the title vocational evaluator was the most appropriate for their job (Table 1); 25.6% felt that evaluator/counselor was more appropriate, 12% felt that evaluator/instructor was more appropriate, 11% felt that the term evaluator/adjustor was more appropriate, and 10% felt that supervisor/evaluator was more appropriate. The other 3.4% chose titles such as counselor/evaluator, counselor/adjustor, evaluator/adjustor, adjustor/evaluator. The forum groups working in this area also found themselves struggling with many issues which seem to stem from the lack of a clear conceptual ideological statement relative to the role and the function of the evaluator.

Influence of Setting

Generally speaking, the evaluator functions in a facility setting. To a great extent, the type of facility determines the role he plays and his self-perception of that role. The Kentucky forum reports in its paper:

> There are currently 26 known individuals in the state of Kentucky whose official job title is that of "Vocational Evaluator"; these 26 individuals also represent 26 facilities ranging from private, non-profit rehabilitation workshops to correctional institutions. Given the fact that at least one study has shown that the approach to vocational evaluation is the function of the emphasis, location, and standing patterns of the particular facility, one could readily imagine the possibility of 26 vocational evaluators in the state of Kentucky all performing different tasks and taking different approaches to their work.

They report that their common experience as evaluators was to have been hired without a job description. After they had been employed for awhile, the "typical procedure appears to be for the vocational evaluator

Table 1. Evaluators' opinions regarding their job title.

	(N=302)
Evaluator most appropriate	38%
Evaluator/counselor more appropriate	25.6%
Evaluator/instructor more appropriate	12%
Evaluator/adjustor more appropriate	11%
Supervisor/evaluator more appropriate	10%
Other titles more appropriate	3.4%
Should be classified as *clinicians* (who participate in the creation of developmental models for each program participant)	57.5%
Should be classified as *Technicians* (who administer tests and record responses)	21.5%
Both statements true	21%

Table 2. Evaluation staff make-up.

(N=302)

Evaluators who work in a facility where five or more people contribute to the evaluation process	59.3%
Where three or four contribute	23.7%
Where two contribute	12.7%
Where only one contributes	4.3%

himself/herself to compose his/her job summary" based upon one's own experience during that period of time.

A major influence is the relation which the evaluator has to other staff at his facility, and the number of professions and individuals who contribute to the final evaluation product. Of the evaluators responding to survey #1, 59.3% reported (Table 2) that there were five or more people in their facility who contributed to the evaluation process. This affects the areas of expertise the evaluator must develop. If a psychologist is available, the evaluator will develop in other areas. If one is not, most evaluators learn to become adequate, with time, in the interpretation of the standard psychometric tests and, in fact, many learn on the job to administer these tests themselves. Interviewing, counseling, observing, and instructing are all roles which the evaluator learns to fill by default. As the number of staff members contributing to the evaluation process decreases, this becomes even more true. Certainly, in facilities where there are only two contributors to the process, the evaluator does it all himself. He either learns to compensate through performing many of these functions himself, or by utilizing community resources which are available to him.

The seed beds for the vocational evaluation program, as we know it today, have been the state-federal vocational rehabilitation programs and the private, not-for-profit, rehabilitation centers that make up a large portion of the vocational rehabilitation delivery system in the United States. They have both had strong influences on this highly individualized assessment service which utilizes observation techniques in real or simulated work settings as its evaluative tools. A majority of evaluators and evaluation programs will still be found in vocational rehabilitation settings (primarily in the private not-for-profit rehabilitation centers).

Eighty-seven percent of the evaluators responding to questionnaire #1 (Table 3) worked in vocational rehabilitation settings. There is, however, a trend toward establishment of vocational evaluation services in school

Table 3. Agency representation of vocational evaluators in vocational evaluation project.

	%
Manpower Agency	1.5
Rehabilitation Agency	87.0
Educational Agency	10.0
Correctional Agency	1.5

settings as evidenced by the fact that 10% of the responding evaluators were from educational settings.

Hiring patterns for vocational evaluators have also been inconsistent. However, a typical pattern seems to have been to hire individuals with limited or no background in vocational evaluation and to put them into, as the Kentucky forum expressed it, a "learn-while-you-earn OJT, which basically lets a person learn by his own mistakes." University trained evaluators are not plentiful. Although exact figures were not available to this task force, it would appear that many university trained evaluators are going into related positions such as sheltered workshop directors, rehabilitation counselor, etc.

The Unique Role of an Evaluator

Richmond (1973), in his position paper for this project, stated that "the true challenge of the emerging field [of vocational evaluation] has been the definition of a unique and systematic body of knowledge which is differentiated from other professions."

Early role models and curricular offerings for evaluators were heavily influenced by those existing for the counselor. This overlap has decreased in recent years. Current survey data indicates a 50% overlap in the 10 principal areas of training (Figure 1). The areas of overlap include: knowledge of total rehabilitation process; knowledge of the world of work; knowledge of worker characteristics; skills to carry out effective interviews with clients; and ability to relate to persons of diverse backgrounds and values.

Five of the ten areas of training considered most important for the evaluator are unique to him and not overlapping with the counselor. These areas are: selecting appropriate work samples; administering work samples; interpreting work samples; using and recording behavioral observations; planning and recommending prescriptive programs for individual clients. Four of these five areas are technical in nature. The unique models and/or curricula seem to be emerging for technical skills while the commonalities remain in the most philosophical bases for human services in rehabilitation settings.

The primary overlap in the field of vocational rehabilitation would seem to be between the vocational rehabilitation counselor and the vocational evaluator. There seems to be no clear-cut delineation in this area. However, the prevalent response among evaluators would seem to be reflected in the responses of the Region IV Evaluator Training Program in Auburn in 1974. Their reaction to the statements of the first year of the Vocational Evaluation Project was that the role of case management "should not be one of the responsibilities of the vocational evaluator." They saw this role as belonging to the rehabilitation counselor. However, they, like most other evaluators, felt that "the evaluator should be involved in vocational counseling. He must assist the client in understanding. . .his vocational strengths and weaknesses."

This task force suspects that if a comprehensive task analysis were done for individuals called vocational rehabilitation counselors, voca-

tional evaluators, work adjustors, and workshop instructors, the analysis of tasks would produce a whole new series of job classifications which would cut across existing classifications and define the professional by the role he performs. As we have stated, the setting or the agency dictates the function, more than does the title. This is true for rehabilitation counselors as well as for evaluators. It is probable that evaluators and counselors do many of the same tasks and also that the evaluator performs the same function as the counselor, except that the evaluator does it in a rehabilitation center setting for an intensive, delimited period of time.

The Arizona forum defined the unique role of the evaluator as "a diagnostic specialist on individuals' potentials and an expert on job requirements which enables him to relate the two in a manner to select the most promising areas for the individual to seek a vocation." This same definition could be used for a rehabilitation counselor. The difference would appear to be the setting, and the opportunity for observation which the setting affords.

The evaluator is also defined by the target clientele of the agency. One school of thought which is ascribed to by many rehabilitation centers (which see the expansion of their vocational evaluation program as a worthy goal) is the espousal that vocational evaluation should be provided for everyone. At such a center, they seek to provide a staff capable of meeting all potential client needs.

A second school is illustrated by a rather well-equipped evaluation center in the United States which went out of business in the early 70's because it felt that vocational evaluation should be only for those with average or above intellectual ability, and who were motivated to discover their vocational potential. Therefore, they refused to take "problem cases" (e.g., behavioral problems, retarded, those recovering from emotional disturbances). This type of assessment is certainly easier to perform.

We would ascribe, however, to the model prepared by Task Force #1 which states that vocational evaluation services are most appropriate for those who have not been adequately assessed in less costly and time consuming programs. By ascribing to this model, we are acknowledging a need for more sophisticated training, for stronger hiring criteria, and for development of clinical techniques for vocational evaluation.

THE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS OF THE VOCATIONAL EVALUATOR

The obvious debate between vocational evaluation and rehabilitation counseling seems to be the need to identify a unique body of knowledge and skills which the evaluator possesses. We have already commented about the influence of the setting on the role of the evaluator. There is no question that the setting also greatly influences the skills he develops and the knowledge he acquires.

A primary uniqueness which the vocational evaluator is able to maintain, primarily because of the setting, is his opportunity to observe a client over a prolonged period of time. The counselor is restricted as to the

amount of time he can spend on a particular client. He is expected to converse with a client at two or three brief sessions and during that period of time, if possible, to guide the client toward a vocational decision. The evaluator is given from half a day to 18 months during which time he can observe, converse with, get to know, and understand the client.

The primary unique skill of the evaluator is his observational skills. Theoretically, the evaluator draws much of his knowledge about an individual from the observation which he does. The ability to report the observation is a part of the basic skill and requires that the evaluator be able to record the behavioral observations in such a way that they will be meaningful to subsequent readers. In recording these observations, the evaluator is dealing exclusively with concrete objective data.

The evaluator must have guidelines, or observational criteria, against which to measure the client. The emphasis of work samples over the years has been to develop norms (criteria against which a client is measured in order to judge his potential in the broader employment market). Seventy-nine percent of our respondents to the questionnaires indicated that the technique of observation in situations other than work samples was utilized in their facility (Table 4). Of that group, however, only 30% had written criteria on which to base their observations for each situational area. Another 62.5% indicated they had general observational guidelines, and 7.5% had no written criteria on which to base their observations. It is clear that the field of evaluation has much work to do in this area.

One of the major shifts for the vocational evaluator in the last 10 years has been an increasing awareness of a national data or information base regarding vocational evaluation. The growth of the *Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Bulletin*, the reprints and new materials from the Materials Development Center at the University of Wisconsin—Stout, and the Alabama Rehabilitation Media Service at Auburn University, as well as this project itself, have all served to create channels through which vocational evaluators have been allowed to come into contact with national opinions on vocational evaluation. This has also been enabled through the dialogue in VEWAA forums, both through this project and through ongoing conversation in VEWAA state units.

The evaluator shares *the synthesizing duty* with the counselor. One of the most difficult tasks of counseling or evaluation comes when one must take data and observations and translate them into meaningful interpretations. There are no guidelines and, while experience helps, the primary tool is the ability to use one's intuitional capacities. Evaluators who have

Table 4. Evaluators surveyed who use situational assessment in their facility.

Of the 79% answering yes:	
Had written criteria on which to base their observation for each situational area	30%
Had general observational criteria	62.5%
Had no written criteria on which to base their observations	7.5%

Table 5. Evaluator job history.

Evaluators who held at least one full-time job prior to becoming an evaluator	83.1%
Evaluators with less than one year of evaluation who held a full-time job prior to employment as an evaluator	69.4%
Evaluators with more than one year's experience as evaluator who held jobs prior to becoming an evaluator	89.2%

trouble utilizing an intuitional approach usually leave the field due to professional anxiety. To be sure, intuitions are weighed against knowledge, and the more experiential that knowledge the better.

The evaluator must be a repository for *occupational information*. The most helpful occupational information is that learned firsthand and through observation, and probably the least helpful is that gained through statistics. Actual work experience prior to becoming a vocational evaluator is a strong asset. Of the evaluators surveyed, 83% had held at least one full-time job prior to becoming an evaluator (Table 5).

The ability to relate to persons of diverse backgrounds and values is also an important competency. Despite the desire on the part of many administrators for a "system" which will eliminate ambiguity from the delivery of vocational evaluation services, there is no projection in the near future of anything to take the place of the vocational evaluator. Like it or not, his effectiveness is the key to good vocational evaluation.

THE PROFESSIONAL VOCATIONAL EVALUATOR

The prevalent mood of vocational evaluators is that they are "professionals," and that the development of the profession is a key to the future growth of vocational evaluation. Virtually all of the forums responding stated that the vocational evaluator is a professional and not a technician. The difference between a professional and a technician, as they defined it, is that the "professional makes decisions that deal with the whole person, and a technician . . . only with a segment."

> A professional is accountable for total outcome, technicians are accountable for only a small part . . . Professionals have the responsibility for setting standards, usually based on academic achievements, for entry, communicating new knowledge, policing themselves through a code of ethics, etc., and take a concerned interest in each. Technicians do not (Auburn Forum 1974).
>
> Dedication to the field is expected to be greater among professionals than technicians . . . The professional formulates as well as executes the plans (Des Moines Forum 1974).

In trying to make evaluation a profession, one is easily tempted to try to define the concrete methods and techniques as the sum total of evaluation. As such, didactic methods become the cornerstone of information

flow and neophytes are quick to build "expertise" based on such guidelines.

The demand of agencies new to vocational evaluation for many evaluators has resulted in an excessive amount of unrelated information becoming available to make "quick and dirty" evaluators via inservice training and short-term institutes; these are not necessarily bad in and of themselves, but without adequate continuity and ongoing on-the-job training and supervision, many "evaluators" are not even adequate technicians.

This has led to a demand for an "evaluation battery"—an ideal program which when imposed on the client and on the evaluator will result in the "ideal prescription." With such batteries, evaluators tend to become involved in a process of test and/or task administration which is identical for each client.

It is easy to fall into a "rote" or activity trap using busy work as situational assessment or behavioral observation simply to keep a client busy. Evaluators may find that it is much easier to "observe" than to administer and interpret standardized information. It is, indeed, much easier to sit around and shoot the bull under the guise of professional observation. It is also easier to say, "This is our evaluation battery," than to tailor the evaluation itself, as well as the prescriptive rehabilitation plan.

Differentiation of Roles

Evaluation as a process demands a dynamic system, which is dependent upon the needs of the individual clients. Not only must the evaluator be responsive to the needs of clients, but he must do it within the framework of the delivery system. He must be the expert consultant to the purchasing counselor, and the helper/facilitator to the client—roles which frequently would appear to be in conflict with one another (see Figure 2).

If the desired outcome is the establishment of evaluation goals, the evaluator must acknowledge the counselor as the expert who sends established goals along with the client; yet as the facilitator/helper, the evaluator must help the client to make his own goals for his period of vocational evaluation. When the counselor and the client have the same goal, this is not a problem. When the counselor and the client have differing goals, the evaluator must be able to enable the client to achieve both his own goals and the counselor's goals, and to enable the counselor to see the client's wisdom. It is clear, however, that evaluators show up playing both roles. Sometimes the evaluator is allowed to play only one, but this is the exception rather than the rule.

The evaluator plays the role of an expert consultant in such activities as performing vocational evaluations for insurance companies, reporting disability determination evaluations to social security, performing evaluations in vocational technical schools where evaluation covers a limited number of training areas, and helping industries select personnel.

With the emphasis on consumer involvement and the holistic approach

VOCATIONAL EVALUATION PROJECT

Forum Analysis

THE TRAINED

Has a knowledge of	Is trained to	Understands
1. Total Rehabilitation Process	9. Select Appropriate Work Samples	How the following effect the client
2. History & Philosophy of Vocational Evaluation	10. Administer Work Samples	19. Psychological conditions
3. Theories of Vocational Evaluation	11. Interpret Work Samples	20. Behavior disorders
4. Occupational Information Resources	12. Structure Situations for Behavioral Observation	21. Economic/Cultural deprivation
5. The World of Work	13. Use & record Behavioral Observation	22. Medical conditions
6. Worker Characteristics	14. Select Appropriate Psychological Tests	Theories of
7. Appropriate Codes of Ethics	15. Administer Psychological Tests	23. Vocational development
8. Techniques such as THOMASAT, MACDONALD, WREST, Job Experience Kits, etc.	16. Interpret Psychological Tests	24. Personality
	17. Utilize Job Analysis Techniques	25. Learning
	18. Structure Complete V/E Program for Individual Client	26. Human development

TRAINED EVALUATOR

TRAINED COUNSELOR

OVERLAP

YEAR TWO

EVALUATOR

"The Evaluator"

Assesses client strengths & weaknesses through use of:	Has the skills to	Has the ability to
27. Clients Educational History	36. Maintain up-to-date, concise records	44. Develop & carry out client orientation to Vocational Evaluation
28. Clients Medical History	37. Plan and recommend prescriptive programs for individual clients	45. Relate to persons of diverse backgrounds and values
29. Clients Psychological History	38. Organize & participate in evaluation "staffings"	46. Motivate and support individual while in "treatment plan"
30. Clients Vocational History	39. Carry out effective interviews with clients	47. Utilize community resources for the benefit of the client's Voc/Eval
31. Clients Social History	40. Develop effective follow-up procedures	Utilize group contact to:
32. Dictionary of Occupational Titles	41. Communicate results of client evaluation to person familiar or unfamiliar with Voc/Eval process	48. Secure Information
33. TOWER Evaluation System	42. Organize individual & community resources into a plan for constructive change	49. Disseminate information
34. Singer Evaluation System	43. Evaluate the outcomes of treatment efforts	50. Establish therapeutic environment
35. JEVS Evaluation System		

to rehabilitation, the evaluator discovers himself to be a helper/facilitator as he seeks to tailor the evaluation process to meet individual needs. This has created demands which can be met through the creation of work samples and job stations where face validity allows the client to see their relationship to actual work, through renewed emphasis on materials for job exploration, and through resources for "world of work" information for the client.

A number of external influences come to bear on this helper/facilitator role as well. In addition to consumer involvement, there is new legislation which emphasizes services for the severely handicapped and evaluation for independent living functioning, and a new emphasis upon normalization of individuals who have been institutionalized for periods of time. The new Equal Employment Opportunities Commission (EEOC) regulations for non-discriminatory personnel selection and federal government affirmative action programs put renewed emphasis upon the need for the evaluator to become a helper/facilitator as well.

The Need for Job Descriptions

There is a creative tension between the need for concrete job descriptions which facilitate the creation of curriculum models, and the danger that job descriptions will tend to limit the creative edge of the field, thus limiting the profession to its current theoretics rather than allowing it to continue to develop. At this point, however, it would seem that there is a need for these guideline job descriptions.

Nadolsky (1974) presented a proposal for seven positions for the classification of vocational evaluation personnel. In his article, he delineated the duties, competencies required, qualifications, and features of each position. They were titled: Vocational Evaluation Aide I, Vocational Evaluation Aide II, and Vocational Evaluation Technician I, Vocational Evaluation Technician II, Vocational Evaluator I, Vocational Evaluator II, Vocational Evaluator III. The task forces of the project spent considerable time looking at this model, and as a test to check its theoretic validity, four groups with only the basic seven position descriptions built seven job descriptions from their best common consensus. The models were very similar in composition, with only minor points of discrepancy.

Until such time as a national job task analysis is completed, this is the most comprehensive career ladder available, and would appear to reflect the consensus of the majority of the leadership of the field.

Indications of Professional Growth

In the last few years, we have seen a slow increase in the development of training for evaluators. Several universities, while not offering degree programs in evaluation, have begun to offer short-term training for evaluators, or classes within the rehabilitation counselor curriculum in vocational evaluation techniques (see Task Force #6 report). This has come about because of the recognized need in the field and because of the demand by the field for such services. A continual push to upgrade the quality of evaluation services by purchasers and the strengthening of

Figure 2

Differentiation of Roles

EXPERT/CONSULTANT APPROACH	DESIRED OUTCOME	HELPER/FACILITATOR APPROACH
evaluator and counselor	decision maker	client and evaluator
by counselor	establishment of evaluation goals	by client and evaluator
to counselor & the evaluation profession	evaluator accountability	to client and the profession
dependent on counselor and evaluator	individual rights and confidentiality	for client
client has input only on request	client input	client has considerable input
designed for evaluator	evaluation techniques	must be meaningful to client
information gathering process	process	learning process
evaluator synthesizes data	synthesis	evaluator & client synthesize data
evaluator has professional relationship with counselor	evaluator professional relationship	evaluator has professional relationship with client
client does not necessarily have to understand process	client understanding of process	client does have to understand to the greatest degree possible
client does not necessarily become involved in the process voluntarily	client involvement in process	must be voluntary

certification requirements point to a need for increased training in the future as well.

When this project began, there were approximately 800 members of the Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Association. Today there are three times that number; yet we are fairly confident that the number of evaluators has not increased in that proportion. The membership growth has come because the Association has taken a stand in matters of professional development and has embraced its role in providing the tools and the forums for discussing the development of vocational evaluation and work adjustment. We anticipate the need in the near future for a certification process, and for more detailed and cleaner definitions of the membership classifications.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROFESSION

Egerman and Gilbert (1969) reported a survey, conducted in 1967, of 293 vocational evaluators who completed and returned questionnaires. The survey of this project revealed some comparative figures for the six-year interval between surveys which reflects a lack of administrative recognition of the vocational evaluator position (Table 6). One factor which is usually considered in such studies is the wages. Egerman and Gilbert reported that in 1967 the average salary was $6500. The VEWAA forum survey indicated $8600. The increase of $2100 represents a 32.3% wage increase over the six-year time spread. The Department of Labor figures for the same six-year period indicates that the average overall wage increased 33.1%. This would indicate that the evaluators only barely held the line, or that there was no real salary increase over that period of time.

Egerman and Gilbert reported that 32% of evaluators felt their salary of 1967 was below average. In 1973, 57.1% of the project evaluators felt that their salary was below average.

Table 6 indicates a number of other comparisons: 72% of Egerman and Gilbert's respondents were male, 60% in the VEWAA forums; 25% of their respondents had been evaluators less than one year, this survey showed 36%. Thirty percent had been evaluators for one to two years, whereas the VEWAA survey found only 22% in this category; 25% had been in evaluation two to four years, 24% of the VEWAA project evaluators had been employed as evaluators from two to four years. It would appear that the trend, as noted by Egerman and Gilbert, continues that a majority of evaluators stay in the field two years or less.

Egerman and Gilbert's respondents indicated 88% with degrees (Bachelor or Master's) whereas the VEWAA project showed only 81%, the biggest discrepancy between the two groups being that VEWAA project participants indicated a larger percentage of non-degreed evaluators (7%). Whether or not this figure is significant is questionable, as the Egerman and Gilbert data was gathered by mail whereas ours was gathered at meetings of vocational evaluators in the VEWAA project. It is interesting to note, however, that in the Egerman and Gilbert study 27% had a Master's degree; the comparable figure in the VEWAA project

Table 6. A comparison of 1973 vocational evaluation project survey with comparable data from 1967 study of vocational evaluators.

		Project Survey (1973)	Egerman & Gilbert (1967)
Number of returned questionnaires		N = 302	N = 293
Male respondents		60%	72%
Female respondents		40%	28%
Years	0-1	36%	25%
in	1-2	22%	30%
Evaluation	2-4	24%	25%
	4 or more	18%	20%
Evaluators who held at least one full-time job prior to becoming an evaluator		83%	87%
Evaluators who had no full-time job prior to becoming an evaluator		17%	13%
[81% of evaluators surveyed had degrees—Bachelor's or Master's]			88%
All had at least high school or GED equivalent.			
With some post high school course work		11.8%	8%
Evaluators with a Bachelor's degree		53%	61%
Evaluators with a Master's degree		28%	27%
Evaluators with no further course work beyond high school		7.2%	4%
Average salary		$8600	$6500
Of the evaluators reporting, the following felt their salary was:			
below average		57.1%	32%
average		35.7%	53%
above average		7.2%	53%

Reflected in the degrees above are persons with Master's degrees who also indicated a Bachelor's degree in a different subject.

was 28%. This figure would appear to be most significant in light of the fact that in 1967 there was only one Master's degree program in Vocational Evaluation and today there are three which graduate a cumulatively larger number each year than in 1967.

Sixty-one percent of Egerman and Gilbert's respondents had Bachelor's degrees, whereas only 53% in the project indicated a Bachelor's degree.

Eighty-seven percent of the 1967 sample had held at least one full-time job prior to becoming an evaluator, whereas in 1973 the comparable figure was only 83%. A significant change revealed by this comparison is a noticeable increase in female evaluators, from 28% in 1967 to 40% in 1973.

Perhaps the area of most significant shift since the Egerman-Gilbert study has been the identification of vocational evaluation practitioners with assessment practitioners from other segments of the human services delivery system. Programs in vocational evaluation funded through voca-

tional education and developmental disability channels have appeared during the last several years. The funding of the Philadelphia Jewish Employment Vocational Service (JEVS) Work Sample System by the Department of Labor; the training of evaluators for that system, both through the Department of Labor and Rehabilitation Services Administration funds; and the establishment of short-term seminar training experiences funded by Vocational Education, such as the program at South Florida State University, would appear to be trends pointed in this direction.

The developers and providers of vocational evaluation tools (Singer, JEVS, TOWER, etc.) have all helped to broaden the field to these other disciplines, as they have sought to broaden their own sales markets. These tools have now been installed in many educational and correctional institutions across the country.

PROPOSALS

There is no question that at present, many evaluators do not measure up to the ideal. Most of them have been on the job less than two years, and a majority have been trained through inservice procedures that are usually less than formal or comprehensive.

This task force believes that the major issue facing the development of professional vocational evaluators today is lack of a comprehensive training program that would enable an individual, at whatever level of education he is functioning, to upgrade his training and expertise. To rectify this situation, we propose that such a comprehensive training program be developed. We would project that this would need to include plans for inservice and on-the-job training, as well as the opportunity to continue through the Master's degree, and perhaps even Doctoral level. This educational program would be facilitative of a concrete career ladder and the development of the profession itself.

In order to accomplish this educational design, it will be necessary to make a comprehensive task analysis of vocational evaluators and other closely allied groups such as vocational rehabilitation counselors, work adjustors, rehabilitation center case managers, vocational skills instructors, and on-the-job training skill instructors.

Proposal #1

We would propose that VEWAA secure support and endorsement from the Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation, the National Rehabilitation Association, the National Rehabilitation Counseling Association, NRA's Job Placement Division, the International Association of Rehabilitation Facilities, and other such organizations for a comprehensive task analysis of the evaluator and the other professionals with whom they interface. These sponsors, along with VEWAA, should secure a funding grant from an appropriate source, such as the Rehabilitation Services Administration, to conduct this project. The task analysis should cover the evaluator's worker requirements, traits, and skills (functional, content, and interpersonal) in relation to at least the following areas:

- Who makes what decisions in the vocational evaluation process?
- When and by whom are evaluation goals established?
- To whom and in what way is the evaluator accountable?
- Who has access to what data (confidentiality)?
- What kind, amount, and level of work experience, training, and education does the evaluator have?
- What evaluation tools and techniques are used?
- What dimensions does the vocational evaluation process have, i.e., is the evaluation process an assessment/information gathering process or a treatment/learning process, or both of these?
- Who synthesizes the data and how?
- With whom does the evaluator have a professional relationship?
- To what extent and in what way does the individual served have input into the process and outcomes?
- To what extent does the individual served understand the process and outcomes?
- To what extent is the individual's involvement in vocational evaluation services voluntary?

Following completion of this phase of the project, there should be a task force made up of representatives of professionals involved in vocational/industrial/occupational evaluation services, and consumer and regulatory groups, to react to the actual job descriptions, overlap, delivery system, and interface of the evaluators and other professional groups by comparing the task analysis study with any available task analysis of other related professionals.

Based on the outcomes of the deliberations of this task force, and any advisory groups which its members wish to use, the project should utilize the data to build a career ladder format which would be applicable across agency settings and add to the common understanding of the lay and professional public.

We would estimate that by the end of one year this could be completed, and a training program based upon these models could be prepared and presented in a series of meetings, perhaps in conjunction with existing professional meetings (NRA, IARF, and AVA—national, regional, and state meetings) as a first step in training and commonizing the field.

It is anticipated that this project would have many real benefits. Included in them would be the availability of real data as distinct from the current subjective opinions surrounding the field. While it might greatly restructure current roles, it would simultaneously redsce role ambiguity and conflict, and strengthen the identities for the professions concerned. It should create a mutual understanding among practitioners, educators, and administrators through the availability of this data. The creation of common titles, standards, and responsibilities should lead to increased public understanding of all of the involved professional groups. It should provide a benchmark for future scientific and practical inquiry as well as a means of assessing changes occuring as a result of improvements in the administrative, professional, and educational areas.

A second year of this project could focus upon the development of a comprehensive curriculum and a series of appropriate textbooks based

upon the work of this current project and the proposed project.

Part of this project task force should be convened to compare the task analysis derived from the project with ideal models derived from standards and theoretics, in order to set priorities for change and to plan courses of action which might, in part, be met through curriculum development.

As a part of this training design, especially at the undergraduate level, there should be more utilization of vocational evaluation programs that can provide practical training in evaluation skills.

We would propose that evaluators receive training in regard to the other disciplines and that other related disciplines receive some training in the basic principles of vocational evaluation.

Proposal #2

We would propose that VEWAA create a task force that would prepare guidelines for local VEWAA units to provide the backup materials and guidelines that would enable local task forces to approach local colleges, junior colleges, and community colleges with specific proposals for courses in vocational evaluation. These proposals would be based upon the curriculum designs (Proposal #1).

Proposal #3

Most of the VEWAA forums dealing with the area of the evaluator dealt with and proposed some type of evaluator certification or registration. We propose that VEWAA establish an ad hoc committee to prepare, for the consideration of the executive council and general membership, a plan for certification of vocational evaluation and work adjustment personnel.

This study and plan should contain, at least, the design of the competency measuring instrument, the administration of the competency measuring instrument, the mechanism for its administration, the certification procedure, the basic requirements for application, the limitations upon grandfathering (not everyone who wishes to should be able to be "grandfathered in"), and the requirements for recertification. We suggest that recertification should be tied to some form of continuing education program.

In addition, this body or an additional task force should look at the accreditation of training programs in vocational evaluation and work adjustment.

Proposal #4

We would propose that VEWAA develop a permanent professional staff. We recognize that this would necessitate an increase in professional dues, and require support from NRA, but a permanent professional staff would serve to strengthen the profession by providing more services for the membership. The programs of the Association might be expanded to include such things as the compiling of an evaluation facilities directory, the creation of an employment exchange, a public information program,

and legislative action. Through this mechanism, the Association would be enabled to continue research in/and development of the fields of evaluation and adjustment and to maintain current information regarding training needs, salary scales, changes in practice, etc.

Proposal #5

We would propose that the Association, under the guidance of professional staff, provide leadership in the following areas:

- Encourage client input and responsibility.
- Advocate such policies for human service agencies which might include client steering committees, and client participation on boards of directors.
- Establish professional standards and membership classifications for membership in the Association.
- Develop guidelines for private practice in the areas of evaluation and adjustment.
- Encourage the expansion of programs to many agencies other than government.
- Establish ongoing continuing education as a requirement for certification to be accompanied by encouragement of employers to provide release time and financial support for the education.
- Encourage the establishment of performance contracts as the basis for delivery of evaluation services; this would include the establishment of a base cost for an evaluation under various foci—counseling and/or placement, depending on referral agency demand.
- Encourage the elimination of the time element as a basic ingredient of the evaluation program, and in its place, encourage the establishment of flexible time, based upon the decision of the evaluation staff.
- Encourage evaluators and adjustors to write for professional publications through such mechanisms as the establishment of writing awards.
- Provide material which would serve to facilitate local VEWAA forums and service facilities to take individual responsibility for community education, to make other programs and agencies aware of what evaluation services are being offered.
- Assist the evaluator in increasing his options, namely, rehabilitation, industry, education, and private practice.

References

The Evaluator

Egerman, K., & Gilbert, J., The work evaluator. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 1969, *35*(3), 12-14.

Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinating Council, *Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures*, Discussion Draft based upon the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, Washington, D.C. 1973. Proposed to supersede "Guidelines on Employment Selection Procedures," which were codified on July 21, 1970 (29 CFR 1607),

effective upon publication in the Federal Register on August 1, 1970 (35 F.R. 12333). Title 29—Labor, Chapter XIV, Part 1607, Sections 1607.1 to 1607.14* which superseded the "Guidelines on Employment Testing Procedures," originally adopted by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission on August 24, 1966.

Nadoldky, J., Guidelines for the Classification and Utilization of Vocational Evaluation Personnel, *Rehabilitation Literature*, vol. 35, no. 6 162-173 1974.

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers*, (1967 = 100), 1974.