
COMPARISON OF VOCATIONAL EVALUATOR POSITIONS IN TRADITIONAL
VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION, SCHOOL, AND PRIVATE-FOR-PROFIT SETTINGS

STEPHEN W. THOMAS

Abstract

A survey of vocational evaluator positions and needs was conducted through the Fall 1984 issue of the VEWAA NEWSLETTER. Completed surveys were sorted into the three different vocational evaluation employment settings of: traditional vocational rehabilitation, school, and private-for-profit. The resulting study compares evaluators in the three settings by a wide range of demographic, educational, financial, environmental, process, and instrumental factors.

In an attempt to identify and analyze the current employment positions, job duties and characteristics, and professional needs of vocational evaluators, the Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Association (VEWAA) decided that a survey of the membership should be conducted. An extensive 39-item survey was developed and printed in the Fall 1984 (Volume 12, Number 1) issue of the VEWAA NEWSLETTER. The survey due date was extended through an announcement in the following issue of the VEWAA NEWSLETTER (Winter 1985), which resulted in a total of 106 completed and returned surveys.

This was a disappointing return (less than 7%) given that approximately 1,600 VEWAA members received this survey in their NEWSLETTER. Several reasons for this poor response could be: the length of the survey instrument (three pages); the complexity of the questions that asked for detailed information on client fees, numbers served, instruments used, per cent of job duties, and type of populations served; the fact that the survey was mailed too close to the return date and the deadline had to be extended; and the survey was restricted to VEWAA members, of which only a part are vocational evaluators. There is also concern with this type of survey that those who are willing to take the time to fill it out and return it may not necessarily be representative of the total membership. For this reason, results should not be viewed as conclusive or reflecting the overall practices and needs of vocational evaluators in general.

An analysis of all completed surveys was published in the Fall 1985 (Volume 12, Number 4) issue of the VEWAA NEWSLETTER. Unfortunately, the representativeness of these results to a full-time vocational evaluator position was in question since only 57 of the respondents (approximately 54%) were employed as full-time evaluators. The remaining 49 respondents were employed in jobs that had titles and primary job descriptions related to counselor, administrator/manager, work adjustment specialist, or a combination of counselor/evaluator, director/evaluator, or adjustment specialist/evaluator. To keep the survey focused on the specific position of vocational evaluator, the 57 full-time positions were the only surveys included in this study. Although the sample is quite small, it does provide a unique picture of the vocational evaluator and could be used as a tool in making limited decisions about the state-of-the-art in the field. In addition, these 57 surveys were sorted into three distinct employment settings so that possible trends in similarities or differences among evaluators in traditional vocational rehabilitation, public school, and private-for-profit rehabilitation settings could be studied.

The following data is arranged in the general order questions were listed in the survey and is consistently reported throughout using the following code:

A. Total (all 57 surveys used in this study)

B. Rehab. (traditional vocational evaluation settings - vocational rehabilitation agencies, sheltered workshops, rehabilitation facilities, public hospitals, correctional facilities, institutions)

C. School (school-based vocational assessment programs - secondary public schools, community colleges, vocational-technical school/center)

D. Private (private-for-profit vocational evaluation services - individuals in self-employed private practice, private rehabilitation agencies/companies/centers, worker's compensation, private rehabilitation hospital)

1. Job Title (Vocational Evaluator, Full-Time)

	N	% of Total
Total:	57	
Rehab:	39*	68%
School:	11	19%
Private:	7	12%

*Approximately 74% of this category is composed of rehabilitation facilities and sheltered workshops.

2. Age (Years)

	N	Ave.	S.D.	Min.	Max.
Total:	56	32.5	7.4	23	64
Rehab:	39	32.2	7.8	23	64
School:	10	35.3	7.9	25	51
Private:	7	30.7	3.2	28	35

3. Sex

	N	Male (%)	Female (%)
Total:	56	20 (36%)	36 (64%)
Rehab:	38	12 (32%)	26 (68%)
School:	11	6 (55%)	5 (45%)
Private:	7	2 (29%)	5 (71%)

4. Length of Time Employed as an Evaluator (Years)

	N	Ave.	S.D.	Min.	Max.
Total:	57	4.8	3.5	0.3	15.0
Rehab:	39	4.1	3.2	0.3	15.0
School:	11	7.1	4.5	1.3	14.0
Private:	7	5.1	2.0	2.5	7.8

5. Present Annual Gross Salary

	N	Ave.	S.D.	Min.	Max.
Total:	54	\$19,558	5,559	10,416	36,900
Rehab:	36	\$17,617	3,989	10,500	32,000
School:	11	\$23,656	7,747	10,416	36,900
Private:	7	\$23,103	3,467	20,000	30,000

6. State Where Employed (Top Three)

	N	State	(n/%)
Total:	57	North Carolina	(9/16%)
		California	(6/11%)
		Arizona	(4/ 7%)
		New York	(4/ 7%)
Rehab:	39	North Carolina	(9/23%)
		New York	(4/10%)
		Illinois	(3/ 8%)
School:	11	Arizona	(3/27%)
One response each from 8 other states.			
Private:	7	California	(4/57%)
		One response each from 3 other states.	

7. Size of Community in Which Employed

	N	Ave.	S.D.
Total:	49	346,827	603,223
Rehab:	33	363,530	706,236
School:	11	212,000	201,859
Private:	7	441,429	396,671

8. Major Referral Sources (Top Three)

	Source	N	% of Caseload
Total:	Voc. Rehab.	46	66%
	Private (Insurance, SS, State Comp., Lawyers, Industry)	34	21%
	Schools	21	43%
Rehab:	Voc. Rehab.	38	73%
	Private	19	14%
	Schools	13	17%
School:	Schools	9	85%
	Voc. Rehab.	5	40%
	Five additional referral sources were cited no more than once each.		
Private:	Private	5	61%
	Voc. Rehab.	2	98%

9. Major Populations Served (Top Three)

	Disability	N	% of Caseload
Total:	Mentally Retarded/ Handicapped	46	39%
	Physically Disabled	44	32%
	Mental Disorder (Emotionally Disturbed, Personality Disorder, Behavior Disorder, Psychiatric, Psychological)	41	24%

	<u>N</u>	<u>% of Caseload</u>
Rehab: Mentally Retarded/Handicapped	34	46%
Mental Disorder	30	26%
Physically Disabled	25	30%
School: Mentally Retarded/Handicapped	11	25%
Learning Disabled	8	50%
Mental Disorder	6	19%
Private: Industrial Injury	5	80%
Physically Disabled	3	63%
Mental Disorder	1	10%

	<u>N</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
School: (Master's)	8	
Voc. Evaluation	3	38%
Guidance/Counseling	2	25%
Special Education	2	25%
(Bachelor's)	3	
Human Resources	1	33%
Special Education	1	33%
Voc. Rehab.	1	33%
Private: (Master's)	6	
Rehab. Counseling	2	33%
Voc. Rehabilitation	2	33%
Voc. Evaluation	1	17%
Education	1	17%
(Bachelor's)	1	
Occupational Therapy	1	100%

10. Highest Degree Completed (Top Three)

	<u>Degree</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Total:	Master's	36	63%
	Bachelor's	20	35%
	High School	1	2%
Rehab:	Master's	22	56%
	Bachelor's	16	41%
	High School	1	3%
School:	Master's	8	73%
	Bachelor's	3	27%
Private:	Master's	6	86%
	Bachelor's	1	14%

11. Major Area of Study (Top Three)

	<u>Major</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Total:	(Master's Level)	36	
	Rehab. Counseling	10	28%
	Voc. Evaluation	6	17%
	Counseling	6	17%
(Bachelor's)	Rehabilitation	20	
	English	3	15%
	History	2	10%
	Occup. Therapy	2	10%
	Psychology	2	10%
	Rehab: (Master's)	22	
	Rehab. Counseling	6	27%
Counseling	4	18%	
Rehabilitation	4	18%	
Voc. Evaluation	2	9%	
(Bachelor's)	English	2	13%
	History	2	13%
	Psychology	2	13%
	Rehabilitation	2	13%

12. Short-Term Training (Total Hours in 1984, In-the-Field/In-House)

	<u>N</u>	<u>Ave.</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Min.</u>	<u>Max.</u>
Total:	54	39/12	47/29	0/0	226/196
Rehab:	37	42/14	54/34	0/0	226/196
School:	11	31/8	29/7	0/0	92/20
Private:	7	41/20	20/14	0/0	60/40

13. Payment of NRA and VEWA Membership Dues (How Much Does Employer Pay?)

	<u>All</u> <u>N / %</u>	<u>Part</u> <u>N / %</u>	<u>None</u> <u>N / %</u>
Total:	20/36%	6/11%	30/53%
Rehab:	12/34%	0/0	25/66%
School:	5/45%	5/45%	1/10%
Private:	2/29%	1/14%	4/57%

14. Type of Certification Held (Top Three)

	<u>Type</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Total: (55)*	CVE	36	65%
	CRC	13	24%
	None	10	18%
	Teaching	4	7%
Rehab: (37)*	CVE	21	57%
	None	10	27%
	CRC	7	19%
School: (11)*	CVE	8	73%
	CRC	4	36%
	Teacher**	3	27%
Private: (7)*	CVE	7	100%
	CRC	2	29%
CWA, LPC, OTR had one each (14%)			

*Many individuals held more than one form of certification, preferably in combination with the CVE.

**Approximately 64% of all respondents indicated that a teaching certificate was not needed to work as an evaluator in their school setting.

15. Number of Clients Worked With at One Time

	<u>N</u>	<u>Ave.</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Min.</u>	<u>Max.</u>
Total:	57	4.3	3.2	0	25
Rehab:	39	3.9	3.1	0	25
School:	11	4.6	2.2	1	12
Private:	7	6.3	4.3	1	24

16. Number of Individuals Evaluated Per Month

	<u>N</u>	<u>Ave.</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Min.</u>	<u>Max.</u>
Total:	53	12.4	8	0	80
Rehab:	38	9.8	5.7	0	35
School:	11	19.7	17.4	4	80
Private:	6	18.7	11	6	40

17. Number of Hours Spent by a Client in Evaluation

	<u>N</u>	<u>Ave.</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Min.</u>	<u>Max.</u>
Total:	53	45.3	97.5	.75	700
Rehab:	35	58.4	119.7	2	700
School:	11	24.5	39.2	1	180
Private:	7	38	52.7	1	200

18. Evaluation Fees

	<u>N</u>	<u>Ave.</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Min.</u>	<u>Max.</u>
PER HOUR					
Total:	8	\$35	19	6	60
Rehab:	5	\$27	17	6	45
School:	None Reported				
Private:	3	\$50	10	40	60
PER DAY					
Total:	19	\$ 62	66	14	300
Rehab:	15	\$ 47	40	14	100
School:	2	\$161	197	22	300
Private:	2	\$ 88	4	85	90
PER CLIENT/EVALUATION					
Total:	19	\$390	200	150	900
Rehab:	12	\$442	204	195	900
School:	4	\$252	119	150	334
Private:	3	\$515	17	495	525
OVERALL PER CASE					
Total:	29	\$ 462	276	21	8,000
Rehab:	17	\$ 418	211	21	900
School:	6	\$ 681	.981	100	2,640
Private:	6	\$1,340	2,376	90	8,000

19. Job Duties

In all settings, report writing and evaluation (administration and scoring instruments) was rated as the most time consuming, most important, and most difficult job duties of the respondents.

Other high ratings under level of difficulty

and importance were scheduling, marketing, and staffing, particularly in the rehabilitation and school settings.

Budgeting received a high difficulty rating under the school category.

Case management received a high difficulty rating under the rehabilitation category.

The private category gave high difficulty and importance ratings for administration and a high difficulty rating for evaluation planning.

20. Most Frequently Used Instruments and Techniques

<u>Instrument/Technique</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Psychometric/Standardized Testing	57	100%
-Interest (Top Three) WRIOT RFVII CAI	50	88%
-Achievement (Top Two) WRAT-R ABLE	44	77%
-Dexterity (Top Three) Crawford Purdue Bennett Hand-Tool	41	72%
-Aptitude (Top Two) SRA RMPFB	36	63%
-Intelligence (Top Two) WAIS-R Revised Beta	26	46%
-Multi-Aptitude (Top Two) GATB (USES) DAT	19	33%
-Behavior/Personality (Top Two) WRIPT MMPI 16PF	18	32%
-Other	7	12%
-Work Samples (Top Five) VALPAR JEVS Singer McCarron-Dial VIEWS	55	96%
-Interviewing (Top Three) Intake Exit Feedback	54	95%

<u>Instrument/Technique</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
-Situational Assessment (Top Four) Sub-Contracts Woodworking Janitorial/Maintenance Food Service	38	67%
-Job Site Evaluation (Top Three) Maintenance Food Service Clerical	17	30%
-Other (Top Four) Behavior Observation Inventories Physical/Work Capacities Assessment Career Exploration Basic Skills Assessment	16	28%

The above instruments and techniques are prioritized in the same order for the rehabilitation, school, and private categories.

21. Major Needs as an Evaluator (Top Two/Three)

	<u>Need</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Total:(55)	Training	35	64%
	Equipment	21	38%
	Funding	14	25%
Rehab:(39)	Training	26	67%
	Funding	16	41%
School:(9)	Funding	4	44%
	Research	4	44%
	Training	3	33%
Private:(7)	Professionalism	4	57%
	Legislation	3	43%
	Training	2	29%

22. Major Issues to be Addressed in the Field (Top Two/Three)

	<u>Issue</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Total:(52)	Professionalism	17	33%
	Technology	17	33%
	Certification	15	29%
Rehab:(36)	Professionalism	18	50%
	Certification	10	28%
	Funding	10	28%
School:(9)	Professionalism	6	67%
	Certification	2	22%
	Technology	2	22%
Private:(7)	Legislation	3	43%
	Professionalism	3	43%
	Certification	2	29%

23. What Members Expect from a Professional Vocational Evaluation Organization (Top Two/Four)

	<u>Expectation</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Total:(55)	Training	34	62%
	Legislation (Lobbying)	22	40%
	Publications	20	36%
	Research	19	35%
Rehab:(38)	Training	30	79%
	Research	16	42%
	Legislation (Lobbying)	15	39%
	Publications	15	39%
School:(10)	Publications	8	80%
	Training	5	50%
	Research	4	40%
	Legislation	3	30%
Private:(7)	Legislation	4	57%
	Publications	4	57%
	Training	3	43%

Special thanks are extended to Marsha Andersen, 1985 VEWAA president, for requesting and encouraging this survey; to East Carolina University graduate assistants Elaine Young and Evelyn Syllivant for their tireless help with data analysis; and to the conscientious evaluators who took the time to complete and return the survey. Without their help and support, this survey would never have become a reality.

AUTHOR

Stephen W. Thomas, Ed.D., CVE
Associate Professor and Director
Graduate Program in Vocational Evaluation
Department of Rehabilitation Studies
School of Allied Health
East Carolina University
Greenville, North Carolina

