

WORK EVALUATION IN REHABILITATION

EDUCATION
PROGRAM

ASSOCIATION OF
REHABILITATION
CENTERS, INC.

In Cooperation With:

Stout State University
Arkansas Research and Training Center
Auburn University
University of Arizona

WORK EVALUATION

IN

REHABILITATION

An Education Guide
Developed From an
Institute Held in July 1969
in Denver, Colorado

Edited by:

Walter A. Pruitt, Ed.D.
Director of Graduate Training in
Vocational Rehabilitation
Stout State University

and

Ralph N. Pacinelli, Ed.D.
Director of Education and Research
Association of Rehabilitation Centers, Inc.

Sponsored by:

Association of Rehabilitation Centers, Inc.
Stout State University
Arkansas Research and Training Center
Auburn University
University of Arizona

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE.....	v
WORK EVALUATION: AN OVERVIEW - Paul R. Hoffman, Ed.D.....	1
DEFINITIONS, OBJECTIVES AND GOALS IN WORK EVALUATION - Charles L. Roberts.....	19
PATTERNS OF SERVICES IN VOCATIONAL EVALUATION - Raymond Sankovsky.....	31
EVALUATION - A REASON FOR CONCERN - Jack M. Sink.....	61
ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION CENTER WORK EVALUATION PROGRAM - Morton Bregman.....	71
STRUCTURE AND ADMINISTRATION OF A WORK EVALUATION PROGRAM - Leonard Lee.....	77
THE ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF A COMPREHENSIVE WORK EVALUATION UNIT IN A MULTIFUNCTIONING VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION PROGRAM - Philip Spergel, Ed.D.....	87
ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF WORK EVALUATION PROGRAMS - Bernard Rosenberg.....	95
CLOSING THE MANPOWER GAP IN VOCATIONAL EVALUATION - David W. Smith, Ph.D.....	101
FUNDING FOR WORK EVALUATION UNITS AND PURCHASE OF WORK EVALUATION SERVICES - Ralph Church and R. Kenneth Barnes, Ed.D.....	109
APPENDIX A Program.....	119
APPENDIX B Institute Faculty and Staff.....	123
APPENDIX C List of Participants.....	125

PREFACE

Within any professional endeavor, it is from time to time appropriate and necessary to assess progress and to determine relationships between activities and objectives. Any growing or changing field has the problem of keeping those involved abreast of new developments. In a relatively new field such as work evaluation, even the terminology may be "new," sometimes ambiguous or as yet not clearly defined. Journal articles and professional conferences do aid peer communication, but a full exploration of pivotal issues may often be bypassed due to limitations of space and time. Individuals associated with institutions of higher learning who prepare practitioners within a specialty must be sensitive to what is happening in the total field. They also have secondary responsibilities such as providing a forum, initiating and stimulating dialogue, and providing leadership in the study and resolution of basic issues in the field.

There is a need in the work evaluation field to take stock of basic issues and advances. Aware of this need and cognizant of their responsibilities to the field, Dr. Paul Hoffman and the staff of the Institute for Vocational Rehabilitation at Stout State University talked to various individuals in the field about getting together for a "think tank" on problems pertinent to work evaluation. As a result of these initial conversations, a representative group was brought together to participate in a workshop of this kind.

The "problem-solving" workshop was held in March 1969 at the Institute for Vocational Rehabilitation at Stout State University. Approximately 20 persons participated in this "think tank" meeting. All were considered thoughtful observers of the state-of-the-art in work evaluation. They came from various rehabilitation facilities, vocational evaluator training programs, professional and institutional organizations, and rehabilitation research and training centers. The participants were given the following charge: (a) clarify basic concepts and terminology, and (b) delineate and resolve some basic problems. The methodology was small group discussion which was periodically summarized and shared with the total group.

In the opening session the participants realized that a reasonable taxonomy would have to be established if work evaluation was to undergo systematic inspection and review. It was decided that meaningful discussion could proceed in two areas: theory versus practice in work evaluation. Theory was subdivided into terminology, goals and objectives, scope and ethical considerations. Practice seemed to logically subdivide into a consideration of systems/methods/models, manpower and training, administration and supervision, and legislation.

The small group discussion sessions that followed the opening session resulted in a great deal of consensus on matters pertaining to the field and process of work evaluation. The participants were able to clarify issues and concepts that previously could only be considered nebulous. In fact, the progress was so remarkable that by the end of the second day, the participants talked about some way of sharing ideas with their contemporaries in the field. The notion of a national institute on work evaluation was the subsequent fruition of what began as desultory conversation.

Before the "problem-solving" workshop adjourned, a planning committee was named and a tentative agenda for the "national institute" was outlined. Serving on the planning committee were: Paul Hoffman, Ed.D., Director of the Institute for Vocational Rehabilitation and Walter A. Pruitt, Ed.D., Director of Graduate Training in Vocational Rehabilitation, both of Stout State University; Charles L. Roberts, Executive Director and Ralph N. Pacinelli, Ed.D., Director of Education and Research, both of the Association of Rehabilitation Centers; Vernon Glenn, Ed.D., Director of Training, Arkansas Rehabilitation Research and Training Center; David W. Smith, Ph.D., Administrator, Rehabilitation Center, University of Arizona; and Jack Sink, Coordinator of Rehabilitation Services Program, Auburn University. Drs. Pruitt and Pacinelli were designated Program and Arrangements Chairmen, respectively. Mr. Roberts pledged financial support for instructional costs and traineeships through the RSA Training Grant administered by the Association of Rehabilitation Centers, and Dr. Glenn offered similar additional support through the Arkansas Research and Training Center. Due to its accessibility from all parts of the country and favorable summer climate, Denver, Colorado, was selected as the site for the July 28-30, 1969, National Institute on Work Evaluation.

An outstanding faculty, composed mostly of those who participated in the "think tank," was assembled for the national institute. A descriptive summary of the material to be covered at the institute was prepared for recruitment of participants and was sent to more than 300 rehabilitation facilities, universities, official agencies (state and federal) and professional organizations. The course description follows:

"Definitions/Objectives/Goals - focus on general and specific objectives and goals of work evaluation as they relate to the overall objectives of vocational rehabilitation. An attempt will be made to clarify the more common terms and concepts of work evaluation in order to facilitate inter- and intra-disciplinary communication.

"Methodologies/Systems/Models - critical examination of the specialization of work evaluation as manifested in a number of systems, methods and models. Procedures and techniques of work evaluation will be related to the prevailing and varied philosophies within the field.

"Organization and Administration of Work Evaluation Programs - experts in the field of rehabilitation facility administration will examine the problems involved in the establishment and administration of work evaluation programs. Among other considerations, they will discuss the adaptation of work evaluation programs for special disability groups.

"Manpower: Preparation and Needs - exploration of the formal training and experiential preparation for work evaluators to function effectively in the field. Emphasis will be placed upon current and future manpower needs and alternate ways of meeting rehabilitation facility needs.

"Research: Completed, Current, and Needed - research in work evaluation will be reviewed. Emphasis will be on the applicability and implications of the findings to the problem areas within the field of work evaluation. Research in progress will be reported and problems needing attention will be identified.

"Funding for Work Evaluation Units and Purchase of Work Evaluation Services - focus on financial resources and legislative authorities of various government agencies for the establishment of evaluation units and the purchase of services."

From over 100 applications for admission to the institute, 77 individuals were selected to participate. Not all of them were awarded traineeships; many attended at their own expense. Those awarded traineeships were selected on criteria including: (a) training and/or experience in work evaluation, (b) level in the organization, (c) current job duties, i.e., facility or program administrator, evaluator, educator, researcher and government official, and (d) geographic location.

In the papers prepared for the national institute, both well known and emerging experts in the field of work evaluation presented their views, experience and acquired knowledge on specific aspects of the subject and the state-of-the-art. Dr. Joseph Moriarty, Director of the West Virginia Research and Training Center, presented a thoughtful, stimulating and well-received talk on Research Implications. We deeply regret that this publication must go to press without his paper.

The national institute was used as the occasion for the premiere showing of a film on work evaluation methodologies. Shown in draft form, the technicolor film was applauded by the participants who felt that it had great potential as a training aid. The Auburn University staff, particularly Mr. Jack Sink and Mr. Joel Anderson, is due a special thanks and much credit for producing the film.

Although the papers in this publication reflect the current situation in work evaluation, the reader should attempt to separate fact from bias which is inevitable due to involvement with specific aspects of work evaluation, i.e., methodologies, training, etc. The reader is encouraged to peruse these articles with the awareness that the field of work evaluation is dynamic and rapidly changing. What might be considered the state-of-the-art today may be ancient history in a relatively short time.

The preparation of a manuscript which eventually results in a publication such as this one requires the various talents of several individuals. For their important contributions of typing, proofing and dealing with the overall format of the training guide, the editors wish to acknowledge and thank Mrs. Lynn McMahon, Mrs. Jane Lee and Mrs. Joyce Rudisill.

Walter A. Pruitt, Ed.D.
Ralph N. Pacinelli, Ed.D.

October 6, 1969