

American Board of Vocational Experts Program Evaluation Survey Results

John M. Williams

Abstract: The American Board of Vocational Experts conducted surveys of current members, former members, and non-members to assess perceptions of the organization's structure, actions, and accomplishments in light of the mission, purposes, and goals of the organization. Three samples included 128 current members, 8 former members, and 78 non-members respectively. Current members gave higher than average ratings to the need for the ABVE Certification Examination to reflect forensic practice, the need for formal mentoring, the need for alternative means of receiving CEU's, the adequacy of the Code of Ethics, the need to inform consumers about ABVE and lower than average ratings on the need to give the examination at alternate sites, the examination preparation workshop, reporting of ethical complaints and disciplinary actions, the depth and scope of knowledge of conference speakers, and the relevance of conference topics to forensic practice. Non-members saw the professional journal and CEU opportunities as most important functions of the ABVE. Having an enforceable ethical code and keeping members aware of evolving roles and changing needs of vocational experts were also seen as important. Non-members gave lower ratings to mentoring opportunities, an annual CEU requirement, and ease of accessing ABVE Board and committee minutes, and establishment of a speaker fund to insure quality of speakers. Non-members chose not to join ABVE because they did not see the need to have the credential in order to practice in forensic settings or had another credential, which they believed, qualified practice in a forensic setting.

Integrating the Opinions of Different Experts in Determining Loss of Earning Capacity in Personal Injury Cases

Bentley Hankins and Patrick L. Dunn

Abstract: There is often a lack of understanding concerning the terminology that is frequently used by the experts (medical/psychological, vocational and economic) who typically comprise a forensic team. As a result, sometimes one expert will develop opinions based on false assumptions obtained from other experts. This divergence of language among the medical, vocational and economic experts can create confusion and potentially derail a plaintiff or defendant's otherwise strong case. This article discusses many of the common variances of language used by forensic experts that can foster misunderstanding and lead to erroneous conclusions.

Understanding Case Law and Using It to Effectively Make a Point

Graham L. Sisson, Jr.

Abstract: This article presents, from an attorney's perspective, the use of case law to effectively make a point. Legal reasoning and concepts are discussed in order to fully explicate the subtleties of the decision making process involved in court rulings or holdings. The IRAC method of briefing cases is explained and illustrated with an example to demonstrate the effectiveness of this tool in making a point.