71-1504

STRADER, Edward N., 1940-
A MANAGEMENT ANALYSIS OF SELECTED STATE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AGENCIES FROM THE PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR SUPERVISORS.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1970
Business Administration

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/2895

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

A MANAGEMENT ANALYSIS OF SELECTED STATE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AGENCIES FROM THE PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR SUPERVISORS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

EDWARD N. STRADER

Norman, Oklahoma

1970

A MANAGEMENT ANALYSIS OF SELECTED STATE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AGENCIES FROM THE PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR SUPERVISORS

APPROVED BY

Ronald Austin Wolf

James E. Hibdon

Edwin W. Brunner

Ronald B. Thurman

William R. Ford

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe a special debt greater than I will ever pay to Dr. Donald Woolf, Associate Professor of Management and Chairman of this dissertation committee, and to his wife, Mrs. Anne H. Woolf, without whose guidance, direction, tolerance, and encouragement this dissertation would never have come to fruition.

Special thanks are also due to Dr. Edwin W. Mumma for his humanity. He gave of himself when he had few reserves from which to give and when he was faced with many demands besides my own.

Dr. William R. Hood must be acknowledged for the most outstanding attitude toward graduate students I have ever encountered.

My sincere thanks also go to Dr. Ronald B. Shuman, a gentleman and a scholar in the true sense of the word, for his service on the committee, and to Dr. James E. Hibdon, for serving as an outside member of the committee.

An expression of thanks is also due to Mike Yeager, Shirley Rhodes, Donna Boll, Patsy Stephens, and Mrs. Naomi Murphy for their assistance in typing this dissertation.

Dr. Harold Viaille, the most understanding employer a person could have, and the rest of the staff of the Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute at the University of Oklahoma for providing a place to work, and other minor conveniences in these last months, and the Institute and the Rehabilitation Services Administration, Social and Rehabilitation Services, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for financing the study, deserve special thanks.

Thanks are also given to the state rehabilitation agencies in Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. Without the cooperation of these agencies and their supervisors this study could not have been conducted.

Finally, my special thanks go to my wife, Carol, for her patience and support throughout the trials of my graduate study.

All of these people named above and many others too numerous to mention have made their contributions to this study, and their assistance has been deeply appreciated. All positive credits for the quality of the work contained in this dissertation must be shared with them while the author alone accepts full responsibility for any deficiencies which have crept into it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS		v
LIST OF TABLES		vi
Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	RESEARCH DESIGN AND FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS OF DATA	23
III.	THE PILOT STUDY: MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN THE OKLAHOMA DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION	44
IV.	THE ORGANIZING FUNCTION IN ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, AND TEXAS	111
V.	THE PLANNING FUNCTION IN ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, AND TEXAS	143
VI.	THE STAFFING FUNCTION IN ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, AND TEXAS	166
VII.	THE DIRECTION FUNCTION IN ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, AND TEXAS	193
VIII.	THE CONTROLLING FUNCTION IN ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, AND TEXAS	216
IX.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	245
BIBLIOGRAPHY		268
APPENDICES		272

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
III-1	Supervisory Activities, Number of Mentions, Average Proportion of Time and Range of Estimates of Proportion of Time Among Supervisors in Oklahoma.....	49
III-2	Activities, Number of Mentions, Average Proportion of Time, and Range of Estimates on Proportion of Time for Counselors in Oklahoma.....	52
III-3	District Budget Request Determination Method in Oklahoma.....	63
III-4	Spending Priorities in Oklahoma.....	71
III-5	Actual and Ideal Sizes of Counselor's Caseloads by Supervisory District.....	105
IV-1	Activities, Average Proportion of Time, Range of Time Estimates and Number of Mentions Among Supervisors in Arkansas.....	118
IV-2	Activities, Average Proportion of Time, and Range of Time Estimates for Counselors in Arkansas.....	121
IV-3	Activities, Average Proportion of Time, and Range of Time Estimates Among Supervisors in Louisiana.....	123
IV-4	Activities, Average Proportion of Time, and Range of Time Estimates for Counselors in Louisiana.....	125
IV-5	Activities, Average Proportion of Time, and Range of Time Estimates Among Supervisors in Texas.....	127
IV-6	Activities, Average Proportion of Time Allocated, and Range of Time Estimates Among Counselors in Texas.....	129

Table		Page
IV-7	Actual and Ideal Span of Management in Arkansas, Louisiana and Texas.....	131
IV-8	Effect of Change in Mix of Specialty and Generalized Counselors on Span of Management in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.....	132
IV-9	Level of Decision in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.....	134
IV-10	Factors Causing Level of Decision To Be Raised in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas...	135
IV-11	Level of Review of Decisions in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.....	137
IV-12	Factors Causing the Level of Review of Decisions To Be Raised in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.....	138
V-1	Supervisory Estimates of Degree by Which Vocational Rehabilitation Services Could Be Expanded in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.....	162
VI-1	Average Proportion of Counselor's Time on Training Activities During Period Considered on New Counselor in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.....	176
VI-2	Average Production Expected of New Counselors as Compared to Experienced Counselors in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas...	177
VII-1	Annual Salaries Received by Rehabilitation Supervisors in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.....	200

A MANAGEMENT ANALYSIS OF SELECTED STATE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AGENCIES FROM THE PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR SUPERVISORS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation will describe and analyze the findings of a research study of management practices in selected state vocational rehabilitation agencies from the perceptions of their supervisors. The study was designed and carried out between September 1, 1967 and August 31, 1968 in four of the state general rehabilitation agencies in the Rehabilitation Services Administration's National Region Seven. Headquarters for this region are in Dallas, Texas, and the region itself comprises five states--Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas. This research was conducted under the auspices of the Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute for Region Seven, located at the University of Oklahoma.

Chapter I of this dissertation will briefly describe the study itself, give a short history of the Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute through which the study was

conducted, and trace the history of the enabling federal legislation under which the state vocational rehabilitation agencies where the research was conducted operate. It also will recount why the study was needed, state its purpose, and relate this research to other organizational research of a similar nature. Finally, it will give a summary of Chapter I and a description of the order and content of later chapters. A brief history of the Research Institute is contained in the next section.

The Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute, University of Oklahoma

The Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute for Region Seven, hereinafter referred to as Institute, was chartered in August of 1966 at the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, under grant RD-1967-G from the Rehabilitation Services Administration, Social and Rehabilitation Service, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The purpose of this Institute was to do research related to administration and management of state vocational rehabilitation agencies. A companion Rehabilitation Service Administration Management Training Institute began operations at the same time and has conducted periodic management training programs since then.

The first project of the Institute was a monograph on administration and management containing selected and

annotated bibliographical entries.[1] This monograph was published in April of 1969.

The second project of the Institute which began in September, 1967, envisioned a group of three associated studies of management practices at the three major levels of operations found in most state rehabilitation agencies. These three studies were to be:

1) a top level study focusing on the state office level of operations of the state agencies and patterned on the Harbridge House Study.[2]

2) a middle level study focusing on the management practices of the organization as seen from the supervisory positions.

3) a lower level study focusing on management practices at the counselor level of the organization.

The state office level study never proceeded beyond the design stage primarily because the part-time researcher employed to conduct it found it expedient to sever his connection with the Institute due to increased duties with his

---

[1] Jagdish T. Danak and William H. Keown, Administration and Management, a Selected and Annotated Bibliography, Monograph Number 1 (Norman, Oklahoma: Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute, University of Oklahoma, 1969).

[2] Harbridge House, Inc., Factors Influencing Agency Effectiveness, A Study for the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration (Boston, Massachusetts: Harbridge House, Inc., 1963).

primary employer. Present plans do not include a resurrection of this study.

The supervisory level study is the one which this dissertation will describe. The counselor level study was carried out in the period from September 1968 to August 1969. A paper describing this research is forthcoming.[3]

A short history of the evolution of the state vocational rehabilitation organizations, centering on the enabling federal legislation under which they operate, follows this brief history of the Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute at the University of Oklahoma.

History of State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies--Enabling Legislation

The joint state federal program of vocational rehabilitation for the civilian disabled, on which the state vocational rehabilitation agencies of today depend for a major portion of their financing, began with the passage of the Smith-Fess National Civilian Vocational Rehabilitation Act in 1920.[4]

---

[3]Jagdish T. Danak, "An Analysis of the Managerial Aspects of the Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor's Position in Selected States" (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, in preparation).

[4]Public Law 66-236, National Civilian Vocational Rehabilitation Act, June 2, 1920, 41 US Statutes at Large (1920), p. 735-37.

This act marked the entry of the federal government into the civilian vocational rehabilitation field. It was preceded by veteran's rehabilitation work which could be traced back to Europe in the Middle Ages in its most rudimentary form. Large scale rehabilitation efforts for veterans in the United States through the provision of medical services must be considered an outgrowth of the Civil War, although veteran's benefits had been provided in connection with every major war beginning with the American Revolution in 1776.[5]

Certain state programs of civilian vocational rehabilitation independent of federal support also preceded this initial federal act by as much as three years.[6] This reference showed Wisconsin, Minnesota, Massachusetts, Nevada, Rhode Island, North Dakota, California, Virginia, New Jersey, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and New York had initiated programs by 1920.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1920 encouraged other states to enact programs since it made financing for state programs available on a dollar for dollar matching basis. The Act provided up to $1,000,000 per year of this

---

[5]C. Esco Obermann, A History of Vocational Rehabilitation in America (Minneapolis: T. S. Dennison & Company, Inc., 1965), p. 135-147.

[6]Ibid., p. 213-14.

matching money in the later years of its five year duration. The amount of matching money available to a particular state depended on the population of that state. A minimum appropriation of $5,000 was set. No provisions for transfer of matching funds, not utilized by the states to which they were apportioned on a population basis, to other states which had exhausted their population-based appropriations, but would willingly match additional federal funds with state funds, were included. This law also provided $75,000 per year for administration of the act.[7] The administrative staff was located in the United States Department of the Interior at this time.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Act was renewed or extended in 1924, 1930, and 1932 without many substantial modifications in either the provisions of the law or the amount or method of appropriations. Noteworthy events or changes occurring during this period included the formation of the United States Veterans Bureau, and, therefore, the relief of the responsibilities for vocational rehabilitation of disabled veterans of the Federal Board for Vocational Rehabilitation,[8] the failure to appropriate funds accompanying the 1924 extension of the act (This deficiency was remedied when the Congress reconvened in 1925.), and

---

[7] Ibid., p. 225.

[8] Public Law 67-27, Act of August 9, 1921, 42 U. S. Statutes at Large (1921), p. 147-57.

the Couzens' Amendment to the Act in 1930 which allowed reallocation of unclaimed matching funds to states able to match more than their original allocations.[9]

Thirty-nine states had come into the joint federal-state program by June of 1924 as the states rushed to inaugurate civilian vocational rehabilitation programs to claim their share of the federal matching funds. However, another fifteen years were required for the remainder of the then forty-eight states to come into the program.[10]

The next piece of vocational rehabilitation legislation came about through the inclusion of a title and part in the Social Security Act of 1935.[11] This legislation raised the overall appropriation to $2,000,000, of which $102,000 was designated for administrative costs.[12] This legislation also changed the status of vocational rehabilitation federal support from temporary to permanent.

The next legislative change came in 1939, again as part of social security law in the 1939 Amendments to the Social Security Act.[13] The amount provided for annual

---

[9]C. Esco Obermann, op. cit., p. 263.

[10]Ibid., p. 242, 246.

[11]Public Law 74-271, August 14, 1935, Title V, Part 4; 49 U. S. Statutes at Large (1935), p. 633-34.

[12]Ibid., p. 270.

[13]Public Law 76-379, August 10, 1939, Title V, Section 508: 53 U. S. Statutes at Large (1939, p. 1381).

grants was raised to $3,500,000 with a minimum state allotment of $20,000. The amount allocated for federal administration was raised to $150,000.[14]

Also in 1939 the implementation of Reorganization Plan I for the Executive Branch of the government saw the United States Office of Education and its subsidiary the Vocational Rehabilitation Service transferred from the Department of the Interior to the newly established Federal Security Agency,[15] where it remained until the creation of the Department of Health Education and Welfare in 1953.

Public Law 78-113 passed on July 6, 1943 contained the 1943 Amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.[16] This act specifically authorized many kinds of services formerly prohibited by administrative fiat. It provided for full reimbursement to the states for direct services extended to war disabled veterans. No limitations were placed on amounts that could be appropriated for vocational rehabilitation support. Technical rehabilitation studies and investigations and support for training of vocational rehabilitation personnel also were authorized. Administrative costs of the states were to be reimbursed in full.[17]

---

[14] Ibid., p. 272.

[15] Ibid.

[16] U. S. Statutes at Large (1943), p. 374-80.

[17] Ibid., p. 286-87.

The end of World War II saw the increased expansion of the vocational rehabilitation program. This program was coming to be regarded more as a sound economic measure and to shed the welfare image it had formerly carried. This change in image was destined to yield handsome rewards for the program in the future. The regional administrative organization began in 1943 with eight regions.

The next vocational rehabilitation legislation was Public Law 83-565, signed on August 3, 1954.[18] This law provided special encouragement for research and demonstration projects. Matching money in varying amounts was still required under all programs, but it was now allocated on a per-capita-income/population basis for basic grants. Grants were authorized to colleges and universities to exapnd curricula and provide traineeships to graduate students in an effort to expand the supply of qualified rehabilitation personnel. The "open end" appropriations of Public Law 78-113 were replaced by "closed end" appropriations, but the amount expanded from $23,000,000 in 1954 to $125,000,000 in 1964.[19]

The final piece of vocational rehabilitation legislation enacted before this research was conducted was Public Law 89-333, passed on November 8, 1965. Probably the

---

[18] U. S. Statutes at Large (1954), p. 652-665.

[19] Ibid., p. 316-17, 309, 322.

two most important provisions of this law were the continued expansion of appropriations (The combined authorized figure for basic services, grants, innovation projects, and research demonstration, training and traineeships for 1968 was $526,000,000.), and the deletion of the word "physical" preceding "handicapped" in the definition of persons eligible for services.

Other important provisions of this law were as follows:

1) Changes in the matching formula (1) in basic grants to a 75:25 percent federal to state basis, (2) in innovation projects to a 90:10 ratio for the first three years and a 75:25 basis for two additional years (innovations to be supported for five years instead of previous three).
2) One hundred percent financing of a two year state-wide program planning effort in all states.
3) Provision for extended evaluations of six months and eighteen months duration.
4) Deletion of the economic need requirement for eligibility to receive services.[20]

The significant point of this tracing of developments was undoubtedly the continued increases in federal

---

[20]Public Law 89-333, November 8, 1965, 89 U.S. Statutes at Large (1965), p. 1202-94.

financing for the federal-state joint program which began in 1935, but really increased rapidly from 1943 and continued to increase through the 1968 appropriations. Absolute amounts of federal appropriations grew remarkably between 1965 and 1968, causing a particularly noticeable expansion of the actual size of state programs in numbers of personnel. Indeed, the major problem faced by the state agencies was getting the state matching appropriations increased at a concurrent rate.

The evolution of the Region Seven Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute, and the evolution of the federal legislation under which the state organizations to be researched exist have been described. The stage is now set for depicting the purpose and need for the present study.

Purpose of the Dissertation

The purpose of this dissertation was to discover and critically analyze selected management practices in four state general rehabilitation agencies of national Region Seven. The data for the study were obtained from the supervisors of these organizations and included some recommendations for changes in management practices suggested by these supervisors.

The purpose of the study was not to develop normative standards for management practices in these agencies although this work might provide a basis for further

research directed toward the development of such norms or guides for management practices in these agencies.

Need for the Study

The most important reason such a study seemed called for was the dearth of present empirical knowledge about management practices in state vocational rehabilitation organizations, particularly at the supervisory level.

A search of the literature found no significant empirical work on management practices at the supervisory level of the state agencies. The following sources have been selected as illustrating the need for management research and the paucity of present knowledge of management practices in the area of investigation. The first quotation came from the original proposal for establishment of the Region Seven Rehabilitation Research Institute at the University of Oklahoma.

> As indicated above, the research area proposed for the R.R.R.I.:O.U. (Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute : University of Oklahoma) will be concerned with managerial problems. Since managerial problems exist at all levels in any organization, the results of this research should be useful in all VR agencies. Management, as a special field of endeavor, has been subjected to formal investigation in modern terms for only a relatively short time. Many problems are unsolved and many others are only partially solved. Even in cases where some knowledge exists, there is always the problem of adapting it for application in the individual situation.
>
> The overall effectiveness of agency activities is probably more affected by the quality of its management than any other single factor. Competence and industriousness in the technical and operative phases of the work can be enhanced or negated by the quality

> of managerial performance achieved. Excellent research work is now under way in the technical and operative phases of VRA's work, but little or no research work is being done in the area of administration. The establishment of this institute would have the effect of rounding out and balancing the whole research effort.
>
> More specifically, the R.R.R.I.O.U. would serve the agencies in Region VII and, in a larger sense, the entire VR program through (1) the development of new knowledge in terms of the special problems of the state agencies; (2) the stimulation of state rehabilitation agencies to become actively curious about their management problems which might be subject to research and to provide consultation to such state agencies on research methods, techniques, design, and so forth; (3) to participate in management research, within the limitations of the R.R.R.I.O.U., at the request of State agencies and VRA.[21]

The following quotation came from Mr. Joseph L. Hunt, former Assistant Commissioner of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration.

> I think the Institute should consider (in giving any priorities) a real serious study of at least a dozen, maybe 20, fair-sized offices, local offices (what we call district offices) where the work is done. Make the study in such a way that when you are through, you will find some things that are very wrong. The study may have to look for volunteers. You should look at the manager as to his age, education, biases, previous work, etc. You should come out with an image of a good sound district office manager. Go into it to the extent to which he does or does not develop staff, methods or things he uses in developing them. You must remember this is the heart of the program.[22]

---

[21] L. Doyle Bishop and William H. Keown, "A Proposal for the Establishment of a Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute for the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration at the University of Oklahoma." Submitted to the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration on November 3, 1964, p. 3.

[22] Joseph L. Hunt, Proceedings of the National Advisory Conference for the Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute at the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, June 23, 1967.

The next quotation came from Dr. Clayton L. Morgan, Coordinator, Rehabilitation Counselor Training, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

> In this /current/ welter of growth and change the area of supervision demands a more precise definition of role and function. The exact duties and responsibilities of a supervisor will vary from /one vocational rehabilitation/ agency to another; even so, it is felt there is need for the spelling out of some common core of general responsibilities and competencies.[23]

Mr. Voyle Scurlock, then Director of Vocational Rehabilitation for the State of Oklahoma, wrote the following words about supervision.

> The third condition which causes us to consider supervision as a problem at this time is the fact that we may not agree in our definitions of supervision. It seems to me that one may be tempted to assume that the state agencies have a commonly accepted concept of supervision and are organized and staffed to carry it out. This I do not believe to be true, and until administrators are agreed upon what is meant by supervision--that is, the kind of supervision that is desired--we obviously cannot decide how and for what purpose it should be used.[24]

Edward J. Moriarty, Director of the Ohio Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation addressed himself to the problem in the following manner: "And so it goes--many analyses /of the functions or areas of supervision/, all of them

---

[23]Clayton A. Morgan and Edgar B. Porter, Some Aspects of Supervision in Vocational Rehabilitation (Stillwater, Oklahoma: The Clearing House, Oklahoma State University, 1963), p. i.

[24]Boyle C. Scurlock, "Supervision in State Rehabilitation Agencies," Journal of Rehabilitation, July-August, 1958, p. 7.

right, and all of them admittedly incomplete."[25]

These quotations appeared to lend ample support for the need to know what management practices exist at the supervisory level of state vocational rehabilitation organizations.

However, one other reason that the study was needed should also be mentioned. Since 1965, three management training institutes, at the University of Oklahoma, Northeastern University, and the College of Saint Thomas, have been chartered by the Rehabilitation Services Administration. Empirical knowledge of management practices at the supervisory level such as this study provided should certainly be of some help in determining the nature and content of these management training programs.

The fact that little research had been done on management practices at the supervisory level in vocational rehabilitation organizations does not mean that similar research has not been done in other organizational contexts. Some of this other related organizational research will be discussed briefly in the next section.

Other related organizational studies

Since no directly similar research on management practices in state vocational rehabilitation organizations

---

[25]Edward J. Moriarty, "The Supervisor in a State Rehabilitation Agency," Journal of Rehabilitation, March-April, 1959, p. 24.

was disclosed by a literature search, the horizons of the literature search were extended to explore organizational research conducted in other contexts.

An initial question about the research design was concerned with obtaining the desired information about management practices in the rehabilitation agencies. Other researches indicated first-hand observation of actual organizational operations as one desirable avenue of approach. For example, such an approach was used in three of the four separate experiments that composed the well known Hawthorne study.[26] (The second relay assembly test room was the lone exception.) This method also was used by Zaleznik[27] and by Jacques[28] among others. This kind of observation and reporting technique of case study is also sometimes written by an insider. Alfred P. Sloan's My Years with General Motors[29] or A. J. Marrow's Management by

---

[26]F. J. Roethlisberger and W. J. Dickson, Management and the Worker (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1943), p. 22, 136, 387.

[27]A. Zaleznik, C. R. Christensen, and F. J. Roethlisberger, The Motivation, Productivity and Satisfaction of Workers (Boston: Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration, Division of Research, 1958), p. 21.

[28]Elliott Jacques, The Changing Culture of a Factory (London: Tavistock Publications, Limited, 1951), p. 11-16.

[29]Alfred P. Sloan, My Years with General Motors (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1964).

Participation[30] were examples of such case studies by insiders.

Although a case study approach to determining management practices was to be the modus operandi of this study, temporal, monetary, and personnel constraints dictated the use of some technique other than direct observation. Another technique, depicted by Blau and Scott, involved the analysis of an organization's documents.[31] Examples of this method of approach cited by Blau and Scott[32] were studies by Katz[33] and Blau[34] himself. This approach was also rejected for the current study. Three reasons for its rejection were as follows:

1) Doubt that documents which would disclose management practices existed.

2) The likelihood of disagreement between policy statement documents and actual practice.

3) Conviction that still another approach was better.

---

[30]Alfred J. Marrow, David G. Bowers, and Stanley E. Seashore, Management by Participation (New York: Harper and Row, 1967).

[31]Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962), p. 17-18.

[32]Ibid.

[33]Daniel Katz, et al., Productivity, Supervision and Morale in an Office Situation (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1950), p. 3-4.

[34]Peter M. Blau, The Dynamics of Bureaucracy (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955, p. 50-55.

A third possible approach to the information gathering process was the use of the interviewing technique. This technique includes the use of unstructured interviews, patterned interviews, and even self-administered questionnaires. The interviewing technique was used by Woodward[35] and by Holden, et al.,[36] in two works. The interviewing technique was chosen for the present study because several agencies were to be studied and this approach appeared best suited to the informational needs and resource constraints operating in the situation.

Another classification of methods of organizational research was detailed by Blau and Scott, based on the purpose for which data are collected. The three types of approaches included under this classification are:

1) Exploratory studies in which familiarity is gained with some problem or new insights are achieved that can guide further research.

2) Descriptive studies which define and portray the characteristics of the object of research or determine the

---

[35]Joan Woodward, Industrial Organization: Theory and Practice (London: Oxford University Press, 1965), The schedule of information obtained appears on page 261-65.

[36]Paul E. Holden, Lounsbury S. Fish, and Hubert L. Smith, Top Management Organization and Control (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1941. And a later similar study: Paul E. Holden, Carlton E. Pederson, and Gayton E. Germane, Top Management (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1968).

frequency of various occurrences and examine their associations with one another, and

3) Hypothesis-testing studies which focus on the collection of data that permit the confirmation of a given hypothesis or set of hypotheses and thereby help to determine the probable validity of the theory from which it is derived.[37]

Obviously many studies, like the present one, serve multiple purposes. The present study served the descriptive purpose just outlined, but it also served the exploratory purpose to a lesser extent. Woodward[38] in her study also served both directive and exploratory purposes. Both Holden[39] studies were primarily descriptive in nature.

Blau and Scott also classified empirical studies on the basis of the research design employed. One of the classes of design is the field study and they made the following assertions about it:

> The field study is the typical research design employed in the study of formal organizations. This approach is well adapted for providing an over-all picture of the organization and information about the interdependence of its constituent parts.[40]

---

[37]Blau and Scott, op. cit., p. 15.

[38]Woodward, op. cit., p. 1, 5-6.

[39]Holden (1941), op. cit., p. VII and Holden (1968), op. cit., p. X.

[40]Blau and Scott, op. cit., p. 20.

Since an over-all picture of the organization was what the present study desired to provide, the field study approach appeared to be the ideal one. Most of the previously mentioned researches followed this field study approach.

One additional aspect of the research design should be developed. This phase was the decision to use the Oklahoma data for a pilot study. The Oklahoma supervisors were questioned first because they were the most accessible group, and the Oklahoma data were analyzed separately and before the data from the other states were collected as a check on the validity of the questionnaire and interview instruments[41] and research procedure. The pilot study or preliminary survey was used by Woodward[42] in her study and by Johnston[43] in his study of the implementation of the 1965 Amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

More detail on the research methodology and the research design of this particular study will be provided

---

[41]Pretesting of questionnaire and interview instruments of an extensive nature are recommended in the following works: Vernon T. Clover, Business Research, Basic Principles and Techniques (Lubbock, Texas: Rodgers Litho, Inc., 1958), p. 145, and Robert Ferber and P. J. Verdoon, Research Methods in Economics and Business (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1962), p. 42-43.

[42]Woodward, op. cit., p. 7.

[43]Addison M. Johnston, "The Implementation of the 1965 Amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act by Selected Rehabilitation Agencies in the South Central United States" (Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas, 1969), p. 50, 51-53.

in the following chapter, but first a summary of the contents of Chapter I and a preview of the contents of later chapters are in order.

Summary and Preview

Chapter I has briefly described the nature of the study, stated its purpose, and depicted the need for it. In addition, it has traced the historical development of the Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute under whose auspices the study was conducted and given a brief legislative history of the evolution of the state-federal program of vocational rehabilitation under which the state agencies where the research was conducted. Then the present research has been related to similar researches in other organizational contexts and, finally a brief preview of the contents of later chapters of this dissertation was provided.

Chapter II will concern itself with the development of the study's research design and instruments. In addition, it will describe the methodology used in conducting the research and will present the framework used for analysis and presentation of the data collected in the study.

Chapter III will describe all relevant phases of the pilot study conducted by the Oklahoma Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. The purpose of the pilot study

was to test the research design and the research instruments before the other states were visited.

Chapter IV will describe the data collected on those management practices associated with the organizing function in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.

Chapter V will explore the collected data connected with the planning function in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas, while Chapter VI will cover that management practice information linked with the staffing function in this trio of states.

That management practice information associated with the directing function and with the control function in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas will be considered in Chapters VII and VIII, respectively.

Chapter IX, the final chapter, will contain the summary, recommendations, and conclusions derived from the study of management practices in the selected state vocational rehabilitation organizations visited.

CHAPTER II

RESEARCH DESIGN AND FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS OF DATA

Research Design

Introduction

As indicated in Chapter I, a survey of some other organizational researches led to the selection of the field study method serving descriptive and exploratory purposes and utilizing questionnaires and interviews for the data-gathering process.

Information sought

With the basic research design selected on the basis of the goals of the study and the literature search of comparable studies, the next step was to decide what information would be collected. A set of preliminary areas or concepts of management to be investigated were selected with primary attention in the selection process focused on the importance of the information sought and the feasibility of obtaining it by the interviewing technique of collection. The patterned interview with a common set of questions was chosen in preference to the non-directive interview so common information would be obtained from all respondents. A proposed set

of questions was concurrently developed for eliciting the desired information in each area.

Research instruments

A procedural decision was made at this point in the study to save time and money by dividing the questions asked by the research into two documents--a self-administered questionnaire and an interview to be conducted by a member of the Institute staff. The primary criteria for the division of questions between the two documents were: (1) difficulty of understanding the questions and (2) the degree to which the information sought could be considered sensitive or damaging.

Face-sheet or classification data and less difficult and sensitive questions were contained in the questionnaire which is exhibited in Appendix I. This questionnaire was mailed to the respondents with a cover letter[1] which briefly explained the purpose of the Institute and the current research project and solicited their cooperation. Meanwhile, the cooperation of the various state directors had already been solicited with an accompanying request that they communicate their endorsement of the research project down through the hierarchy of their organizations. The letter also indicated that the questionnaire would be followed up shortly with an interview session. Enough lead time, approximately two

[1]A sample cover letter also is included in Appendix I.

weeks, was allowed for the questionnaire to be completed and returned for examination before the interview was conducted. Excessive lead time was avoided so the questionnaire information would be fresh in the respondent's mind. This return procedure allowed for follow-up on any questionnaire items where it appeared desirable.

The interview instrument, which is included as Appendix II, contained the more difficult and sensitive questions pertaining to the management practice data the research sought. These were questions which might require some explanation, clarification, interpretation or amplification in order to obtain valid and understandable responses from the supervisors.

The separation of the information sought into questionnaire and interview instruments meant that some areas or concepts fell wholly in one document or the other, but questions on several areas were contained partially in the questionnaire and partially in the interview. In these cases, the criterion of continuity governed where the separation would be made with the more difficult and sensitive questions always being assigned to the interview.

At a point some time after the documents had been formulated, their length was carefully considered. A maximum of four hours or one half day's time was all the Institute felt an individual respondent could be asked to give to the interview process. With this four-hour guideline in view a preliminary test of both the questionnaire and the interview

were arranged with a supervisor from the Oklahoma Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. A total of eight to ten hours composed of parts of three separate days were required to complete both documents.[2] Approximately 75 percent of this time was devoted to the interview questions. On the basis of this preliminary check, a number of questions were eliminated and the documents were adjudged to be ready for the pilot study in the Oklahoma Agency. During this period of time, running from September, 1967, through March of 1968, while the questionnaire and interview instruments were being developed and finalized into the form used in the pilot study, they were also examined by Dr. Harold Viaille,[3] then Chief of Program Planning, Oklahoma Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Timetable of field work

In April of 1968, the pilot study was conducted among the supervisors of the Oklahoma Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. The data collected in Oklahoma were analyzed and a preliminary analysis was done on them before the research was continued in another state agency. On the basis of the research experience in the Oklahoma Agency, some modifications

---

[2]The patient cooperation of Mr. Jack Barbee, Supervisor of District Two, Oklahoma Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, is gratefully acknowledged.

[3]Dr. Viaille is now Director of the Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute at the University of Oklahoma, a post he assumed in May, 1968.

were made in the supervisor interview. The most substantial of these modifications will be mentioned in the description of the pilot study in Oklahoma contained in Chapter III.

After the preliminary analysis and description of the Oklahoma data were completed, three other states were visited. These states were Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas and they were visited in the order of their listing. The field phase of the research work was completed with the interview of the last selected supervisor in Texas in August of 1968.

Number of supervisors interviewed

The research design initially anticipated that the entire universe of supervisors in each state would serve as both questionnaire and interview subjects for the research. However, it proved possible to reach all supervisors only in Oklahoma and Arkansas. A total of thirty supervisors were interviewed. They included eleven in Oklahoma, eight in Arkansas, four of a possible six in Louisiana (the other two were on vacation when the interviews were conducted in their state), and seven of thirteen in Texas. A sample of supervisors was used in Texas because of the larger number employed in that state, their greater geographic dispersion, and time pressure for completion of the field work.

The detailing of the number of supervisors contacted concludes the exposition of research design and procedure. The development of a framework for analysis of data collected follows in the next section of this chapter.

Framework for Analysis of Data

Introduction

The framework for analysis of data used here will be to take the management concepts explored by the various sections of the supervisor questionnaire and supervisor interview and classify them under one or more of the five functions of management identified in the classical school founded by Henri Fayol.[4] The particular list of management functions to be used for classification purposes in this paper is taken from Koontz and O'Donnell,[5] contemporary followers of this school.

These authors' five functions of management are planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling, and the sections of the documents to be discussed under each function are as shown in the following outline:

Organizing:

- The Organization Structure
- Activities and Proportion of Time
- Span of Management
- Decision Level and Review
- Caseload

---

[4]Fayol's elements of management are described in Henri Fayol, General and Industrial Administration (London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd., 1949), Chapter Five.

[5]Harold Koontz and Cyril O'Donnell, Principles of Management, Fourth Edition (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968), Chapter Three.

Planning:

Plans and Policies

Budget

Resources

Needs

Staffing:

Recruitment, Selection, and Placement

Training

Directing:

Communication

Supervisor's Rewards

Counselor's Rewards

Controlling:

Control

(Caseload)

(Budget)

(Decision Level and Review)

Some concepts are listed more than once with second listings indicated by parentheses. These second listings were necessary because some comments germane to the second function under which an area was listed seemed in order.

The functions, concepts, and areas of management listed above will be discussed in the order of their listing. The discussion will center on disclosure of the kind of management information the researcher expected to elicit with the questions in the section being considered.

The questionnaire also included a large number of face-sheet or classification questions which were not designed to yield information germane to the management analysis and will not be discussed further in this dissertation. These data were collected for analysis in another study which will be forthcoming later.

The order generally followed in a discussion of management functions begins with planning. A departure from this order is justified by the analytical nature of the paper. To this writer, the key to a management analysis of any organization being an understanding of its organization structure, the point of embarkation for this analysis will be the organizing function.

Organizing

Organizing is primarily concerned with the design and operation of the activity-authority structure of the organization. The five areas or concepts of management to be discussed under organizing were the organization structure, activities and proportion of time, span of management, decision level and review, and caseload.

The Organization Structure

Three areas were explored in the structural section--the supervisor's picture of the chart, strong and weak points of the existing structure as seen by supervisors, and finally the supervisor's recommendations for structural change.

Activities and Proportion of Time

In this section, the researcher wanted to discover how the supervisors conceptualized their own jobs and those of their counselors. They were asked to list the activities they performed and the proportion of their total working time spent on each activity. Then they were asked what changes they felt were desirable in the format of activities or the relative time allotted to each. Finally, they were asked about their likes and dislikes among these activities. They were then asked to answer similar activity and proportion of time and desirable change questions about the counselors who worked for them.

One of the changes made in the documents between the pilot study in the Oklahoma Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and the studies of the other states came in this section. Open-ended lists of representative activities performed by supervisors and counselors were developed from the data collected in Oklahoma and through consultation with Oklahoma Division of Vocational Rehabilitation personnel.[6]

The advantages of developing such lists were felt to outweigh the disadvantages because the comparison of relative time allotted to various activities by different supervisors or counselors in the same or different states was impossible without a common list. In order for the proportionate time

---

[6]Specifically, Mr. Jay Bailey, a counselor in the Norman area office, was consulted in connection with the development of the counselor list.

weighting of activities to be meaningfully compared, a common base or set of activities was necessary. Both lists, however, were purposefully left open-ended to allow the respondents to add any activities not included in the list. One other small addition was made to the supervisor interview in this section. At the bottom of the supervisor and counselor lists, the supervisors were asked to consider the paperwork portions of all activities in the lists and estimate how much of their total time was spent by supervisors and then by counselors on paperwork of one kind or another.

This portion of the document provided what was potentially the most interesting and informative data of the whole study since it concerned itself with the actual activities of the job and attitudes of the supervisors toward these activities. However, these data were not extensive enough for an in-depth analysis of the job itself and attitudes toward it. Further research along these lines should definitely be encouraged.[7]

The next concept to be considered is the span of management.

---

[7]The work of Frederick Herzberg and Scott Myers as depicted in the following references illustrates the kind of work that merits doing in these rehabilitation agencies. Frederick Herzberg, F. Mausner, and B. B. Snyderman, The Motivation to Work (New York: Wiley and Sons, 1959), and M. Scott Myers, "Who Are Your Motivated Workers," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 43, No. 1 (January, February, 1965), pp. 73-88.

Span of Management[8]

These questions sought to determine the actual span of management of each supervisor and the span he thought he should have under ideal circumstances. He was then asked why he chose the ideal number he mentioned.

Since both specialty counselors and general counselors were found in all the agencies, the influence of a change in the mix on the span of management was also explored with one question. The section on decision level and review follows.

Decision Level and Review

The questions in this area were concerned with which organization level made decisions in certain specific areas, who reviewed the decisions made, and specific factors which would cause the level of decision making or review to be raised. This concept was considered in this section because of its connection with the organizing concept, decentralization.

Caseload receives next consideration. It is the last topic discussed under the organizing function.

---

[8]The traditional view of the desirability of a narrow span of management is espoused in the following references: Lyndall Urwick, "Axioms of Organization," Public Administration Magazine (October, 1955), pp. 348-49, and Sir Ian Hamilton, The Soul and Body of an Army (London: Edward Arnold Publishers, Ltd., 1921), p. 229. An explanation and justification of the wide span can be seen in the following reference: James C. Worthy, "Men, Management, and Organization," Proceedings, Fifth Personnel Management and Industrial Relations Seminar (Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles, October 30, 1951), mimeographed.

Caseload

The major emphasis of the questions in this caseload section is on control, but these caseload questions were expected to show the method of departmentation used in organizing the agencies.[9]

This discussion of the caseload section concludes the points to be considered under the organizing function. The next function to be examined is planning.

Planning

Planning may be defined briefly as deciding in advance what, when, where, how, and by whom things will be done in the organization.[10] The planning process is the initial step, the function which takes place first, and, as such, is perhaps best studied in a new organization. Unfortunately, the organizations being researched were far from new. Although two of them were destined to experience significant organizational changes during or shortly after the period of the research, the planning and implementation of these changes could not yet be meaningfully studied. Therefore, a way to study planning in an existing organization which would yield some answers showing something other than a

---

[9]Harold Koontz and Cyril O'Donnell, op. cit.; Chapter 13 discusses methods of departmentation.

[10]Ibid., p. 81.

projection of the preceding year's plans adjusted for current conditions needed to be devised.

Such information was sought in one part of the plans and policies section, the first of the areas to be discussed under planning. The other areas investigated in the planning group are budget, dealing with financial planning, and sections on resources and needs dealing with projections in these two important areas.

Plans and Policies

The research sought to avoid projection and adjustment of the preceding year's plans by asking about the sources of new goals or objectives, major innovations, and policy changes that the supervisors could recall. Supervisors also were asked how production goals were set and implemented in the organization. Finally, they were asked to evaluate the objective setting and policy making process in the organization and to recommend any changes they deemed desirable.

Budget

The questions in this section were addressed to the determination of how resources were allocated in the agency. Specifically, the research asked how district and individual counselor budget allocations were determined, how differences in requests and appropriations were reconciled, and what happened if a counselor fully depleted his allocation of money. Finally, the supervisors were asked if they had

reserve funds or other ways to get additional money if available funds were exhausted and what criteria they would use in deciding how to allocate this additional money.

Resources

This section endeavored to find out what kinds of additions to or re-allocations of resources the supervisors deemed most desirable. Questions were asked dealing with people, physical facilities, and money.

A final question in this section asked the supervisors how they would spend a lump of unfettered money if given it immediately. The intent of this question was to establish a ranking or priority system among the various needs the supervisors perceived.

Needs

This final section to be considered under the planning function asked the supervisors for an estimate of the volume of unmet needs for vocational rehabilitation services in their unit or area and for the basis for their opinion.

The needs area was the last to be explored under the planning function. The next function considered is the staffing function.

Staffing

Koontz and O'Donnell define staffing as manning and keeping manned the organization's positions.[11] This function encompasses manpower forecasting; recruitment, selection, and placement; training and development; and appraisal. Manpower forecasting was considered to be a central office duty, and appraisal was included in the section on control, so only recruitment, selection, and placement and training drew attention in this section. Recruitment, selection, and placement were treated first.

Recruitment, Selection, and Placement

Several questions were asked dealing with this topic. The research wanted to determine how the agencies decided where to put a new counselor, and what criteria were used in making these placement decisions. Information on supervisory involvement in recruitment and selection, and about supervisor's thoughts on sources of applicants and selection criteria were also sought. Finally, the research asked for suggestions directed toward improving the recruitment process. The logical area of consideration following recruitment is training.

Training

The training area was considered in several ways. A distinction was drawn among training for new counselors,

---

[11] Koontz and O'Donnell, op. cit., p. 49.

experienced counselors, and supervisors. Another type of break was made between inside training conducted by an experienced counselor, by the supervisor himself, or by other agency personnel such as the training officer, and outside training conducted by outside training resource persons. The research asked the supervisors what training of either an inside or outside nature was available for each of the aforementioned groups--new counselors, experienced counselors, and supervisors--what training was being utilized, what their evaluation of the results of such training was, and finally, how training could be improved. Also, in this section, the supervisors were asked to evaluate existing graduate programs for training rehabilitation counselors on the basis of their experience with graduates and to suggest methods for improving these graduate programs.

Training is the last staffing topic viewed. Next, the directing function of management will be explored.

Directing

The directing function of management encompasses communication, motivation, and leadership.[12] The initial section of the directing material dealt with the communication process in the agency. The research probed the motivation of supervisors in the section on supervisor's rewards. Then it probed the supervisors' perceptions of the motivation of

---

[12] Ibid., p. 535.

counselors in the section on counselor's rewards. Leadership was not explored because the supervisors were felt to be relatively autonomous in their jobs. An indication of the portions of their jobs that the supervisors liked and disliked also relates to this discussion on motivation. This material is covered under the organizing function since it follows other activities-and-proportion-of-time questions.

Communication

In this area, the research tried to get the supervisors to evaluate the up-and-down flow of communications in their agencies. They were asked specifically (1) what they received that was useful, (2) what they received that was trash, and (3) what they did not receive that they needed. Finally, they were asked to rate the overall quality, adequacy, and timing of the flow of communication in the agency.

Supervisor's Rewards

In this section, the research was directed toward determining what rewards accrued to the supervisors from their work. The broader section was split into monetary and non-monetary reward categories. The first question asked the supervisor what his current salary was. Then he was asked how well he was paid in comparison to whatever job he might use for comparison with the requirement that the comparison job be specified.

In the non-monetary category, specific questions were asked concerning opportunities for advancement and recognition.

Then the supervisors were asked to name any other non-monetary rewards that made their positions attractive.

Counselor's Rewards

The questions in this section were addressed only to non-monetary rewards. Questions were asked on criteria for advancement, recognition provided, and other non-monetary factors making the position attractive.

Counselor's rewards concludes the discussion of topics grouped under the directing function. The consideration of the final function, control, follows.

Controlling

Control is said to compel events to conform to plans.[13] Therefore, it is inseparably linked to planning. Planning sets goals and control follows up planning to see that the goals are accomplished. The basic control process involves three steps:

1. Setting standards
2. Measuring performance
3. Correcting deviations[14]

All three steps are markedly interdependent. Without a standard, a measurement has little meaning; without a measurement, one cannot judge whether the standard is being met; standards and measurements are useless if deviations are not

---

[13] Ibid., p. 50.

[14] Ibid., p. 640.

corrected. One should remember, however, that standards are not sacred. A deviation might call for an adjustment in the standard as easily as it might indicate a need for a change in the level of performance.

Most of the questions dealing with the controlling function were concentrated in a section labeled control, but a few questions from other sections also drew comments concerning this function.

Control

The dimensions of control toward which specific questions in the questionnaire and interview were directed concerned the following:

1. The degree to which the supervisor actually directly observed the counselor's interactions with contacts.
2. The degree to which he close-checked the counselor's paperwork.
3. The amount of money the supervisor could spend without prior approval of a superior.
4. The methods of evaluation of and feedback on counselor performance.

A distinction was drawn between new and experienced counselors on most of these dimensions.

The caseload section sought other information related to control. It is considered next.

Caseload

The next section dealt with the sizes of the caseloads carried by the counselors reporting to a particular supervisor. These data measured in terms of average numbers of active cases and numbers of closures per counselor per year, provide the principal measure of the productivity of counselors and by totaling of counselor statistics for supervisors. The goals of the research with regard to this section were several. The primary one was the development of district, state, and regional norms on active cases and closures per counselor. Other goals were to determine how supervisors felt about the average caseload size and how they thought their counselors felt about the caseload sizes.

Other control-related information

Budgets, discussed earlier, must certainly be considered as a control device particularly to the degree that they are limited and inflexible.

The level of decision and review is also related to control since one of the surest ways to retain control is to centralize decision-making and close-check all decisions made by subordinates.

Summary

The conclusion of this section on control finishes the discussion of areas or concepts considered under each of the five functions of management. The purpose of this

second chapter has been to present the research design and procedure of the study and to develop a framework for the analysis of the data which were collected in the various state agencies.

The technique for data collection selected was use of questionnaires followed by personal interviews. The field research was conducted from April to August of 1968. Four state agencies in Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana and Texas were visited. A total of thirty supervisors were interviewed.

The framework for data analysis classified fifteen management concepts under five functions of management. The questions asked in regard to each concept were discussed. The functions of management were planning, organizing, staffing, directing and controlling. Questions dealing with several of the fifteen concepts were discussed under each.

Subsequent chapters will present the findings from the several agencies visited.

CHAPTER III

THE PILOT STUDY: MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN THE OKLAHOMA DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Introduction

The Oklahoma Agency research was labeled as a pilot study because the data collected there were analyzed before data from any other states were collected. The researcher used this pilot study to evaluate his documents and his research procedure. Although the results of this evaluation were overwhelmingly positive, some minor modifications in the supervisor interview were indicated. These changes were made and incorporated in the study of the succeeding states. They will be discussed under the appropriate section.

The format for presentation and analysis of the data developed in Chapter II will be followed in this chapter and in all succeeding chapters. The first function treated was organizing.

Organizing

Five concepts are explored under organizing. They are (1) organization structure, (2) activities and proportion of time, (3) span of management, (4) level of decision and review, and (5) caseload.

The Organization Structure

Three questions were asked on organization structure. The first asked for construction of a brief organization chart. Then the supervisors were asked how the structure helped or hindered them in doing their jobs, and how they would change the structure if given a chance.

The charts constructed in response to the first probe showed that the structures had three basic levels--state office, supervisor, and counselor, and that they were line and staff structures with staff functions concentrated at the state office level. However, an intermediate level existed between agency director and supervisors. This meant that two levels existed in the state office and four levels were found in the hierarchy of the total organization.

The overall reaction to the present structure was quite positive. In general, the structure was pictured as a highly flexible one without rigidly defined job duties and responsibilities. Such a flexible organization structure had the important advantage of allowing someone who

was well acquainted with it to get questions answered quickly with a minimum involvement of middlemen. This flexibility only became a marked disadvantage for someone lacking a thorough informal knowledge and most supervisors had enough service to avoid this disadvantage.

The supervisors made one general suggestion for structural change. This change proposed the insertion of another level of supervision between the Assistant Director for Rehabilitation Services and the supervisors. The supervisors desired this change because they felt their boss was being spread too thin. This change has since been made with the state being divided into eastern and western halves and supervisors in each half reporting to a separate boss who reports to the assistant director for rehabilitation services.

Several other changes of a largely individual nature were suggested, but they will not be discussed here.

The fact should be noted in passing that as a result of the Oklahoma experience, the section of the interview on structure was moved from the sixth section to the first. This action was taken because a description of the structure taken at the beginning of the interview turned out to be most helpful to the interviewer in understanding many of the supervisors' responses to other questions. The next section will focus on activities and proportion of time.

Activities and Proportion of Time

This section on activities and proportion of time was divided into two basic parts. The first concentrated on the supervisors themselves, asking them what activities they performed and how much of their time they spent on each category of activities. Then, they were asked what changes they would like to make in either activities performed or time spent on particular categories. Finally, they were asked to pick out the activity categories they particularly liked and disliked.

The second part of the section asked the supervisors to list activities performed by counselors and proportion of time on each activity. Then, the supervisor was asked what changes were desirable in either activities performed by the counselor or time allotted to them.

On the basis of the responses from the Oklahoma supervisors, a representative list of activities was developed and added to the interview for the reasons explained in Chapter II.[1]

The list of activities is as follows:

1. Travel - visits to field offices in territory, normally once a week
2. Review of plans and approval of closures
3. Consultation with counselors about problem cases

---

[1]Chapter II, p. 33.

4. Public relations activities - includes speaking engagements, working with third party agencies, developing referral sources, seeking new placement openings, and talking to community functionaries
5. Planning
6. Training their staff
7. Training and continuing orientation for the supervisors themselves
8. Evaluation of their staff--primarily day-to-day evaluation but also includes semi-annual performance rating and annual case review
9. Correspondence

Table 1 presents certain data on activities which received multiple mentions from the supervisors.

The range of estimates, as seen from the table, was extremely divided in some cases and only minimal standardization of responses from the supervisors was possible. These problems were reduced in later research by the use of the standardized lists of activities.

The question on changing the format or time allocation of supervisors' activities yielded little information. The supervisors in general seemed to adopt an attitude that said they would do whatever the job required. This attitude led them to think that changes were, in many instances, not feasible.

TABLE 1

ACTIVITIES, NUMBER OF MENTIONS, AVERAGE PROPORTION OF TIME AND RANGE OF ESTIMATES OF PROPORTION OF TIME AMONG SUPERVISORS IN OKLAHOMA[1]

Activity	No. of Mentions	Average Proportion of Time (Percent)	Range of Estimates (Percent)
Review Plans and Approve Closures	6	31.67	20-50
Training Staff	6	24.17	20-35
Planning	5	13.00	5-35
Counselor Consultation	5	17.00	10-25
Supervisory Training	5	14.20	10-20
Public Relations	6	10.00	1-25
Travel	5	8.60	1-12

[1]A total of eleven supervisors were interviewed in Oklahoma.

Source: Supervisor Interview, Question 9.1.

The supervisors liked their jobs in general and they particularly enjoyed consulting with counselors about problem cases and training and developing new counselors. They particularly liked the contacts with other professionals inside and outside the vocational rehabilitation organization that their jobs provided. They also appreciated public relations opportunities for telling the public about the vocational rehabilitation program in which they believed so strongly themselves.

Evaluations were mentioned twice as a disliked area. Another major category of dislikes was voiced by those several supervisors who had multiple duties. Their complaints arose either in connection with promotions or in connection with supervision of special projects. These multiple duty positions were universally decried by the supervisors holding them. One supervisor also noted that he disliked having to make hiring recommendations under present salary scales which he felt did not attract the best quality of applicants. In general, however, the supervisors indicated they encountered few distasteful tasks.

The representative list of counselor activities developed on the basis of supervisory responses and consultation with counselors contained the following thirteen items:

1. Intake work - processing referrals
2. Determining eligibility
3. Counseling with client to determine services needed
4. Writing plans
5. Arranging for services with persons other than the client
6. Follow-up activities
7. Closures
8. Public relations activities
9. Inservice training

10. Staff meetings and consultations
11. Travel
12. Planning
13. Other (to include activities not mentioned above)

The supervisors did not, however, conceptualize counselor activities with a breakdown as detailed as the one above. Table 2 shows any items mentioned by more than two supervisors.

Many activities in the developed list were not identifiably mentioned and others were mentioned infrequently. A possible explanation is that the research was seeking information about counselor activities from a third person, the supervisor, rather than from counselors themselves.

Five supervisors noted the desirability of a reduction in paperwork for counselors to increase the amount of time spent on counseling activities. Three supervisors mentioned more and better planning as being desirable for counselors. One of the supervisors felt counselors should spend less time on intake work and processing referrals. The next section will discuss the span of management concept.

TABLE 2

ACTIVITIES, NUMBER OF MENTIONS, AVERAGE PROPORTION OF TIME AND RANGE OF ESTIMATES ON PROPORTION OF TIME FOR COUNSELORS IN OKLAHOMA[1]

Activity	No. of Mentions	Average Proportion of Time (Percent)	Range of Estimates (Percent)
Direct Client Contact (Counseling	9	34.72	20-50
Paperwork	10	31.25	10-50
Screening Referrals	6	17.50	10-30
Determining Eligibility	3	15.00	10-25
Travel	5	13.20	1-25
Arranging for Services	3	11.67	6-20
Public Relations	6	10.67	5-15
Placement and Follow-up	3	10.00	5-15

[1]A total of eleven supervisors were interviewed in Oklahoma.

Source: Supervisor Interview, Question 9.5.

Span of Management

In this section the supervisors were asked what their present span of counselors was, what an ideal span would be, and why they chose the ideal number they did. The mean, median, and mode for the supervisor's current counselors were respectively 9.1, 9, and 10 counselors. The range of spans was from five to twelve counselors.

For the choice of an ideal span, the mean was 7.7,

the median was 8, and the mode was 8. The principal reason for the concentration at a figure of eight counselors was the existence and general acceptance of an agency guideline which set the target span of counselors per supervisor at eight. The range of ideal choices was five to ten counselors. Some other variables which supervisors thought should influence the determination of the span were:

1) types of caseloads

2) experience level of counselors, and

3) size of district.

In general, the supervisors felt that they could do their supervisory jobs better if they had fewer counselors reporting to them. Those in charge of special projects also expressed the opinion that their supervisory performance would improve if they were relieved of the special project duties.

One question asked the supervisors what effect a change in the mix of general and specialty counselors should have on span of management. A mixed response to this question was received. Five supervisors said a change in the mix should not influence the span while five others answered that an increase in the number of specialty counselors should lead to a decrease in the span of management. Those supervisors answering no effect on span from change in mix of general and specialty counselors probably did so because they already supervised some specialty counselors

and did not perceive their supervision as more difficult than supervising general counselors. The next concept treated was level of decision and review.

Level of Decision and Review

This section was directed toward determining the degree of decentralization in the organization by determining the organizational level at which certain decisions are made and reviewed.

The supervisors were asked who made the final decision on client acceptance; formulation of case plan; commitment of funds for diagnosis, physical restoration, and training; and closure. The first three areas were indicated by the respondents to be those in which the counselors made the decisions. The closure decisions were indicated by most supervisors to also be made by counselors, but they indicated that all closure decisions must be approved by the supervisor before being finalized.

Certain factors were specified by the supervisors as things which might cause decisions or at least approval of decisions to be raised to a higher level in the organization. Seventeen such factors, including cost of care, money for services or training to be spent out of state, and experience level of counselor (break at end of first year of service) were specified in Section 5.96 of the Oklahoma Casework Manual as requiring prior supervisory

approval. The supervisors also noted that counselors were encouraged to seek the help of higher levels in making any difficult decisions, and that clients had the option to appeal any decision if they wished.

The results of the question on review reinforced the previous finding that the counselor made and was responsible for most decisions. Acceptance of clients, formulation of case plans, and commitment of funds for diagnosis, physical restoration, and training were indicated as being reviewed primarily at the counselor level. The closure decision was indicated as being reviewed at the supervisory level.

The review level was raised by counselor appeal, client appeal, or classification among the activities specified in the previously mentioned Section 5.96 of the Oklahoma Casework Manual.

This concentration of decision making and review at the counselor level promoted maximum flexibility and minimized time delays in the application of resources to the rehabilitation of clients. The next section dealt with caseload.

Caseload

The caseload section was briefly considered under organizing because of the indications it yielded as to the

method of departmentation employed.[2] Most counselors in Oklahoma were assigned to territories on a geographical basis (usually a county or counties or a portion thereof) although a considerable number of specialty counselors who worked with particular types of disabilities (customer departmentation) were scattered through the organization. Examples of these specialists were counselors in cooperative school programs for the mentally retarded, alcoholic counselors, penal project counselors, and mental patient counselors. In general, the supervisors held that specialty counselors should have smaller caseloads and closure quotas because the cases they processed were generally more difficult.

The method of departmentation was the last concept or area to be considered under the organizing function. Attention was focused on the planning function of management in the next section.

Planning

Four concepts or areas of the documents were explored under the planning function. They were: (1) Plans and Policies, (2) Budget, (3) Resources, and (4) Needs. They will be considered in the order of their listing above.

---

[2]For an explanation of methods of departmentation, see Koontz and O'Donnell, op. cit., Chapter Thirteen.

Plans and Policies

The questions asked in this section thrust in two major directions. The first thrust was directed at determining the source of major innovations or changes in the particular state's vocational rehabilitation program.

The findings of the analysis of the responses to this question showed three major sources of innovations, changes, or expansion of vocational rehabilitation program efforts. The first source was the agency central office staff person in charge of program development. The second source was agency field level personnel including supervisors, counselors, and other staff, while the third source was pressure initiated by interested groups in the community.

Innovations from the first source came about as a result of being pulled through the hierarchy of the state agency from the federal level by announcing the availability of money normally on a ninety percent to ten percent ratio of federal to state matching funds for certain types of research or program development. This pulling of innovations through the system with money from the federal level had met with some success.

The second major source of innovation came from field personnel in the agency observing and recognizing the existence of a particular need for services and communicating this knowledge up the hierarchy so the need can be met. An

example of this sort of innovation was the creation of the testing and evaluation center now operating in Oklahoma City.

The spread of cooperative school projects for the mentally retarded to more and more communities across the state was cited as an example of a program for which community interest provided the most important impetus.

The supervisors were also asked if they had any suggestions for changes in the agency objective setting and planning process. The most important suggestion occurring in response to this question asked for more active encouragement from the central office administrators for field personnel to participate in setting objectives and communicating their ideas up through the hierarchy. The supervisors, in general, found their administrator fairly receptive to bottom-up communication and they certainly did not feel the administration was actively trying to discourage participation and bottom-up communication. Rather, the supervisors felt that these things were lost among the press of other duties, and they would have appreciated a positive effort from the top to encourage them.

Another suggestion was for a state level coordinator for special projects to function as a liaison man for dealing with third party agencies. The penal projects and special education projects needed a full-time man. A full-time program development officer was suggested as a valuable

addition to the central office staff. The current man had other duties besides program development. The second major thrust of this plans and policies section centered on the setting and implementation of production goals.

Certain objective variables were used in determining plan and closure goals for counselors. Probably the most important of these criteria was the experience level of the counselor, but others such as the size and location of his territory, its population, and the economic circumstances of its people were also used.

The question was really directed at determining who sets production goals. The responses to the question were divided. Some supervisors said that the state office formulated a state goal for transmission to regional and national levels. This state goal was then broken into district goals and communicated to the supervisors who in turn broke the district goal into goals for their individual counselors.

Another portion of the supervisors said that the counselor or at least the counselor and supervisor together determined the counselor's goal. Under this approach the individual counselor goals were aggregated to yield district and state goals.

A further exploration of responses showed several supervisors saying that goals were set from the top down before 1965, when the bottom-up process by which the counselor

determined his own goals was instituted. While all these supervisors agreed that the procedure had been nominally changed, some saw it as a genuine reformation of the goal setting process and others saw it only as a nominal change.

A significant fact was that the first two years operation under the new system where the counselor sets his own goals had shown the state-wide goal to be met or exceeded. Top-down imposition of plan and closure quotas did not seem necessary to get production. However, the interviewer still heard from some supervisors that they pressured some of their counselors to raise their closure goals. One responding supervisor commented that he might be very likely to encourage a counselor to raise his closure projections, but that he would never encourage one to lower his closure goal.

The stockpiling or banking of closures was readily admitted, but several supervisors noted that it appeared to be less frequent and less necessary currently than in prior years.

Pressure for additional closures late in the year had occurred in the experience of most supervisors. They saw this pressure as coming down the scalar chain from Washington through the Dallas Regional Office to the state office to the individual supervisor.

At the conclusion of this section the supervisors were asked how well current policies met the needs of the

disabled and what policies they would like to see changed. Most supervisors felt that they had maximum flexibility in meeting the needs of any applicant who qualified under the existing definition of vocational handicaps. Three respondents recommended no changes. Several other respondents made individual suggestions such as higher maintenance allowances for college students, better office locations and accessibility, and provision of services on the basis of financial needs.

The supervisors, in general, were not particularly concerned with beginning to serve the economically and socially deprived, but there were three exceptions. These three supervisors felt the definition should be broadened. They cited the following reasons for accepting the economically and socially deprived as vocational rehabilitation clients.

1. Large economic gains resulted from getting a client gainfully employed regardless of the nature of his vocational handicap.
2. Vocational rehabilitation personnel were very experienced in writing plans and obtaining services, particularly training services to render a client employable.
3. Vocational Rehabilitation had low overhead in comparison to Office of Economic Opportunity programs which should enable them to get a

higher return in services provided from appropriated money.

4. More money might be secured to finance vocational rehabilitation operations if services were offered to the economically and socially deprived.

In short, the vocational rehabilitation agency could probably make more people employable at a chepaer cost and probably with a better success ratio than any new agency, and could build its own empire at the same time.

These questions were the last ones included in the plans and policies section. The next planning section will explore the agency budgeting process.

Budget

Supervisors were first asked how the budget request for operation of the district was determined. A checklist offering individual counselor needs, total district needs, and an "other" category with description requested, as choices for determining the budget request for the district gave the results shown in Table 3.

These results showed fourteen responses from only eleven supervisors. This result occurred because one supervisor checked all three categories and one checked two categories. The pure response frequencies were respectively: choice one -- 6, choice two -- 1, and choice three -- 2.

TABLE 3

DISTRICT BUDGET REQUEST DETERMINATION METHOD IN OKLAHOMA

Alternative	Number of Choices
1. Individual Counselor Needs Determined and Totaled	8
2. Total Needs Estimated for District	3
3. Other (please describe briefly)	3

Source: Supervisor questionnaire, Question 9.1.

The responses showed clearly that a budgeting process did exist and that its primary emphasis was on the needs of the individual counselor.

The next question asked what criteria were used in determining the budget allocation of an individual counselor.

An individual counselor's allocation was determined by multiplying the predicted number of closures for the individual counselor by the statewide average closure cost per case from the previous year. This procedure would have yielded an allocation of $35,000 for a counselor with fifty predicted closures for fiscal year 1968 since the statewide average closure cost for fiscal 1967 was approximately seven hundred dollars per case.

The method described above appeared to weigh the number and type of cases to be served and other variables

although the weighting process was somewhat abstract. The number of cases to be served was considered in arriving at a predicted number of closures, and types of cases and services required to bring them through the rehabilitation process to closure certainly influenced the average closure cost. Other criteria mentioned by the supervisor as influencing the amount of money a counselor needs were the counselor's experience, the population of his territory, its geographic size, the general economic conditions that prevailed in the territory, the availability of and cooperation received from third party agencies and the availability and accessibility of services.

The only possible faults evident in this allocation process were (1) significant changes in costs of cases served from year to year and (2) significant differences in costs of serving cases in different districts and territories within the state. But, the supervisors were quick to point out that money could be, and sometimes was, shifted within districts and within the state. This flexibility was seen as essential to maximizing the overall effectiveness of the statewide vocational rehabilitation effort as long as it did not result in raiding of the counselors and supervisors who carefully husbanded their resources by those who had not been so prudent.

If a counselor exhausted his money before the end of the fiscal year, he either received more from within the

agency or from outside sources or he spent his time on activities which did not require expenditures from casework service funds. Inside sources of funds were primarily transfers from the following sources:

1. the supervisor's reserve allocation
2. other counselors within the district
3. the central office reserve allocation
4. other districts within the state

The following outside sources of funds were named:

1. Social security disability trust funds
2. Department of Public Welfare public assistance funds
3. Crippled children's funds
4. Cancer society funds
5. County commissioner's funds

Non-expense categories of work included public relations activities, development of referral sources, development of training opportunities, development of placement opportunities and follow-up work on clients. The supervisors also noted that in some cases treatment costs in facilities were borne by the facilities and that some expenses such as college tuition payments for summer sessions could be shifted to the next fiscal period by delayed payment.

Ten of the eleven supervisors answered that if appropriations differed from requests, adjustments would

be made on a selective basis. The criteria named as guidelines in making these selective adjustments were volume of needs, kinds of needs, comparative costs associated with needs, the existence or potential existence of outside funds which could be tapped to meet these needs, the immediacy of the needs, and the judgment which a counselor had exercised in previous spending.

Many supervisors commented that short money had not been a major problem. Some also noted that under conditions of tight money, counselors were encouraged to seek funds from outside sources. This discussion concluded the section on budgeting. The following section dealt with projection of needs in resource areas.

Resources

This section was designed to determine what additions to or reallocations of resources appeared desirable to the supervisors. The three areas that were explored were people, physical facilities, and money.

In the people area, the top priority item was a need for more counselors. However, the supervisors realized that given the current job specifications and the current market with its attractive alternative opportunities, the prospects for increased hiring of quality applicants were slim.

Barring hiring of more counselors, the supervisors' thoughts then turned to methods of making current counselors

more productive. The major suggestion in regard to increased productivity was to relieve counselors of their non-counseling tasks by the addition of sub-professionals. Suggested additions of this type were counselor aides, secretaries, and placement specialists. The counselor aide position also had the added attraction of being useful as a screening position for future counselors.

More secretaries were believed needed because the present agency ratio was only two secretaries to every three counselors and the not infrequent result was that counselors found themselves performing secretarial tasks. Most supervisors felt that a one-to-one ratio rather than the present two-to-three ratio of secretaries to counselors was desirable. The added secretaries would be fully utilized if the central office recommended that counselors delegate as much of their paperwork and intake work as possible to secretaries. Presently, such arrangements enjoyed no such official sanction.

Another expressed need in the human resources area was for more professional personnel to serve agency clients. The most urgent need was for psychiatrists and psychologists, but medical doctors, physical therapists, and social workers were also needed. One supervisor also mentioned that work evaluators were needed in mental hospitals.

Two suggested additions to the central office staff would complete this section on needs in the human resources

area. These additions were a full-time statewide coordinator for special education projects and penal projects and a full-time public relations officer for the agency.

After human resources, the next area of need was for physical facility improvements or expansions.

Halfway houses, sheltered workshops, and better offices were named almost unanimously by the supervisors as needs in the physical facilities category. Halfway houses would house public offenders, the mentally ill, the mentally retarded, and alcoholics while attempting to reintegrate them into society. Sheltered workshops would provide employment opportunities for the severely handicapped.

The need for better located offices with more privacy and with interiors and exteriors of higher physical attractiveness was near universal across the state. Many of the supervisors' offices which the researcher visited were separated from the rest of the facilities in that location only by partial partitions. Such a layout quite probably affected clients' willingness to discuss certain kinds of problems with their counselor. Oklahoma has followed a policy of establishing offices where space was available either free or at nominal costs. This decision undoubtedly affected both staff morale and client service and deserved to be reconsidered.

A need for more testing and evaluation centers of high quality was expressed by some supervisors. Such a

unit was being placed in operation in Oklahoma City at the time this research was being conducted and the Tulsa area personnel felt one was definitely needed in their area.

The next question asked how current monies might be utilized more effectively. Over half the supervisors had no suggestions for better uses for money. They thought full value was being received in return for current expenditures and that the real need was for additional money rather than reallocation of currently appropriated money. A few scattered suggestions were offered in response to this question however.

A listing of these suggestions was as follows:

1. More spending to employ professional consultants particularly psychologists and medical doctors
2. More expenditure on staff training
3. Return to a set fee schedule for compensating persons rendering certain kinds of services to vocational rehabilitation clients
4. Imposition of an economic need criterion on the granting of vocational rehabilitation services.

On the basis of current federal level policies, the supervisors did not expect the last two suggestions to be implemented.

Next, the supervisors were queried about the spending pattern that they would follow if immediately given a sizeable lump of money with only the stiuplation that it be used to contribute to vocational rehabilitation efforts. This question was designed to rank the needs previously expressed in order of priority. Unfortunately the research only obtained rankings from a few supervisors, so a composite ranking was not possible to compute from this data. The next best thing, a distribution compiled on the basis of frequency of mention of items, was presented in Table 4.

The only items in the table not previously discussed were caseload reduction and service expansion and these tied directly to either the employment of more counselors or the more efficient utilization of present counselors.

The scene then shifted from needs in the resources area to needs in the area of service.

Needs

An estimate of the volume of unmet needs for vocational rehabilitation services was requested of the supervisors in this section. They were also asked to disclose the basis for their opinions.

Eight numerical estimates were obtained from the supervisors. These estimates were either expressed in or converted to expression in terms of the degree to which services could be expanded. The average estimate of the

TABLE 4

SPENDING PRIORITIES IN OKLAHOMA

Item	Number of Mentions
Hire more counselors	6
Hire more clerical help	5
More and better offices with more privacy	5
Reduce caseload	3
Expand services	3
Halfway houses	3
Workshops (sheltered and other types)	2
More professional help (psychologists, medical consultant, other)	2
Pay raises for present personnel	1
Testing and evaluation center	1

Source: Supervisor Interview, Question 12.32.

degree to which services could be expanded was forty-six percent. The range of estimates was from twenty percent to one hundred fifty percent with the concentration of estimates at the lower end of the range. The second highest estimate was fifty percent and the average of estimates excluding the highest was thirty-one percent.[3] This expansion of service should take the form of serving new-need

[3]These percentage figures were compiled from the responses to Question 13.1 of the supervisor interview.

groups, shrinking sizes of territories, and expansion of existing special programs into new areas of the state.

The supervisors based their opinions on the degree to which services could be expanded in their unit largely on their own experience and familiarity with needs which were not currently being served.

The supervisors showed a remarkable degree of caution in their estimates of the degree to which services could be expanded. Perhaps this caution resulted from their knowledge of current shortages of personnel and money and from fear of doing an inadequate job if they tried to expand services too fast.

The conclusion of this discussion of needs for services finishes the areas or concepts classified under the planning function. The next function to be considered is the staffing function.

Staffing

Two areas were explored in a rather detailed fashion in connection with the staffing function. These areas were recruitment, selection, and placement and training.

Recruitment, Selection, and Placement

The first question in this section asked the supervisors how they decided where to place a new counselor. Several criteria for making these placements were cited.

The first and most obvious was the existence of a position which was authorized and funded but was unfilled.

Vacant positions result from turnover and program expansion. Program expansion has resulted in the creation of a significant number of new positions in this agency since 1965.

The second major criterion for placing counselors was what might be called need for services. The following variables were cited by the supervisors as indicators of need for services: Caseload size, number of applications for service, number of referrals and population.

The third major criterion used in deciding where to place a new counselor related the accessibility of his territory to the existing pattern of office locations. Since new counselors were normally placed in an existing office, so they may benefit from association with experienced colleagues, the existing office nearest the new counselor's territory was the assignment he drew.

Finally, in establishing a new office, or in choosing among a group of existing offices approximately equal in accessibility to the territory, factors like availability of office space, availability of secretarial time, location of third party agencies, and availability and concentration of physical restoration and training facilities were considered.

The next question asked at what step in the normal chronological progression through recruitment, selection, and placement the supervisors became directly involved. Eleven supervisors checked recruitment while only seven checked selection and placement. This declining progression of numbers was explained by all supervisors' awareness of the need for good personnel and encouragement to recommend them by superiors. The actual selection became enmeshed in the state civil service procedure, and those recruits surviving this screening were then assigned by the central office to a newly created or currently vacant position with the supervisor's approval. Supervisors figured they all sent applicants but had less influence over their selection or placement.

The supervisors were next asked where applicants were secured. The principal part of the supply of applicants for counselors' positions for the Oklahoma agency has been composed of people from the education field. They were former school administrators, teachers, coaches and school counselors. A job specification requiring that applicants for counselor positions hold master's degrees and have some credit hours in the fields of psychology, counseling, and guidance, and tests and measurements limited the supply of qualified people largely to educators. Besides raiding schools, the agency also hired infrequently from its sister state agencies such as welfare and employment,

and it was able to attract an occasional graduate of rehabilitation counselor training programs at Oklahoma State University and elsewhere.

A list of criteria used for selecting counselors from among the applicants was developed from the responses to the next question. The two most frequently mentioned were education and work experience. Others receiving multiple mentions were interest in the field, references, and personal interview data.

The final question in this section elicited suggestions for the improvement of the recruiting process. The supervisors had two ready answers for this question -- namely, to pay better salaries and to employ a full-time recruiting officer at the state office level. In addition to the two above which were accorded the highest frequency of mention, the following suggestions were presented:

1. Publicize vocational rehabilitation more, both from a career standpoint and from a general informational point of view.
2. Lower the job specifications for employment to allow acceptance of bachelor's degree holders with a stipulation for getting a master's degree.
3. Hire more female counselors.
4. Get more pleasing offices for employees to work in.

Three supervisors suggested that little need existed for improving the recruiting process since they see the present system as functioning very well. One supervisor did mention that seven people out of a small school system in south-central Oklahoma where he had once been superintendent were now employed in the agency.

The next step in the staffing process after recruitment, selection, and placement is training.

Training

The first question in this section dealt with what efforts were made to train or develop a new counselor after he arrived on the job. The new counselor arrived in the field quickly after a one-week orientation program in the central office. After this point his training was largely the responsibility of the supervisor and the experienced counselors with whom he worked.

The new counselor was also sent to certain standard workshops. The three phase federal regional training program which attempted to orient him to the vocational rehabilitation effort in three one-week workshops, each dealing with a particular phase of the program, the prosthetics and orthtics workshop, and the mental retardation workshop, were examples. The counselors were sent to these workshops as traineeships became available and as the counselor could be spared from his other duties. This training

program was rounded out by staff conferences, observation, and facilities visits as needs arose or time permitted.

The major burden of this training fell on the supervisor and the experienced counselors in the area where the new man was assigned because of the urgent need to get the new man into the field and have him begin serving client needs.

The next question asked how long a counselor was normally considered a new counselor. The standard answer obtained from all supervisors was that new counselors were considered to be probationary employees until the end of their first year of service. The next question asked the supervisors what proportion of a new counselor's time was spent on training activities during this period. The range of these estimates was a wide five to fifty percent with a mean of 27.2 percent and a median of thirty percent.[4] Production expected of new counselors as compared to experienced counselors was the subject of the next question. The modal estimate on this expected production given by four of the eleven supervisors was fifty percent. This figure represented the low end of the estimates which ranged upward to seventy-five percent. The mean of estimates was sixty percent.[5]

---

[4]Compiled from responses to Supervisor Questionnaire, Question 5.3.

[5]Compiled from responses to Supervisor Questionnaire, Question 5.4.

In the interview, supervisors were asked to evaluate the quality of the in-service training program for new counselors and to make suggestions for improving it. The question was an awkward one because of the limited nature of the current program. Two reasons were offered as explanations for the limited program. First, the current training officer had other responsibilities besides training and he had none of the helpers the supervisors think he needs. Secondly, the recent, fast rate of expansion of the organization combined with normal turnover had made such heavy immediate demands for caseload service that an extended counselor training period did not appear to serve the best interests of the agency.

Specific suggestions for improvement of the training program for new counselors were as follows:

1. Two days a month of in-service training at a central location if time and financing are available.
2. Closer supervision in the initial period of case handling.
3. More and better instruction in the content areas of policies, procedures, and medical terminology.
4. Possible longer period of actual work experience before attending workshops.

5. Possible simulations of different tasks encountered on the job developed, administered, and evaluated as a part of the training program.

The next set of questions shifted to the consideration of training for experienced counselors. The first question asked for a description of any inside training programs for experienced counselors. (An inside training program for purposes of this study is defined as one conducted by personnel from within the agency.) The supervisors' responses indicated that the agency's efforts in this area were extremely limited. A meeting was held by the supervisor of each area each month to keep experienced counselors oriented and informed about any current changes in wording or interpretation of the policies, procedures, rules, or legislation under which the agency operates. More was being done for experienced counselors than was the case in the past, but much more of value could be done if enough training personnel were available in the agency to plan and carry out the program.

Few informative bits of data were gleaned from the supervisors' evaluation of the inside training program because virtually no program existed for them to evaluate. The supervisors did feel that if time and money were available, something could be done in this area. They suggested research to determine training needs, more involvement of counselors in determining training directions, emphasis on

improved productivity as a result of training, and reliance on obtaining outside resource persons for actual conduct of the training sessions.

Outside training for experienced counselors was the next region probed by the research. Such outside training was of two principal types. These were:

1. The regional and national workshops which counselors attend on traineeships, and
2. Independent outside study for credit in a university, usually leading toward a graduate degree.

The nature of the federally financed traineeship program for attending workshops was the same for all states. A certain number of slots or traineeships were alloted to each agency and the agency selected people from its staff to fill them.

The Oklahoma agency's provisions for independent university study allowed for educational leave with full pay for up to three months after a two year period of service and for educational leave with partial pay for up to one academic year after five years of service.

Another provision reimbursed the employee for tuition and books for three to six hours per semester taken while employed full time. These courses must be necessary to meet job specifications for employment or must be

applicable to earning an advanced degree in a field relevant to the employee's vocational rehabilitation employment.

The evaluation of the outside training provisions was approached by asking the supervisors whether these provisions should be continued, dropped or modified. Eight of the eleven supervisors opted for continuation while the remaining three chose modification. Suggested modifications included the following:

1. more training in caseload management
2. allowance, or preferably encouragement, of work toward a doctorate in relevant areas of specialization with partial subsidization. (Doctoral work was not encouraged or subsidized because of fear of loss of personnel if the doctorate was completed.)
3. more and better concentrated workshops with more emphasis on participation, involvement, and information exchange among participants
4. more counselor visits to other states for first hand observation of their operations and facilities (particularly relevant when moving into new areas of client service where others already have experience).

The justification for continuation of the outside training provisions was that the training helps counselors keep current in their field by providing information about

new developments both from the university courses and workshops they attended and from the associations with their colleagues it allowed. Modifications suggested were, of course, offered with a view to improving outside training.

Specialty supervisors commented that they found meager offerings of outside training in areas of specialization. This paucity of offerings was probably attributable both to the newness of some specialties and the limited returns available to training institutions from offering courses because the number of practitioners is small.

Most respondents felt the general quality of outside workshops was high in comparison with those available to employees in other areas of public service, but they also noted wide variations in the quality of the outside programs they had attended. The prosthetics and orthotics course offered by the University of California at Los Angeles was singled out as being particularly outstanding.

The supervisors were also questioned about the preparation for counselors provided in graduate programs for training rehabilitation counselors. First they were asked if they had first hand experience with graudates of these programs. Nine of ten supervisors answered that they had worked with either graduates or interns from an existing counselor preparation program. One supervisor did not answer this question. The nine all had experience with

either graduates or interns from the program at Oklahoma State University. Two of the nine also had experience with persons from another school. The other schools were Texas Technological University and the University of Texas.

On the basis of their experience with graduates and other knowledge, the supervisors were asked to evaluate these counselor preparation programs and suggest ways in which they might be improved. The supervisors generally agreed that the Oklahoma State University rehabilitation counselor training program provided excellent instruction for future counselors. They felt a graduate of this program could become productive faster than a comparable counselor without this training. However, this advantage was cited as being primarily an initial one and counselors hired from other sources were thought to be able to equal their counterparts from this program within the first year of employment.

Possible deficiencies in these programs suggested by the supervisors were:

1. A lack of practical experience in casework.
2. Too great an interest in psychological aspects of the work such as counseling and testing rather than in the total process of providing case services for rehabilitation clients.
3. Limited knowledge of agency policies, procedures, and rules provided to graduates.

The first of these deficiencies could be remedied by building some actual casework experience into the training. Suggestions along these lines were

1. letting trainees work with the student client group at Oklahoma State,
2. letting them work with the Payne County (Stillwater) general caseload, and
3. putting them in the field with an experienced counselor for some period of time before their degree is granted.

The second deficiency labeled the gradeate program counselor trainees as unwilling to deal with the trivia that fill a counselor's day-to-day existence. This problem is a more difficult one with which to deal since the trainee when he graduates finds himself in a seller's market and can choose to specialize or do facilities work.

The third deficiency was recognized by the supervisors as being impossible to correct since a regional program which does not know where its graduates will work cannot realistically train them in the policies, procedures, and rules of a single state.

The next pair of questions, the last ones to be considered under the training concept, asked the supervisors what offerings were available for their own training and development and what they would like to see offered for supervisors that was not currently available.

The offerings mentioned as being strictly for supervisors were the federal level management training programs conducted in Dallas and Denver and the university management training offerings of the University of Oklahoma and Texas Technological University. In addition, supervisors may attend any of the programs offered to counselors and they were beneficiaries of the same reimbursements and educational leave provisions as counselors.

The greatest area of training need felt by the supervisors was for management or supervisory training. Specific suggestions included the following:

1. management training workshops perhaps taught by experienced supervisors and using small group discussions as an instructional method.
2. opportunities to visit other states and observe their operations to get ideas.
3. training in their specialized areas was desired by the penal project supervisor and the supervisor of the alcoholic unit.

The conclusion of this section on training finishes the areas to be considered under the staffing function. The next management function under which some areas were probed was directing.

Directing

Three concepts or areas are grouped under this function. The first of these was communication which was necessary to let people know what was expected of them and to guide their efforts along the correct lines. Since the supervisor's guidance of counselors is covered elsewhere,[6] the research concentrated on the communications linkage between central office and supervisor.

Communications

Supervisors were asked a set of three questions on information: what useful information they received; what useless information they received; and what needed information they did not receive. In the category of useful information three major classes of data were noted by the supervisors: statistical data including the monthly production report; guidelines on changes in policies, procedures, and rules; and information about new programs. The monthly staff newsletter was also mentioned by some respondents as being useful.

In the useless information category, the supervisors gave the generally expected response that they received little useless information. Several did suggest,

---

[6] See for example the questions on control, particularly Questions 6.3 through 6.5 of the supervisor questionnaire and Questions 6.2, 6.3, and 6.6 in the supervisor interview in Appendix one.

however, that they would like to see the various publications they received through the central office, particularly those from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, be subjected to a more thorough screening process before being forwarded to them.

The third category, information needed but not currently received, elicited one overshadowing response. At the time this research was being conducted, the Oklahoma Division of Vocational Rehabilitation was facing a move from the Department of Education to the Department of Public Welfare within the following six months. This transfer was not regarded by the vocational rehabilitation agency personnel as a friendly one, and, consequently, they approached it with much uncertainty and no little apprehension and insecurity.

Specifically, five supervisors wanted more information about what effect the transfer would have on agency operations and personnel. When questioned further, these respondents said they felt this lack of communication on transfer effects was due to lack of knowledge in the central office rather than any reluctance to communicate.

Several supervisors indicated no information needed but not received giving this response the second highest frequency of all answers.

Following these specific questions on various categories of information, the supervisors were asked for a

general evaluation of the quality, adequacy, and timing of the flow of communication within the agency. The overall rating was a lukewarm one. The supervisors' anxiety about what would happen when the transfer took place colored their rating. Several noted that agency morale was at an all-time low because of the unsuccessful effort to prevent the transfer and that communications had suffered as a result of this low morale.

Some of the general comments on communications were as follows:

1. Expansion of the central office staff might reduce the press of other duties on present personnel and allow more attention to communication.
2. Monthly statistical reports were sometimes late.
3. Administration was sometimes slow to take action on some matters referred to them for action. (Two specific examples, a personnel decision and a physical equipment purchase, were cited.) Decentralization of less important decisions was proposed to speed up the process.
4. Indecision and slow communication were noted by one specialty supervisor to characterize his operation. His explanation rested on the cooperative nature of his project and the coordination necessitated by this cooperation.

The section on communications is thus concluded. Supervisors' rewards, considered as a key to motivation, is the next topic of exposition.

Supervisor's Rewards

In this section on supervisor's rewards the research was aimed at determining what made the supervisor's job attractive. The first breakdown in the section was between monetary and non-monetary rewards. Data on current salaries and comparative salary information were sought on the monetary side. On the non-monetary side, opportunity for advancement, recognition, and other non-monetary factors were explored.

The range of supervisory salaries was from $765 to $1,115 per month. The average salary for ten supervisors (One did not divulge his current salary.) was $877 per month. The median and modal salaries of the ten were an identical $855 per month.[7] Three supervisors were paid this amount. Length of service seemed an important variable in determining where a supervisor fell within the salary range.

After the supervisor's current salary had been recorded, he was asked how well he felt he was paid on a comparative basis and what jobs he used for comparison.

---

[7]These figures were computed from the responses to Question 10.1 of the supervisor interview.

The replies to this question made apparent the fact that the current salary structure posed some problems for the agency. Furthermore, this problem would increase in magnitude if current salaries were not increased.

The supervisors were conscious of pressure on their salary schedule from at least three comparative points of view. First, a supervisor does not make much more than a counselor. Indeed, in some cases, because of the influence of the length of service factor on pay, supervisors had counselors who earned more than they did. The supervisors felt that the more important supervisory duties should justify a higher pay differential over counselors than the current salary scale provided.

The second source of unfavorable comparison on salaries was the teaching profession. A favorable differential between the salaries of teachers and vocational rehabilitation personnel had certainly been narrowed and, in many cases, reversed. The supervisors were made aware of this change by increased difficulty in recruiting from the teaching profession and by the publicity attached to legislative actions on teacher pay.

Finally, the agency's personnel were becoming more and more aware of the higher salaries being paid to vocational rehabilitation personnel in other states. Texas was a notable example. A beginning counselor there received

over $9,000 per year while Oklahoma tried to hire people at about $7,000.

Although no mass resignations of supervisors could be expected because better financial opportunities existed elsewhere, they could not help feeling some resentment and dissatisfaction if they considered themselves underpaid by comparison with other similar jobs.[8]

The next pair of questions looked at interest in and opportunities for advancement into a higher level position. Interest seemed to be the major deterrent to a supervisor's advancement into a higher level position. Nine of eleven supervisors interviewed indicated they were not very interested in being promoted. Three indicated they had turned down promotions to state office jobs. Two reasons offered for this attitude were: (1) a reluctance to relocate their families and themselves, and (2) a feeling that the increased pay and perquisites that would accompany a promotion would scarcely compensate for the increased headaches that it would also entail. One supervisor had accepted a promotion to the state office recently and another was working part time until a suitable candidate for the position he was filling in the state office could be found. This lack of desire to advance on the part of supervisors

---

[8] See the discussion of salary in Frederick Herzberg, et al., op. cit., pp. 82-83, for support of this statement.

made it difficult to fill state office positions by promotion from within.

The next question looked at formal and informal recognition received by the supervisors. Oral praise for good work received six mentions and high ratings on semi-annual performance reviews received five mentions in response to this question. Two supervisors mentioned receiving annual salary increments as recognition for good performance. Recognition, either formal and informal, was not a widely used motivating tool in the agency.

The final question in this section on supervisory rewards asked the supervisors to name any other non-monetary factors that made their jobs attractive. Seeing people helped to become self-supporting was indicated as a satisfying factor by seven supervisors. Five supervisors said they appreciated the freedom or autonomy they had in doing their jobs. Three stated they derived much satisfaction from training counselors and seeing them develop. In another frequently mentioned category of response, the supervisors said they liked the environment of their jobs including the agency image, the outside contacts the job provided, and the associations with agency co-workers.

The next section dealt with counselor's rewards. Its purpose was to determine, from the supervisor's perspective, what non-monetary factors about counselors' jobs provided inspiration for performance.

Counselor's Rewards

Three questions were asked in this section. They focused on criteria for promotion, recognition, and other non-monetary factors making the job attractive.

The first question in this section asked for a listing of criteria for determining if and when a counselor will be promoted. The first criterion was, obviously, a vacant higher level position. Evidently existence of openings had not been a problem recently because of expansion in the number of supervisory positions. (The average length of service of supervisors was only three and one half years, and it barely exceeded two years with the longest service supervisor omitted.)[9]

Beyond this obvious criterion, the three criteria which appeared as most important were: (1) being located in the area where the vacancy existed since most people did not want to move, (2) performance in the present job (usually counselor), and (3) the recommendation of the supervisor for whom the candidate for promotion currently worked.

Several other variables were mentioned in response to this question. They included age, length of service, human relations skill, management skill, training skill, and, finally, a willingness to accept the proffered job.

---

[9]These statements are derived from responses to Question 2.4 of the supervisor questionnaire.

One supervisor specifically stated that definite standards or criteria for promotion needed to be established and publicized so counselors who were seeking promotion would know what they could do to achieve it.

The next question was directed toward discovering what kinds of recognition were provided for counselors who were doing exceptional work.

The supervisors mentioned three kinds of recognition they provided for their counselors. They were:

1. Oral praise -- may be given to counselor alone or in a group setting.
2. Written praise -- usually going to counselor himself but sometimes sent to state office.
3. High ratings on semi-annual performance reviews which lead to granting of incremental salary increases.

Some supervisors pointed out that they must also of necessity show their recognition of bad performance, but they indicated that they tried not to overdo it.

The organization provided some formal recognition in the form of a counselor-of-the-year award. Honorable mentions went to the first ten runners-up in this competition. The state office occasionally sent a memorandum of appreciation to a counselor for an outstanding piece of work.

The next question solicited the supervisors' identification of other non-monetary factors making the counselor position attractive. The supervisors definitely felt that the opportunity to provide needed services to needy clients and see the results, often on a fairly immediate basis, was probably the most important non-monetary reward that accrued to a counselor. Running a close second to this fulfillment of a service motive was the freedom, autonomy and self-control that a counselor was able to exercise in doing his job. The only limits on him were the broad ones imposed by agency policies and procedures. These two factors were near universally named.

Other non-monetary factors identified less frequently by the supervisors were the image of the agency, the varied contacts occasioned by the job and the security of the position.

The section on counselor rewards concludes the directing function discussion. Attention then turned to the controlling function, the final one to be explored.

Controlling

Under the controlling function, the concept or area labeled simply as control contained most of the questions.

Control

This section on control contained a total of eleven questions dealing with general control procedures and the time schedule for implementing them, the length of time

during which a new counselor's plans are closely checked, the criteria used for deciding when to relax this close checking process, the frequency of supervisory visits to field offices, the accompaniment of counselors in their field work, reasons for this accompaniment, spending limits, weighting of costs in approving plans, and methods of evaluation of counselor performance and feedback of the results to the counselor.

The first pair of questions asked the supervisors to name and describe the (control) procedures they had established to indicate whether the district's established goals and objectives were being met and to describe the time schedule they followed in implementing these procedures. The most used control procedure reported by supervisors was to check production by reference to the monthly statistical report which showed the number of cases in each status and the change from the previous month in the number of cases in each status. This report was mentioned by nine supervisors.

Among the other control procedures mentioned by the supervisors were periodic (usually monthly) spot-checks of individual case records selected at random from a counselor's files, review of the weekly itineraries all counselors were expected to prepare, consultations with counselors about their special problems and situations, and occasional discussion of the slow-moving cases in a

counselor's caseload. (Data on slow-moving cases were provided periodically from the central office.)

The timing scheme under which these control procedures were implemented was regulated by three factors -- (1) frequency of supervisory visits to field offices in the territory, (2) preparation and distribution of statistical reports showing current numbers and movement of cases by statuses on a monthly basis, and (3) the necessity for keeping books on a total number of closures on an annual basis.

Some supervisors indicated progress toward a counselor's annual closure goal should be checked on a monthly basis to see that he is progressing satisfactorily toward it. Others disagreed, saying the annual closure goal would be exceeded regardless of what the monthly figures were if the counselor simply rendered services to the best of his ability.

The next pair of questions was concerned with the length of time during which a supervisor carefully reviewed a new counselor's plans and the criteria he used in deciding when to relax this careful review. The specified prior approval period for plans of a new counselor in the Oklahoma Agency is one year. Ten supervisors indicated that they checked plans carefully for this one year period. Follow-up questioning in the interview indicated, however, that the time period was not that rigid. The interval of careful

review was seldom less than six months and it might extend for more than two years in exceptional cases.

The general criteria used in deciding when to suspend this careful review were the quality of the casework and plans of the individual counselor. Some of the more specific guidelines used in judging a new counselor's plans and casework were as follows:

1. Eligibility of client for services
2. Feasibility of plan from view of clients' needs and abilities, costs of plan, and chances for successful closure
3. Completeness of diagnosis (including all needed medical and psychological information)
4. Adequacy of case recording including completion of all necessary forms with high quality information
5. Conformity of plan to agency regulations

A second and more subjective set of factors named by the supervisors included promptness of handling cases and referrals, evaluation of the new counselor's judgment, evaluation of the way he planned and used his time, and evaluation of his relationships with clients, co-workers, and the community.

The next question inquired about how frequently the supervisors visited their field offices. Seven supervisors said they tried to visit each field office once a week

while three visited each office at two-week intervals, and one was able to visit only once a month. Since most supervisors had no more than four field offices[10] one or two of which were located in the same city where the supervisor maintained his office, they could visit on a weekly basis with little difficulty. Factors causing more infrequent visits were geographic spread of territory and larger number of offices.

The next trio of questions asked the supervisors whether they accompanied counselors in the field, and, if so, how frequently and for what reasons. Eight of eleven supervisors indicated they did go with their counselors in the field while three indicated they did not.

The most frequent response to the question on frequency of accompaniment stated that no set time interval was followed for this accompaniment. The most popular reasons offered for accompaniment of counselors in the field were counselor request (for consultation on problem cases or situations), evaluation of the counselor, and to familiarize himself with the territory, its make-up, and its special problems.

Those three supervisors who did not accompany counselors said they refrained because they did not wish to

---

[10]Statement based on responses to Question 3.2 of supervisor questionnaire.

undermine the counselor's self-confidence or his relationship with clients or third parties.

The next question asked the supervisor what guidelines he used in reviewing plans of experienced counselors for approval. (Supervisor must approve all plans, but he had to give prior approval before services were authorized for counselors in their first year of service.) The criteria for evaluating plans submitted by experienced counselors were not markedly different from those used to evaluate those of new counselors. The same five criteria -- eligibility, feasibility, completed diagnosis, complete and adequate recording, and conformity to agency rules and regulations -- discussed in some detail previously,[11] are used to evaluate an experienced counselor's plans.

The next question asked how much money a supervisor could authorize for spending on an individual case. The finding was that no dollar limit on authorization for spending on an individual case existed for supervisors. Estimates of most expensive cases in their experience from the supervisors ranged from $1,500-$2,000 to over $18,000.[12] Counselors in Oklahoma must have prior supervisory approval

---

[11]These criteria are discussed in connection with Question 6.1 of the supervisor interview on page 102.

[12]Figures derived from responses to Question 6.4 of the supervisor interview.

for expenditures of $4,000 or more on an individual case. Most supervisors indicated they would consult superiors before beginning a plan of services on any case which promised to be particularly expensive.

The weighting of comparative costs in the approval process was the subject of the next question. The standard answer to this question, offered without qualification by four supervisors and with qualification by six others, said the need for services and the probability of successful vocational rehabilitation (closure) rather than the cost were the governing factors in approval of plans.

Money has not been a problem because counselors managed their caseloads in such a way that they did not serve needs or seek referrals beyond the limits of their resources. This picture was beginning to change as more awareness of the services that vocational rehabilitation can provide developed among referral sources, the general population, and the handicapped themselves. This change was being further accelerated by relentless pressure from the national level to expand services. This pressure forced the agency into working with more difficult cases which were usually more expensive also.

The six supervisors who gave qualified answers on the weighting of costs in approval of cases emphasized that money often gets tight at the end of a fiscal year. Even under these circumstances, however, need would still be

more important than dollars in approval. Training cases in process, clients with deteriorating conditions, and clients who can be quickly placed in (or returned to) an available job received top priority among approvals.

The final question in the control section concerned itself with the appraisal of counselors and the feedback of the results of this appraisal to the counselors. The three principal methods for measuring counselor performance described by the supervisors were:

1. The semi-annual performance rating accompanied by form VR-A-10
2. The annual case review accompanied by form VR-C-55[13]
3. The impressions gained from normal supervisory interaction with the counselor's other contacts in the community and from observing the counselor's paperwork and case recording.

Several relevant comments on these three methods were offered. First, the supervisors regarded the third of these methods as being the most important. They considered this day-to-day interaction to be the best way to strengthen performance of counselors in areas where it was marginal or unsatisfactory. The case review and performance appraisal were seen more as inventories of the results of

---

[13]Copies of forms VR-A-10 and VR-C-55 referred to above are included in Appendix III.

the development process.

Second, several supervisors criticized the form of the performance rating device. Specifically they disliked the form because it called for a rating without any narrative explanation on the rating form as to how that rating was derived. They also disliked the use of a numerical rating scale saying they found it difficult to justify differences in these numerical ratings to the affected employees.

Some supervisors also complained that too many performance evaluation documents were required too frequently. One supervisor cogently stated: "People just do not change that fast."

The feedback procedure described by the supervisors involved sitting down with the counselors and discussing the evaluation, emphasizing the areas of current strength and weakness in an individual's performance. The whole trick here was to concentrate on improving future performance rather than evoking defensive behavior on the part of subordinates by berating them for past mistakes.

Some supervisors noted that they allowed counselors to rate themselves. Then, the supervisor went over the self-ratings with the counselor, with the supervisor making those changes he felt were appropriate. Those supervisors following this procedure said they often found themselves upgrading more of these self-ratings than they downgraded.

However, it was usually the marginal performer rather than the good one who needed to be downgraded.

The analysis of the responses to this question completed the control section. The next area explored was caseloads.

Caseload

Three questions were asked about caseload. The first concerned the average size of a counselor's caseload in the particular supervisory district. Supervisors could either estimate the average caseload size or they could obtain the exact figures from their latest production report. Five supervisors gave estimates while five others quoted figures from the reports. The remaining supervisor gave both estimated and actual figures. The second question in this section asked how the supervisors felt about this average caseload size and their answers sometimes included an ideal caseload size. These data were summarized in Table 5.

Several comments about the data in Table 5 seemed in order. Summing the figures in column 1 of Table 5 yields 2,033 average active cases for the eleven supervisory districts or an overall average of 185 active cases per counselor in each of the eleven supervisory districts. This figure was twenty cases lower than the 205 active case average for the state shown by the March, 1968, production

TABLE 5

ACTUAL AND IDEAL SIZES OF COUNSELOR'S CASELOADS BY SUPERVISORY DISTRICT

Average Active Cases	Ideal Caseload Size
300[1]	200
209	209
202	150
200[1]	---
192	---
179	150
176	---
175[1]	175
150[1]	150
150[1,2]	100
100[1,3]	50

[1] - estimated rather than actual figures

[2] - special education supervisor

[3] - penal project supervisor

Source: Supervisor interview, Questions 2.1 and 2.2.

report. This finding was surprising since two supervisors indicated that the average figures on active cases from the production report tended to be understated due to the influence of small caseloads handled by new counselors or specialty counselors.

The two specialty supervisors, one in penal projects and the other in special education, did show estimates which were on the low end of the range of estimates in Table 5. These low estimates were an indicator of the difficulty of the cases with which their counselors worked.

Turning to the second question of this section which inquired how supervisors felt about the average caseload size, the results showed that eight supervisors felt current caseloads were too large while three supervisors felt current caseload sizes were about right. No supervisor felt current caseload sizes should be larger.

Average closure estimates per counselor by districts were not obtained from the supervisors because the research period did not include the end of a fiscal year. However, the state did close 3,815 cases in the fiscal year from July 1, 1967, to June 30, 1968, with about 100 counselors.[14] Dividing the 3,815 figure by 100 yields 38.15 closures per counselor for a statewide average. This figure approximated fairly closely the generally accepted goal of 50 closures per counselor if some allowance was made for the smaller number of closures expected of new counselors and specialty counselors.

The final question in this section asked the supervisors how they thought the counselors felt about the

---

[14]This figure was obtained from a summary of the responses to Question 8.1 of the supervisor questionnaire.

average caseload size. Seven supervisors reported they thought counselors felt current caseload sizes were too large. The basis for this feeling was that better service could be rendered if a counselor did not have so many cases to handle. The other four supervisors said they thought their counselors felt the current caseload sizes were about right. Their reasoning was that plan and closure goals would be harder to meet without rushing clients through the rehabilitation process if caseloads were smaller. This exposition concludes the caseload section. A discussion of the control implications of the budgeting process follows.

Budget

The budget must be regarded as a control as well as a planning device. In the Oklahoma agency, however, the control exercised was largely self-control since the counselor was allocated a budget on the basis of his closure goal at the beginning of the year.[15] The only other control exercised over this allocation of money was a sequential release provision which allowed a counselor to draw fifty percent of his budget allocation over the first four months of the fiscal year, thirty-five percent over months five through nine of the fiscal year, and the remaining fifteen percent over months nine through twelve, the last three

---

[15]The budget allocation process is explained in detail on page 62.

months of the fiscal year. Sequential release prevented a counselor from running completely out of money very early in the year.

With the comments on budgeting in reference to the controlling function thus concluded, decision level and review as it relates to the controlling function will now be considered.

Decision Level and Review

Decision level and review relates to the controlling function by giving an indication of the degree of decentralization of authority. Obviously close control can be maintained by minimizing decentralization and delegation of authority. The findings in the Oklahoma Division of Vocational Rehabilitation were that most decisions were made at the counselor level and were seldom individually reviewed at a level higher than that of supervisor except in very exceptional cases. Even when this review occurred, it usually came in response to a request for it from a lower level. The degree of decentralization of decision making appeared high in this organization.

Decision level and review is the last area to be considered under the controlling function and the finish of the controlling function brings the end of Chapter III. A summary of this chapter follows.

Summary

Chapter III has analyzed management practices in the Oklahoma Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

The organization had four levels with staff services concentrated in the central office. Paperwork and training of their staff were the most time consuming supervisory activities. Counseling and paperwork occupied the most counselor time. Span of management averaged about nine counselors per supervisor, while eight counselors were indicated as the ideal number. Most decisions on casework were made at lower organization levels. Caseloads were developed mostly along geographic lines although some specialty counselors were found.

Sources of innovations were state program planning personnel, field personnel and community interest groups. Budgets were allocated to individual counselors with funds released sequentially. Resource needs were voiced for more counselors and support personnel, particularly secretaries, for better offices, halfway houses, and sheltered workshops. Service expansion of about thirty percent seemed possible to the supervisors.

Recruiting problems centered on relatively low pay while training was largely the responsibility of supervisor and experienced counselor after the recruit was on the job.

Communication questions disclosed high anxiety about the agency transfer from Department of Education to

Department of Welfare in a generally adequate communication system. Supervisors and counselors were gratified by client progress toward self sufficiency and both appreciated the autonomy their jobs afforded.

Control procedures were largely confined to production controls. Caseloads averaged 205 cases per counselor statewide and were thought to be too large by most, but not all, counselors and supervisors.

As a result of experience from this pilot study, certain rearrangements, additions and corrections to the supervisor interview were made before additional data were collected in other states. No changes were made in the supervisor questionnaire.

Chapter IV will report the findings from the areas related to the organizing function of management for the remaining three states in which data were collected. These states were Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.

CHAPTER IV

THE ORGANIZING FUNCTION IN ARKANSAS LOUISIANA AND TEXAS

Introduction

Five areas will be considered in connecting with the organizing function. They are (1) organization structure, (2) activities and proportion of time, (3) span of management, (4) decision level and review, and (5) caseload.

Organization Structure

Supervisors were first asked to draw a small chart of that part of the organization structure with which they had direct connections. Then they were asked how this structure helped or hindered them in carrying out their duties and what changes, if any, they would recommend in the structure.

Arkansas

The Arkansas Rehabilitation Service had three basic levels--state office, supervisory, and counselor. However, the hierarchial chain-of-command had five positions--counselor, area supervisor, field services supervisor,

assistant director, and director. The typical line and staff kind of arrangement with staff services concentrated at the state office level was also found.

The supervisors in Arkansas generally agreed that the present organizational structure was helpful to them. Two minor complaints expressed typical line-staff conflicts. One supervisor was concerned about whom he should approach with his personnel problems--his superior or the staff specialist in personnel--while another was concerned about central office staff people not going through him in dealing with his counselors.

One major problem came to light with regard to the specialty supervisor dealing with alcoholics. A policy difference with regard to staffing an alcoholic rehabilitation program became evident. The supervisor wanted a job specification for alcoholic counselors stating that they must be arrested alcoholics. This view was not generally shared among other agency personnel. This sort of difference in staffing philosophy is evidently a common occurrence in connection with alcoholic rehabilitation efforts. What little evidence was available in this state indicated that this supervisor's approach of using arrested alcoholics like himself to rehabilitate other alcoholics was relatively more successful than other approaches. However, new approaches should not be foreclosed and the danger of substantial political consequences arising from

a regression of an arrested alcoholic employee should be recognized.

Only two structural changes were recommended by the eight supervisors interviewed in Arkansas. One supervisor wanted the geographic size of the territory of one of his counselors in a sparsely populated area of the state reduced to allow provision of better services. The alcoholics supervisor previously mentioned wanted statewide control of the alcoholic program placed under an alcoholic specialist (preferably one agreeing with his own and Alcoholics Anonymous' philosophy of alcoholic rehabilitation) rather than under the supervisor for facility services where he was currently located.

Louisiana

In Louisiana, four of a total of six supervisors were interviewed. The remaining two supervisors had just begun their annual two-week vacation when the interviewer visited their state. Louisiana did not have as many supervisory positions as either Arkansas or Oklahoma, although this smaller number of supervisors was compensated for by having an assistant supervisor position between supervisor and counselor levels. The Louisiana Division of Vocational Rehabilitation was located in the Louisiana Department of Education as was typical for most state agencies.

One difference was observed among the organization charts drawn by the interviewed supervisors. Two of

the four included the position of assistant administrator for general rehabilitation services between the supervisor position and that of the state administrator for vocational rehabilitation. This position certainly existed, but the failure of half of the interviewed supervisors to include it in the scalar chain implied that it was often bypassed in communication and decision making.

Another structural difference observed in Louisiana was the prominent mention of the state Superintendent of Education in the hierarchy of the rehabilitation agency. Evidently he took a much stronger interest in vocational rehabilitation affairs than people in comparable relationships in other states usually did.

The Louisiana Vocational Rehabilitation Agency showed six positions in the hierarchy described by the supervisors. They were counselor, assistant supervisor, supervisor, assistant administrator, administrator, and state Superintendent of Education.

The structural picture in Louisiana indicated relatively more specialization of services than the other states. All four supervisors interviewed reacted favorably to the present structural configuration. Suggestions for changes in the present structure included a suggestion for the creation of additional supervisory districts by subdivision of the present four districts and additions to staff particularly in specialist categories. Also, one

respondent suggested that perhaps the present structure was too flexible and that a more rigidly defined set of job duties and responsibilities and a clearer chain of command might aid him.

Texas

The Texas Agency had just experienced a major structural change when this research was conducted. This change involved the insertion of an additional level of management between the supervisors and the state director. The state was divided into five regions with a regional director reporting to the state director appointed for each region.

Vocational Rehabilitation in Texas was a division of the Texas Education Agency. The positions listed in the hierarchy developed by the supervisors were counselor, supervising counselor, supervisor, regional director, state director, assistant commissioner of education for rehabilitation and special education, and state commissioner of education. The number of field offices shown varied from three to nine and the mix of general and specialized offices ranged from all general to all specialized offices.

The question asking how the structure helped or hindered the supervisors in doing the organization's job drew a divided response. The dichotomy of responses was directional with some respondents looking at the structure

below their positions and others looking above. Four of the seven supervisors made favorable comments about the new regional design. The essence of these comments was that the regional division increased administrative accessibility and accelerated the decision process. The need for this additional level of management had become apparent as the organization expanded in size. The significant downward directed comments focused on the number and dispersion of offices and people a supervisor must direct.

Recommendations for structural changes (or additions) included a liberalization of the present two-to-one ratio of counselors to secretaries, creation of a research and advisory staff department at the state level, addition of more counselors so sizes of territories could be reduced, addition of supervisors to reduce size of supervisory districts, and better implementation of the position of supervising counselor to take advantage of the experience of senior counselors and reduce supervisory burden.

This concept of organization structure has now been discussed. The next area to be considered concerns activities and proportion of time.

Activities and Proportion of Time

The two basic parts of this section deal with supervisory activities and time alloted to them and with supervisory perceptions of counselor activities and the

time alloted to them. Supervisors were asked to estimate the proportion of their total time they spent on each category of activities in a representative list of supervisory activities. Then they were asked for their change recommendations on either activities performed or amounts of time allocated to particular activities and, finally, they were requested to specify the activity categories they particularly liked and disliked.

The second major portion of the section queried the supervisors on the proportion of counselor time on each category of a representative list of counselor activities and then asked for their change recommendations on counselor activities or time allocations.

Arkansas

Unfortunately the Arkansas supervisors were queried before the representative lists of activities were added to the interview instrument. The responses of the Arkansas supervisors to the question on supervisory activities and proportion of time allocated to them were summarized in the following table.

The wide range of estimates in some categories was probably due in part to differences in names and numbers of categories listed by the various supervisors. Notable omissions from the activities named by Arkansas supervisors were planning and evaluation.

Recommendations for changes in format of activities

TABLE 1

ACTIVITIES, AVERAGE PROPORTION OF TIME RANGE OF TIME ESTIMATES AND NUMBER OF MENTIONS AMONG SUPERVISORS IN ARKANSAS

Activity	Average Proportion of Time (Percent)	Range of Time Estimates (Percent)	No. of Estimates[1]
Consulting Counselors	23.33	15-45	6
Office Management	20.00	-0-	4
Training Staff	20.00	5-40	4
Review Plans & Closures	19.00	5-40	5
Travel	13.75	5-20	6
Paperwork	13.57	10-25	7
Training and Orientation of supervisor himself	10.00	5-15	5
Public Relations	5.80	1-10	5

[1]The maximum possible number of estimates is seven since one supervisor did not answer this question.

[2]All estimates were the same.

Source: Supervisor interview, Question 9.1.

or time allocated to various activities were as follows:

1. Three supervisors said they wished less of their time was consumed in travel;
2. Three supervisors wanted to be able to spend more time on consultation with and development of their personnel, particularly their counselors;
3. Two supervisors wanted to spend less time in group meetings; and
4. One supervisor desired to spend less time on paperwork.

These recommendations appeared to be offered in an idealistic sense, since the supervisors felt it was largely beyond their control within the present constraints of the job to implement these changes.

Among the activity areas of their jobs liked by the Arkansas supervisors, seeing their personnel increase their job competence partly through the supervisor's training and development efforts received the highest number of mentions with five. Four mentions were accorded to consultation with counselors about problem cases. Three supervisors said they liked all areas of their jobs. Two supervisors said they enjoyed public relations efforts which allowed them to spread the vocational rehabilitation message. Shift from the direct helping role to the role of teaching others to perform it well was the essence of the first of

these areas while staying close to the actual helping action was behind the interest in the consultation and case review areas.

Three generalized areas and two specific or specialized areas of complaint were named by the supervisors in response to the question on parts of their jobs they disliked. The three generalized areas were: (1) discipline or correction of wayward subordinates with three mentions, (2) travel with two mentions, and (3) paperwork with a single mention. The specialized complaints each had only a single mention. The specialty supervisor working with alcoholics reiterated that he spent a great deal of time explaining his program to his superiors. Another supervisor was charged with the collection of National Rehabilitation Association dues from his coworkers in the agency and he found this task distasteful.

Counselors

The comprehensive list of counselor activities was also absent from the interview instrument when the Arkansas data was collected. The results of what Arkansas supervisors said about their counselor's activities and allocations of time were summarized in the following table. The supervisors in Arkansas only conceptualized the four major activity areas named for counselor activities. Included in the client work category were counseling, placement, follow up, and arranging for services. The

TABLE 2

ACTIVITIES, AVERAGE PROPORTION OF TIME, AND RANGE OF TIME ESTIMATES FOR COUNSELORS IN ARKANSAS

Activity[1]	Average Proportion of Time (Percent)	Range of Time Estimates (Percent)
Client Work	37.81	25-70
Paperwork	35.81	10-50
Public Relations	7.71	1-15
Travel	11.79	10-20

[1]Because activity categories are extremely broad, either 7 or 8 of a possible 8 estimates were obtained for each category.

Source: Supervisor interview, Question 9.5.

paperwork category included writing plans, case recording, reports, and correspondence. Four of the eight supervisors estimated that at as much as half of the counselors time is absorbed by paperwork. Travel took slightly over a tenth and public relations activities somewhat less.

Four supervisors recommended no changes in either activities performed by counselors or time devoted to their performance. This view was occasioned by the perceived realities of the situation. The other four said they would like to see the amount of time counselors spend on paperwork reduced. One suggestion for reducing this paperwork time was increased use of dictating equipment. The supervisors thought that any time saved on paperwork could be used profitably on client work, especially counseling. Other suggestions were for better planning of time use and increased time on placement and follow-up.

Louisiana

The activities performed and the proportion of time devoted to them by the Louisiana supervisors were as shown in Table 3. The only surprising activity category among those with high rankings was public relations. Perhaps more importance was placed on public relations activities by Louisiana supervisors than by those supervisors in the states previously mentioned.

No important specific changes were recommended in the activities performed or the time allocated to them.

TABLE 3

ACTIVITIES, AVERAGE PROPORTION OF TIME, AND RANGE OF TIME ESTIMATES AMONG SUPERVISORS[1] IN LOUISIANA

Activity	Average Proportion of Time (Percent)	Range of Time Estimates (Percent)
Training their staff	19.00	12-30
Public Relations	15.00	10-25
Evaluation of their staff	13.33	5-25
Consultation with Counselors	11.67	5-20
Travel	9.67	5-12
Training and continuing orientation for supervisors	8.33	5-10
Review of plans and approval of closures	8.33	5-10
Correspondence	6.67	4-10
Planning	5.33	1-10
Paperwork[2]	16.83	12.5-20

[1]The number of responses was three since one respondent spent most of his time on counseling.

[2]Paperwork was considered as a separate category and included all paper processed in connection with other activities.

Source: Supervisor interview, Question 9.1.

One supervisor did say that he would like to handle fewer phone calls. The two assistant supervisors interviewed both specifically stated that they would like to drop their current caseloads and spend their full time on their supervisory responsibilities. On its face this last change appeared to be a highly desirable one since Louisiana had fewer supervisors than other states, and dual jobs are seldom desirable if they can be avoided.

The question on activities liked by the supervisors showed two supervisors who said they liked the whole job. In a more specific vein, three supervisors said they like field work and interaction with counselors best among all the activities they performed. Single mentions were accorded to staff meetings and training and development activities.

The question which asked supervisors to pinpoint the activities performed in connection with their jobs that they disliked showed a surprising unanimity of response. Three supervisors of the four said the review of case records was the part of their job they liked least because this activity did not allow any interpersonal interactions. The remaining supervisor did not mention any specific dislike.

Counselors

The activities performed by counselors and the proportion of time spent on each activity were as shown

in Table 4. Paperwork was shown to be the most significant single category. The more detailed breakdown of activities provided by the list reduced the proportions of time allocated to particular categories of activities. Placement centered activity showed up as a noticeable omission from the activities list.

TABLE 4

ACTIVITIES, AVERAGE PROPORTION OF TIME, AND RANGE OF TIME ESTIMATES FOR COUNSELORS[1] IN LOUISIANA

Activity	Average Proportion of Time (Percent)	Range of Time Estimates (Percent)
Intake Work	16.25	5-40
Counseling	16.25	5-25
Determining Eligibility	9.75	4-15
Follow-up	9.50	5-15
Travel	8.75	5-10
Planning	5.75	2-10
Arranging for Services	5.25	5-6
Inservice Training	5.00	4-6
Closure	4.50	3-5
Writing Plans	4.25	3-6
Staff Meetings	4.25	2-5
Public Relations	4.00	3-5
Other (placement)	6.00	2-10
Paperwork[2]	26.25	10-50

[1]Responses were obtained from four supervisors two of whom also carried caseloads.

[2]Paperwork was considered as a separate category encompassing the paperwork portions of all other activities.

Source: Supervisor interview, Question 9.5

A change in activities or proportion of time allocated to them suggested by three supervisors was for more and better planning of their activities by counselors to utilize their time more effectively. Another supervisor thought it desirable for counselors to spend more time on public relations and promotional activities.

Texas

The seven supervisors covered by the research in Texas allocated their time among the various activities covered by the standardized list as shown in the following table. The wide range of time estimates was possibly explained in part by the inclusion of three specialty supervisors in the sample of seven. Public relations showed a conspicuously high ranking in proportion of time among the activities.

The following changes in time allocations were recommended by the Texas supervisors:

1. Less travel if possible--mentioned by two supervisors;
2. More time on training of counselors and other staff to reduce "fire fighting"--mentioned by two supervisors;
3. Less paperwork if possible;
4. More time for consulting with counselors.

Training and development of staff, particularly new counselors, with four responses and consultation with

TABLE 5

ACTIVITIES, AVERAGE PROPORTION OF TIME, AND RANGE OF TIME ESTIMATES AMONG SUPERVISORS[1] IN TEXAS

Activity	Average Proportion of Time (Percent)	Range of Time Estimates (Percent)
Consulting Counselors	23.86	5-50
Training Staff	15.71	3-40
Public Relations	10.71	3-26
Planning	10.00	5-20
Review Plans and approve closure	8.14	3-15
Training and continuing orientation for supervisor	7.00	2-15
Evaluation	6.86	1-15
Travel	5.86	2-15
Correspondence	5.57	5-10
Paperwork[2]	21.07	10-30

[1]Seven supervisors served as subjects for the research in Texas.

[2]Paperwork portions of all other activities were summed for this category to get an estimate of total paperwork.

Source: Supervisor interview, Question 9.1.

counselors about cases or other problems with three responses headed the list of activities liked or enjoyed by the supervisors. Public relations received two mentions and planning was a surprise item which also had two mentions among the seven supervisors. Finally, one supervisor noted that he found it quite rewarding to be able to pursue difficult personnel problems to a successful conclusion.

Reviewing case folders and records was the single disliked activity with more than one mention. Paperwork, a related activity, was mentioned by another supervisor. The handling of vendor and other complaints about late payments and attempts to reconcile misunderstandings between counselors and clients were other activities disliked. Another supervisor said he disliked having to do things which interfered with the performance of his primary supervisory duties. He referred to his writing of that portion of the statewide plan covering his region as an example of such an activity. The supervisor's perceptions of activities performed and time allocated to them by their counselors were the subject of the next section.

Counselors

The average proportion of time the Texas supervisors thought their counselors allocated to the various activities of the representative list of counselor activities was as shown in the following table.

The estimate of paperwork showed it to be the most time-consuming single activity. An estimate of zero time on planning by counselors came from one supervisor.

The Texas supervisors were unanimous in their agreement that more time should be spent on counseling while five supervisors said the best place to find this time was a reduction in the time spent on paperwork.

TABLE 6

ACTIVITIES, AVERAGE PROPORTION OF TIME ALLOCATED, AND RANGE OF TIME ESTIMATES AMONG COUNSELORS[1] IN TEXAS

Activity	Average Proportion of Time (Percent)	Range of Time Estimates (Percent)
Counseling Clients	16.14	4-24
Determining Eligibility	13.14	5-28
Follow-up	11.00	2-20
Intake	10.00	5-18
Writing Plans	8.14	2-18
Arranging for Services	6.57	2-15
Travel	5.43	1-10
Staff Meetings	5.43	2-10
Planning	5.14	0-15
Closure	4.57	1-10
Inservice Training	4.43	1-10
Public Relations	3.57	1- 5
Other (placement)	5.57	3- 8
Paperwork[2]	32.14	20-50

[1]Data from seven supervisors about the activities and time allocations of their counselors were collected.

[2]This paperwork estimate was solicited separately and was explained as including the paperwork portions of all other activities performed by counselors.

Source: Supervisor interview, Question 9.5.

Three supervisors also mentioned the desirability of counselors spending more of their time on planning. Suggestions for releasing time from paperwork were hiring of more well-qualified secretaries and other kinds of support personnel such as rehabilitation technicians and counselor aides.

All the data on activities and portion of time have been presented. The next section explored the span of management concept.

Span of Management

The section on span of management asked four questions. The first two of these questions asked the supervisors in the selected state agencies how many counselors they currently supervised and how many they would supervise under ideal circumstances. The responses to these two questions were summarized in Table 7. The differences in response frequencies on the actual and ideal questions were due to failures to respond to the ideal question.

The ideal average was higher than the actual average only for the Arkansas data which showed the lowest of the actual average figures. The actual figure was highest for the Louisiana agency and lowest for Arkansas. The range for both the actual and ideal figures was highest in Louisiana. A possible explanation was that both supervisors and assistant supervisors were interviewed with some consequent double counting of counselors.

The third of the four questions asked the supervisors why they considered the ideal number they chose to be desirable. The responses split in two ways. Those six supervisors who chose an ideal number greater than the actual number of counselors they currently supervised justified their choice on the basis of providing better

TABLE 7

ACTUAL AND IDEAL SPAN OF MANAGEMENT
IN ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, AND TEXAS

Response Category	Arkansas	Louisiana	Texas
Average Number of Counselors currently supervised	8.50	16.67	13.00
Number of Responses	8	6	7
Range of Responses	2-14	8-27	9-15
Counselors Ideally Supervised	9.67	14.50	10.00
Number of Responses	6	4	6
Range of Responses	7-12	8-30	8-12

Source: supervisor questionnaire, Questions 8.1 and 8.2.

service to clients in the territory. Those eight supervisors who chose an ideal number less than the actual number they currently supervised felt they could give better supervision if they had fewer counselors to handle.

The fourth and final question in this section on span of management asked the supervisors how a change in the mix of specialized and general counselors would affect the number of people they should supervise and why. This question was asked because a trend toward more specialization among counselors is evident in the field. The responses to this question were summarized in Table 8.

TABLE 8

EFFECT OF CHANGE IN MIX OF SPECIALTY AND GENERALIZED COUNSELORS ON SPAN OF MANAGEMENT IN ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, AND TEXAS

Effect of Change in Mix on Span of Management	Arkansas	Louisiana	Texas	Total
Raise it	0	3	1	4
Leave it unchanged	5	1	1	7
Lower it	3	2	5	9

Source: Supervisor questionnaire, Question 8.4.

Those supervisors saying the span should be lowered if the specialty-general mix changed were a clear majority only in Texas. They chose this answer because they felt that specialized counselors were more difficult to supervise than general ones. The next most popular choice said a change in the specialty-general counselor mix should leave the span of management unchanged. The general reason behind this choice was that most supervisors already had some mix of specialty and generalized counselors and that small gradual shifts in the mix would not affect the supervisors that much. Those supervisors who indicated a change in the mix would raise their span of management were thinking simply of the addition of new counselors of either a specialty or generalized nature which would, of course, raise the span of management.

This discussion concluded the consideration of the span of management concept. The next area explored was decision level and review.

Level of Decision and Review

This area, level of decision and review, contained four major sections. The first of these sections indicated the level at which certain decisions were normally made. A summary of the responses for the three states was as presented in the following table.

These results showed that decisions in all three states were made at the counselor level. This finding replicated what was found in the Oklahoma Agency and it undoubtedly accelerated the process of decision making.

The second section of the decision level and review area asked the supervisors to indicate if certain factors pertaining to a particular case would cause decisions about that case to be made at a higher level in the agencies. In other words, did the principle of exception operate in these agencies and were decisions in exceptional cases rendered at higher agency levels? The answers to this question were summarized in Table 10.

The highest aggregate response frequency (14) came on the experience level of counselor item reflecting the supervisors' concern with probationary counselors (normally those in their first year of service).

TABLE 9

LEVEL OF DECISION IN ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, AND TEXAS

Decision Item	Level of Decision	Arkansas	Louisiana	Texas	Total
Acceptance of Client	Counselor	8	6	7	21
	District Supervisor	0	0	0	0
	Central Office	0	0	0	0
Formulation of Case Plan	Counselor	8	6	7	21
	District Supervisor	0	2	0	2
	Central Office	0	0	0	0
Commitment of Funds for Diagnosis, Physical Restoration, and Treatment	Counselor	8	6	7	21
	District Supervisor	0	2	0	2
	Central Office	1	0	0	1
Closure	Counselor	8	6	6	20
	District Supervisor	0	2	1	3
	Central Office	0	0	0	0

Source: Supervisor questionnaire, Question 7.1.

TABLE 10

FACTORS CAUSING LEVEL OF DECISION TO BE RAISED IN ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, AND TEXAS

Factor	Arkansas	Louisiana	Texas	Total
Difficulty of the Case	3	3	4	10
Cost of Case	6	2	4	12
Money for services or training to be spent out of state	1	1	7	9
Experience level of Counselor	5	4	5	14
None indicated	2	1	0	3
Maximum possible response frequency	8	6	7	21

Source: Supervisor questionnaire, Question, 7.2.

The only unanimous choice among the individual state selections came in Texas on the item concerning out-of-state expenditures. The lowest response frequencies were on the same item, out-of-state expenditures, in Arkansas and Louisiana which apparently did not have the strong questions about such expenditures found in Texas.

The third portion of the decision level and review area was directed toward ascertaining the organization level at which those same decisions made in section one of this area were reviewed. Table 11 summarized the results obtained in this section.

These responses reaffirmed that the counselor is the most important person involved in making and reviewing decisions affecting clients. The supervisor was indicated as the reviewing agent almost as often as the counselor, but the central office was excluded from listing as a reviewing agent except in Arkansas.

Final consideration in the decision level and review area returned to the same factors considered in section two on raising the level of decision and inquired which of these factors might cause the review level to be raised. The summary of the responses to this question was presented in Table 12. High frequencies appeared in Arkansas and Louisiana on difficulty of case, in Arkansas and Texas on cost of case, in Texas on out-of-state expenditures and in Louisiana on experience level of counselor. Low frequencies were observed in Arkansas on out-of-state

TABLE 11

LEVEL OF REVIEW OF DECISIONS IN ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, AND TEXAS

Decision Item	Level of Review	Arkansas	Louisiana	Texas	Total
Acceptance of Client	Counselor Decision (normally not reviewed)	4	4	5	13
	District Supervisor	4	2	0	8
	Central Office	2	0	0	2
	No Answer	1	0	0	1
Formulation of Case Plan	Counselor Decision (not normally reviewed)	3	4	4	11
	District Supervisor	4	3	3	10
	Central Office	2	0	0	2
	No Answer	1	0	0	1
Commitment of Funds for Diagnosis, Physical Restoration, and Training	Counselor Decision (not normally reviewed)	3	5	4	12
	District Supervisor	4	1	3	8
	Central Office	2	0	0	2
	No Answer	1	0	0	1
Closure	Counselor Decision (normally not reviewed)	3	4	4	11
	District Supervisor	4	3	3	10
	Central Office	3	0	0	3
	No Answer	1	0	0	1
Maximum Possible Response Frequency	----------	8	6	7	21

Source: Supervisor Questionnaire, Question 7.3.

TABLE 12

FACTORS CAUSING THE LEVEL OF REVIEW OF DECISIONS TO BE RAISED IN ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, AND TEXAS

Factor	Arkansas	Louisiana	Texas	Total
Difficulty of case	4	4	2	10
Cost of case	5	1	4	10
Money for Services or training to be spent out of state	1	1	4	6
Experience level of counselor	3	4	2	9
None indicated	2	1	0	3
Maximum possible response frequency	8	6	7	21

Source: Supervisor Questionnaire, Question 7.4.

expenditures and in Louisiana on cost of case and out-of-state expenditures. Overall totals showed difficulty of case and cost of case with the most mentions and experience level of counselor running a close second. Exposition on this question finishes the decision level and review concept. The next concept, the final one treated in this chapter, was caseload.

Caseload

Caseload information was accorded only the briefest treatment under the organizing function. From the caseload data, certain inferences about the organizing concept of departmentation could be drawn and these inferences were the subject of the current attention. Caseload information was treated in more detail later in the chapter on the controlling function.

Arkansas

Departmentation in Arkansas followed the traditional territorial pattern for all supervisors except the alcoholic specialist who used customer departmentation in serving his specialized client group. Below the supervisory level some specialization along customer and enterprise functional lines was beginning to creep into the individual supervisor's operation but it had not proceeded too far.

Louisiana

Of the six supervisors in Louisiana, five had more specialized field offices than general ones. The mean ratio of specialized to general field offices was 5-1/3 to 2-1/3.[1] The conclusion which followed from this analysis was that five of Louisiana's six supervisors could be considered as having departmentalized largely along customer lines. Certainly the process of customer specialization has proceeded farther than in Arkansas.

Texas

Texas seemed to be following the trend toward more specialization and, therefore, customer departmentation at the supervisory level and below. The trend was particularly evident in the Dallas and Houston areas. Three specialty supervisors were interviewed in Texas. They included two combined alcoholic and mentally disturbed specialists and one economically disadvantaged specialist. In the less populous portions of the state territorial departmentation was still the most common practice although specialization in handling particular types of disabilities was beginning to appear.

This trend toward more specialization is unquestionably part of a national pattern of movement and can be

---

[1]These figures are derived from an analysis of responses to supervisor questionnaire, Question 3.2.

expected to continue. It will undoubtedly be accelerated by the trend among state agencies to obtain more and more of their state matching monies through third party agreements with special interest groups. The discussion of caseload as an organizing concept has been completed. The next section was devoted to a summary of Chapter IV.

Summary

Chapter Four has addressed itself to the organizing function in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. Organization structure in these states was found to proceed pretty much along expected lines with either four or five levels in the hierarchy between state directors and their counselors. Staff services were concentrated in the state offices of the agencies. Texas had recently split itself into five regions each with a regional director for each, thus adding another level to its hierarchy.

Supervisors wanted to spend more of their time on consulting with counselors and on training activities and less on travel. They wanted their counselors to spend more of their time on counseling and planning and less on paperwork.

Span of management was lowest in Arkansas and highest in Louisiana with Texas falling between the two. Ideas about an ideal span were not far removed from the actual span. An increase in the number of specialty

counselors of a supervisor should lower his span of management according to most, although by no means all, of the supervisors.

Most decisions in all states seemed to be made at the counselor level with review seldom proceeding higher than the supervisory level if it took place at all. Experience level of the counselor was the most important factor in causing the level of decision to be raised to a higher level in the agency.

Caseload as an indicator of departmentation method showed some mix between territorial and customer departmentation with a definite, though in some cases slow, trend toward more use of the latter, particularly in population centers, evident.

Chapter Five dealt with the planning function as carried out in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.

CHAPTER V

THE PLANNING FUNCTION IN ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, AND TEXAS

Introduction

Data relating to four major areas or concepts were discussed in connection with the exploration of the planning function in the state vocational rehabilitation agencies of Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. These four major areas or concepts which were investigated were as follows:

1) Plans and policies--seeking information about the process of setting agency objectives and production goals.
2) Budget--to determine how money for casework services is allocated, transferred, and supplemented in the agencies.
3) Resources--investigating needs for additions to or changes in utilization of people, physical facilities, and money.
4) Needs--estimating the volume of unmet needs for vocational rehabilitation services and exploring the basis of the estimates offered.

The plans and policies section received attention first.

Plans and Policies

Three major areas were touched in this plans and policies section. They were (1) the method by which agency objectives were determined and implemented and any recommendations for changes in these methods, (2) the method of setting production goals, application of pressure for more closures late in the year and source of such pressure if it existed, and (3) an evaluation of the degree to which current policies of the organization met the needs of the vocationally handicapped any any recommendations for changes in these policies.

Arkansas

The body mentioned most prominently in beginning major innovations or policy shifts was the state advisory committee composed of supervisors and counselors. This committee was mentioned by five supervisors. In the larger sense, the same three major sources of innovations or changes found in Oklahoma operated in Arkansas. These three sources were: (1) the state central office primarily through proposals and grants for research and demonstration, (2) the field level personnel of the agency operating primarily through their advisory committee mentioned above, and (3) community and special interest groups which had been particularly active in this state in the mental health

and mentally retarded areas pushing for cooperative school programs, sheltered work-shops and treatment facilities and funds for the mentally-ill.

The greatest agreement of responses on change recommendations on objective setting and policy making came from those three supervisors who had no changes to suggest. The other five supervisors each made different individual suggestions covering things like clearer definition of goals, more involvement of field personnel, and less emphasis on undifferentiated numbers of closures.

The setting of production goals in Arkansas seemed to be left largely to the individual counselor. Seven of the eight supervisors indicated as much. However, they also were generally aware of the importance of numbers, but indicated that getting enough closures had not been a significant problem in the state. One supervisor did mention an implied goal of sixty-five closures per year for an experienced counselor while another said he let his counselors know how many closures he expected from them in the coming year.

No pressure for additional closures late in the year had been applied in the recent memory of any Arkansas supervisor. In fact quite the opposite situation had occurred during the year the research was conducted (fiscal 1968--July 1, 1967 through June 30, 1968). The state office had reduced the number of closures it would accept

to a minimum, telling the field level personnel to hold them for the following year.

The supervisors remembered such pressure for additional closures had been applied in the more distant past and they felt it originated either at the national or regional levels.

Supervisors in Arkansas saw the present policies of their state agency offering no resistance to the provision of service to the disabled. They did note that certain difficult classes of cases such as the mentally ill and the elderly were not being served as well as they might be, but the reason for such service limitation was resources, not policy inflexibilities.

The only recommendations for policy changes were a suggestion for more emphasis and possibly a longer time period for follow-up work on cases and a suggestion for more autonomy for the alcoholic program with policies interpreted in light of its special needs.

Plans and policies in Louisiana were treated next.

Louisiana

The principal agents for innovation and change in Louisiana according to the supervisors were the assistant administrators in charge of the areas where the change was forthcoming. Community or special interest groups were noted as change agents by three supervisors but the

remaining one said they had not been active in his city. Field level personnel (supervisors and counselors) were mentioned by two supervisors while another said he had seen no innovations or changes coming from field level personnel.

No specific changes in the agency objective setting and planning process were suggested by these supervisors although one did say there was some talk of involving counselors in this process, and he was not sure it was a good idea since he saw program planning, innovation, and direction as a state office duty.

Production goals in Louisiana were said by three of the four supervisors to come to the state from the regional office and to the supervisors from the state office. The individual supervisor then met with his counselors to determine the goals of each. The state goal was said to be determined on the basis of population and number of rehabilitation personnel. The district goals were determined on the basis of the number of counselors in a district. The remaining supervisor said that goal setting had been a top down process before the beginning of the previous year (fiscal 1968) when counselors had been asked to set their own goals. He reported that his new procedure had resulted in a ten to fifteen per cent increase in the number of plans written.

All four supervisors answered that they had experienced pressure for additional closures late in the year and

they saw the source of this pressure in the desire of the state office to meet its quota and thus please the regional office.

The Louisiana supervisors generally agreed that the current policies of their agency were well suited to serving the needs of the disabled. They observed some more severely handicapped groups were not being served too well because of resource limitations and pressure for numbers of closures, but written policy did not prevent service to these groups.

No major recommendations for changes in policies were forthcoming from the Louisiana supervisors. One supervisor did mention that he desired more authority and cooperation in recognizing and rewarding exceptional performance by counselors.

Next consideration went to plans and policies in Texas.

Texas

Community or special interest groups, field level personnel including supervisors and counselors, and the state office under the impetus of available federal money were all mentioned by the Texas supervisors as sources of innovations or changes. Another idea not previously noted was the borrowing of ideas from other states. Also, Texas supervisors were required to set perofrmance standards for themselves each year.

Five of the seven Texas supervisors said the agency objective setting and planning process seemed to operate quite well currently. One said good ideas could be communicated to higher levels and another said the counselor advisory committee helped significantly in involving field level personnel. One supervisor made the same comment voiced by a single Arkansas supervisor. He said he feared that the agency might be trying to move into too many new areas too quickly.

Six of the Texas supervisors said counselors set their own goals in cooperation with the supervisor. This process which allowed the counselor to set his own goals had been in operation for two years. However, three of these six supervisors went on to say that a rule of thumb of thirteen or fourteen closures per employee of the agency was used to judge results. The total state goal on closures had not been met in Texas in the two years preceding the current year. One supervisor said the inexperience of the new one-third of the agency's staff was responsible for this failure to meet the closure goal. The goal had been met in the current year (fiscal 1968).

Pressure for additional closures late in the year was familiar to all seven of the Texas supervisors although the extent of such pressure seemed to vary somewhat among the supervisors. They labeled the regional director of their particular region within the state and the state

central office as the sources of this pressure, but they went on to say they felt sure it came from the National Regional Office and ultimately from Washington. One supervisor differed from this commonly expressed point of view labeling the state legislature as a source of pressure for the additional closures. Perhaps he realized the problem of obtaining state funds to get matching federal funds.

Three supervisors said most needs for services could be met under existing policies. Several different complaints about current policies were, nevertheless, voiced by the Texas supervisors. Three supervisors complained about the slow rate of current disbursements found in their agency. Two supervisors said they would like to see their agency move into working with the economically and socially deprived at a faster rate and on a more extensive basis, but another supervisor said eighty percent of the economically and socially deprived could be served under current policies and another said he had mixed feelings about a broader definition of vocational handicaps.

Other suggestions included more work with public offenders and the educationally deprived, and making some limited amount of funds available to the counselors for immediate disbursement at their discretion. These funds would allow emergency needs to be met immediately. Another supervisor said work with families of the vocationally

handicapped should be encouraged and another pleaded for more research, particularly directed toward those areas of needs not currently served.

The plans and policies information from the three states has been completed. The next major section examined the budgeting process used in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.

Budget

The section on the budgeting process contained six questions. The first question asked how the budget allocation for the supervisory district was determined. The second asked what criteria were used to determine the budget allocation of an individual counselor. The third question focused on the method of reconciling differences between budget requests and actual appropriations if such differences occurred. The course of action which would be followed if a counselor exhausted his supply of money before the end of the year was the subject of the fourth question.

The fifth and sixth questions were concerned with reserve funds. If such funds existed, supervisors were asked to identify their source. The final question asked what criteria would be used in allocating reserve funds among those requesting them.

Arkansas

Quite surprisingly, the finding was that the state of Arkansas simply had not had a formal budgeting process in the past although one was to be instituted in the following year (fiscal 1969). The reasons this state had not adopted a formal budgeting procedure were (1) their ability to obtain most or all of the federal matching money available to the state in the past, and (2) a feeling that case service might be impaired by the financial limits of the budget. However, in the previous year Arkansas had used all their funds statewide several months before the end of the year because an unexpected drop in state revenues had precluded the realization of a substantial amount of state matching money.

The budgeting process for the following year was to depend on the aggregation of individual counselor needs to yield total allocations for district and state. Criteria mentioned as important in determining the allocation of an individual counselor were population in the area, number of cases handled, types of cases handled, the demands of special projects in the area, and past spending in the area.

The general consensus among Arkansas supervisors was that a difference in budget requests and actual allocations would result in special projects being funded first and with the remaining money allocated on the basis of needs.

Three solutions to the problem of a counselor running out of money were offered by the Arkansas supervisors. They included reallocation of money from other counselors, seeking funds from outside sources, and spending time on no-cost work. (No-cost work is defined as work requiring no expenditure of casework service funds.)

Six of the eight Arkansas supervisors said no reserve funds were known to exist in their state while one said some emergency money was reserved by the state office and another mentioned trust funds. The final question on the method for deciding how to allocate reserves was not applicable in this state because most supervisors said no reserves existed.

Budgeting methods in Louisiana were discussed next.

Louisiana

Louisiana, like Arkansas, has no budgeting process operating at any level below the state level. Louisiana supervisors also indicated that their state had no reserve funds. Therefore, the questions in this section were not applicable to the Louisiana Vocational Rehabilitation Agency. Budgeting in the Texas agency was described next.

Texas

Three choices were offered to Texas supervisors for describing the method by which the budget request for operation of the district was determined. These choices were:

1) individual counselor needs determined and totalled--chosen by two supervisors,
2) total needs estimated for district--chosen by four supervisors, and
3) other (funds allocated on a regional basis to each of the five regions in Texas)--chosen by a single supervisor.

The question on criteria used in determining the budget allocation of an individual counselor showed size of caseload and type of caseload frequently named as criteria. Other criteria mentioned less often were location of working area and past spending patterns in the area.

The next question asked if changes in allocations among counselors or field offices would be made on a selective or an absolutely proportional basis in the event that budget requests differed from actual appropriations. Only two relevant answers to this question were obtained. This result corresponded with the two supervisors who said individual counselor needs were determined and totalled to arrive at the district budget request. Need was cited as the principal criterion for selection in making the changes required under these circumstances.

If a counselor exhausted his allocation before the end of the year in Texas he was (1) allocated more money from reserves of other counselors, supervisor, regional director or state director, (2) encouraged to seek funds

from third party agencies or other sources or (3) forced to concentrate his time on activities which generate no case service expenses. Examples of such no-cost activities were public relations, counseling, cultivation of referral sources and placement opportunities.

Four supervisors in Texas named no reserve funds. Those three who did name reserve funds said they came from higher levels within the agency or from outside sources, particularly third party agencies. No-cost work and service to only those cases exhibiting dire and immediate need were named as other methods of stretching resources.

Since this discussion concludes the section on budget, attention shifts to the next topic considered under planning, that of resources.

Resources

The section on resources opened with a question about desirable changes in utilization or desirable additions to the current human resources involved in the vocational rehabilitation effort. This question was followed by one inquiring about desirable changes in or additions to vocational rehabilitation physical plants. Suggestions for more effective ways to use currently appropriated vocational rehabilitation funds were explored in a third question and the fourth and final question in this section asked the supervisors how they would spend the additional money if they were immediately given a sizably increased allocation.

Arkansas

Arkansas supervisors suggested the following additions to human resources in their state:

1) psychiatrists and/or psychologists
2) social workers--particularly for help with family adjustment problems of clients
3) clerical help
4) counselors--particularly those specializing in particular types of disabilities
5) counselor aides
6) placement specialists

Although none of these suggested additions were universal, all received multiple mention. The only suggestion that could be construed as a suggestion for change in current usage was the recommendation for more specialization in particular types of disabilities among counselors.

In the physical facilities area, a need for more sheltered workshops was the most frequently mentioned item. Six supervisors recognized such a need in their areas. More convenient and attractive offices with more privacy for confidential conversations between counselors and clients were next in frequency of mention with five recognitions. Single mentions were accorded to a mental health facility and an alcoholic dorm.

Three supervisors thought the money currently appropriated was being quite well utilized and they suggested no

ways for utilizing that money more effectively. Arkansas supervisors were highly committed to helping clients help themselves and they suggested more emphasis on maximum utilization of a client's own resources with vocational rehabilitation only making up the difference rather than financing the whole plan. Other supervisors thought money could be saved by returning to a fixed fee schedule for physical restoration services rather than the current usual-and-customary fees. Usual-and-customary fees meant that the rehabilitation agency pays whatever fee the vendor would normally charge other buyers. Another suggested that a formal budgeting process might help in saving money. More money to salaries in order to attract and hold good personnel was the suggestion of another supervisor.

Additional money would be spent first on provision of more case services (This problem was on the supervisors' minds because case services had been severely curtailed by short money in the months immediately preceding this research.); on additions to staff including counselors, counselor aides, social workers, and secretaries and on higher salaries for current staff in all groups; and finally on physical facilities such as better offices, halfway houses, sheltered workshops, and mental health treatment facilities. Analysis of responses to this question completed the consideration of resources data from Arkansas supervisors. Louisiana resources data were treated next.

Louisiana

Three of four Louisiana supervisors interviewed said they needed more staff. A higher qualified and more specialized staff was desired. One supervisor said he had enough people currently. No other human resources needs were mentioned.

Among physical facilities needs, two supervisors mentioned a treatment facility for the mentally ill, one needed a larger office, another needed some furniture for a larger office he had recently occupied, one said a facility for public offenders was needed, and one mentioned that a multiple disability service center such as Arkansas's Hot Springs facility or Oklahoma's Okmulgee facility was needed in his state. The supervisor from New Orleans said he had no real needs in the facilities area.

Two supervisors said currently appropriated money could be better utilized by returning to a fixed-fee schedule for physical restoration services rather than following the current practice of paying usual-and-customary fees. Two supervisors had no suggestions for more effective utilization of money and one supervisor said few of the college students who were vocational rehabilitation clients should be sent to private or out-of-state schools because of their higher tuition fees.

Spending of additional appropriations would be channeled into added staff, especially for specialized need

groups, particularly the mentally ill, into higher salaries for present personnel, and finally into an expansion of case services.

The next section considered the resource suggestions of the Texas supervisors.

Texas

Four of the seven Texas supervisors said they could use more counselor aides. Gaining three mentions for additions in the human resources area were expressed needs for interviewers, placement specialists, social workers, and psychologists and/or psychiatrists. Five supervisors wanted a one-to-one ratio of secretaries to counselors or more rehabilitation technicians specializing in paperwork. A need for more counselors to cut down on territory size and/or population was noted by two supervisors. One supervisor thought more effort should be directed into public relations either by present personnel or new personnel hired expressly for that purpose. Finally, the addition of more supervisors to reduce the span of management was suggested by a single supervisor. Two Texas supervisors mentioned the use of a coordinated team approach to rehabilitation utilizing various enterprise functional specialists with the counselor as their director to carry out the rehabilitation program.

In the facilities area, the Texas supervisors were unanimous in proclaiming their need for a pre-vocational

testing and evaluation unit owned and operated by the rehabilitation agency. Two mentioned a companion pre-vocational training unit. Three supervisors noted needs for halfway houses and sheltered workshops. Two said more accessible and convenient offices were desirable. One supervisor recommended adding a detoxification unit for alcoholics in his area.

With regard to the utilization of currently appropriated money, three supervisors had no suggestions for improvements. Two supervisors suggested that more careful attention to client needs and capabilities in writing plans might improve the ratio of successful plans. Two supervisors recommended shopping for the best value available on expenditure of training funds with particular attention directed to sending college student clients to state-supported rather than private institutions because of their lower tuition fees. One supervisor suggested reinstitution of the economic need requirement for provision of services.

Additions to staff were the first thing on which most Texas supervisors would spend an additional sum of appropriated money. The supervisors wanted more secretaries, more counselors and more of various kinds of support personnel such as counselor aides, placement specialists, rehabilitation technicians, interviewers, and social workers. They were interested in experimenting with a team effort

toward rehabilitation. Ranking as a close second to additions to staff among spending priorities were the testing and evaluation units all supervisors said they needed. Other ranked items were higher salaries for staff, particularly secretaries (counselors were relatively well paid in Texas starting at over $9,000 annually), halfway houses, and sheltered workshops in that order.

With the completion of this analysis, all resources data have been explored. The fourth and final section of Chapter V examined unmet needs for vocational rehabilitation services in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.

Needs

In the needs area one primary question and one follow-up question were asked. The primary question asked the supervisors in the various states to estimate the volume of unmet needs for vocational rehabilitation services that existed in their units and the secondary question probed for the basis of this opinion.

The analysis of the responses to the question on the volume of unmet needs for vocational rehabilitation services was presented in the following table. The average of estimates from each of the individual states was over eighty percent. This result simply says the supervisors thought the volume of unmet needs for vocational rehabilitation services was substantial. The wide range of estimates in all three states did, however, highlight the supervisory

differences of opinion about how extensive this volume of unmet needs really was.

TABLE 1

SUPERVISORY ESTIMATES OF DEGREE BY WHICH VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES COULD BE EXPANDED IN ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, AND TEXAS

	Arkansas	Louisiana	Texas
Average of Estimates of Degree of Service Expansion Possible (Percent)	81.43	91.88	148.29
Range of Estimates (Percent)	20-300	15-200	20-400
Number of Responses	7	4	7

Source: Supervisor Interview; question 13.1

Arkansas supervisors based their opinions on the degree by which services could be expanded on the following factors: experience and personal knowledge, the proportion of total referrals not handled, and, in one case, an experiment with a limited area to see how much service could be expanded.

Louisiana supervisors relied on their own knowledge and experience and on federal and state figures on the number of disabled people as a basis for their estimates.

Supervisors in Texas cited: (1) figures on number of people disabled annually, (2) comparison of service figures to population figures, (3) experience with division of territories followed by rebuilding of caseloads to

former sizes, (4) own knowledge of needs, and (5) state and federal figures on volume of needs for service.

In general, it appeared that the estimates at the higher end of the range of estimates were based on figures on the number of disabled people in the population while lower estimates were based on personal knowledge and experience. Significantly, all supervisors in these three states agreed some needs were not currently being met.

Needs was the last topic to be considered in this chapter on planning. The summary of this chapter follows.

Summary

This chapter on planning has explored four major areas or concepts: plans and policies, budget, resources, and needs.

In the plans and policies area, changes seemed to come from the central office in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas and from field staff and community interest groups in Arkansas and Texas.

Production goals appeared to the supervisors to come from the state office in Louisiana, from the counselors in Arkansas, and from the counselors operating under the influence of a state office guideline in Texas. Pressure for additional closures near the end of the physical year was present in Louisiana and Texas, but it was relatively absent in Arkansas.

In the policy change area, Texas supervisors were particularly concerned about getting their agency's disbursement policy changed so its bills could be paid on time. Supervisors in Arkansas and Louisiana were less critical of current policies than those in Texas and voiced few recommendations for changes.

Formal budgeting procedures were not found to exist in Arkansas and Louisiana and assumed only a rudimentary form in Texas. Problems of short money in all three states were met by seeking additional funds from inside or outside sources or by doing work which required no direct expenditures until more money was available.

In the resources area, supervisors from Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas voiced a need for more staff, more convenient and accessible offices with more privacy, and facilities for serving specialized client groups. All Texas supervisors voiced their need for testing and evaluation centers.

Spending of additional funds would go for hiring additional staff, paying higher salaries, expanding casework services and adding to or improving offices and facilities.

All the supervisors interviewed generally agreed that unmet needs for vocational rehabilitation services existed but their estimates of the volume of these unmet needs varied widely. The average of estimates for Texas

supervisors was markedly higher than the average for Louisiana and Arkansas but estimates in all three states were over eighty percent.

Chapter VI will consider the staffing function of management as viewed by the supervisors in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.

CHAPTER VI

THE STAFFING FUNCTION IN ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, AND TEXAS

Introduction

The staffing function normally includes manpower planning; recruitment, selection, and placement; training and development; and appraisal. The first and last of these four concepts were not explored in this chapter. Manpower planning was felt to be largely a central office function so supervisors were not queried about it, and appraisal will be covered under the control function. Attention focused on recruitment, selection and placement in the first section of the chapter.

Recruitment, Selection, and Placement

Five questions were directed to the supervisors in this section. They asked about (1) placement criteria for new counselors used by the supervisors, (2) point of involvement of the supervisors in the recruitment, selection, placement process, (3) sources of applicants for counselor positions, (4) criteria for selection of counselors from among the applicants, and (5) suggestions for improving the recruiting process.

Arkansas

Population, current caseload sizes, numbers of referrals, location of present or new facilities or programs, and existence of specialized need groups in an area were cited as criteria used in deciding where to place a new counselor in Arkansas.

Supervisors were given three choices with regard to their point of involvement in the process of recruitment, selection and placement. They could select all three choices--recruitment, selection, and placement--or any combination of the three choices. A tabulation of results for the eight Arkansas supervisors showed six saying they were involved in recruitment, five saying they were involved in selection, and four indicating an involvement in placement. Two of the supervisors selected all three choices while three selected recruitment alone.

Five sources of applicants for counselor's positions were named by Arkansas supervisors. These five sources are listed below with the number of the eight supervisors mentioning them shown in parentheses:

1. Public school personnel--teachers, counselors and administrators (5)
2. College and university recruiting (4)
3. Employees of other state agencies (welfare, and employment security were specifically named) (4)
4. Agency personnel office (3)

5. Referrals and recommendations of present employees (2)

This list does not contain mutually exclusive categories, but it does contain all sources mentioned by the Arkansas supervisors.

According to the supervisors, the four most important criteria for selection of counselors (with the number of mentions among the eight supervisors again shown in parentheses) are as follows:

1. Education (successful applicants must be college graduates) (6)
2. Previous work experience (4)
3. Personality (3)
4. Positive interest in rehabilitation employment (3)

In addition to these four criteria, one supervisor mentioned administrative ability and one supervisor named reputation as being considered in the selection process. The alcoholic supervisor had an additional criterion for employment in his unit. He would hire only persons who were arrested alcoholics with a record of two years of continuous sobriety before employment.

The most frequently offered suggestion for improving the recruiting process, named by four Arkansas supervisors, was to raise current salary levels in order to attract more recruits and recruits of higher quality. Other suggestions

for improving the recruiting process included hiring of more women counselors, development of a rehabilitation counselor training program at a university within the state, seeking better methods for publicizing jobs in rehabilitation, and clearer definition of the recruiting duties of the recently-added agency personnel officer and those of other agency personnel.

Louisiana

When confronted with the question of how they decided where to place a new counselor, three Louisiana supervisors answered that these placement decisions were made by administration rather than by supervisors. The remaining three supervisors named factors such as population and specialized disabilities, number of referrals, type of referrals, size of current caseloads, and training and experience of counselor. In addition, the location of the counselor's present home was named as a consideration since new counselors in Louisiana were often political appointees and were seldom placed outside the local area where they live.

Given the three choices--recruitment, selection, placement--about the point in the process at which they, the supervisors, become involved, three Louisiana supervisors indicated no involvement. The remaining three supervisors indicated an involvement only in placement.

Sources of applicants named by Louisiana supervisors were (1) recruits from colleges and universities, (2) the

Louisiana State Employment Service, (3) other state agencies in related work such as welfare, (4) parish school system employees, and (5) former clients. Recommendations from the present staff were noted as one method for securing these applicants.

The only criterion named as being used for selecting counselors from the pool of applicants was that the applicant must hold a college degree. No areas of specialization for this degree were specified. In the interview, the general impression was gained from the supervisors that an applicant's political loyalty and influence with the legislators in his district were the most important determinants in the hiring process.

Suggestions for improvement of the recruiting process in Louisiana included more supervisory involvement in picking the new employees, a change in the job specifications to require some training in counseling and guidance or psychology rather than just requiring a college degree, and, possibly, some age considerations (unspecified).

The recruitment, selection, placement answers of the Texas supervisors will be presented next.

Texas

Two frequently mentioned criteria for deciding where to place a new counselor in Texas were the number of referrals and the volume of intake work generated in a

particular area. These criteria were mentioned by four of the seven Texas supervisors.

Another class of criteria labeled special needs was mentioned by six supervisors. These special needs which would affect counselor placement decisions might arise from the initiation of new programs or from contracts with third party agencies or, as is frequently the case, from a combination of attempts to serve new need groups and the initiation of new third party agreements with parties also interested in meeting the needs of these particular disability groups. Other criteria named by Texas supervisors were population concentration and counselor qualifications and interests.

Of the seven Texas supervisors, five said they were involved in recruitment, six said they were involved in selection, and five mentioned an involvement in placement. Four of the seven had checked all three choices--recruitment, selection, and placement.

Sources of applicants for counselor positions named by Texas supervisors are shown in the following list (number of supervisory mentions shown in parenthesis):

1. Colleges running rehabilitation counselor training programs or with good reputations for training in psychology, sociology, or counseling and guidance. (6)
2. Other state agencies including the public

employment service, the welfare agency and the probation department. (5)

3. Public schools with particular mention of school counselors. (3)
4. Vocational rehabilitation counselors from other states (salaries were significantly higher in Texas) (1)
5. Self-referrals (from any of the above sources or others) resulting primarily from contacts with current employees. (1)

Remarkable agreement was evident among the seven Texas supervisors on the criteria governing the selection of counselors from among applicants. The three major criteria named were (1) the academic background of the applicant including school attended, area of specialization, and grades, (2) the applicant's previous work experience, and (3) the general personality and attitudes of the applicant including stability, resourcefulness, communication ability, commitment to service to the handicapped, willingness to work and willingness to learn. These three criteria received six, five, and four mentions respectively among the seven Texas supervisors. A single supervisor mentioned the applicant's reasons for wanting the job for which he was applying as a criterion for selection.

In general, Texas supervisors saw no need for improvement in their recruiting process since they had many more

applications than they had vacant positions. The probable reason that Texas had few problems in recruiting was their salary level which was high in relation to those paid in surrounding states or in comparable jobs in their own state. Five of the seven supervisors interviewed had no suggestions for improving recruiting while one suggested a more extensive public relations effort and another said expanded fringe benefits might make the employment more attractive.

The conclusion of the recruitment-selection-placement section has been reached. Training was the subject considered in the next section.

Training

This section on training was quite lengthy. Some aspects of the training of four different groups were explored within it. These four groups were new counselors, graduates of rehabilitation counselor training programs, experienced counselors, and supervisors. The new counselor group was considered first.

Training of New Counselors

Six questions about new counselors were directed toward the supervisors in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. The first of these questions asked what the supervisor did to train or develop new counselors after they arrived on the job. Arkansas supervisors noted that their new counselors attended a one week orientation program in the state

office. Then they were assigned to the supervisor and he imbued them with rehabilitation philosophy, improved their knowledge of agency policies and procedures through manual study, had them review cases, had them observe experienced counselors in their work, reviewed all plans and casework done by them in their first year because of the prior approval rule, and sent them to appropriate workshops as traineeships were available. The training in Arkansas was largely of the informally structured on-the-job type.

In Louisiana, the new counselor underwent from three to six weeks of orientation with the state training officer. Then, the new counselor was assigned to a district where he worked under an experienced counselor for a time. He also worked on internalizing agency policies and procedures and reviewed cases during this period. Soon he began to handle some cases of his own under the supervisor's guidance. First year prior approval of plans also existed in Louisiana. Workshops were attended as openings were available.

In Texas, the orientation period in the state office was one week (five days). After this orientation session was completed, the new counselor was assigned to a supervisor. The supervisor gave him a complete overview of the position and its duties, had him study the basic policy and procedure manuals, and had him review some cases processed by others. Then he was assigned to an experienced

counselor. Finally he began to handle his own cases with the prior approval rule governing implementation of plans he wrote during his first year. New counselors in Texas also attended workshops as opportunities presented themselves.

The second question asked concerning new counselors inquired how long a counselor was considered a new counselor. Five choices were offered to the respondents beginning with three months and graduated in three month intervals up to a choice of more than one year. Arkansas supervisors universally chose the one year interval. Supervisors in Louisiana showed the greatest variance in their responses. One Louisiana supervisor said six months, two said one year, and the remaining three said more than one year. In Texas, six of the seven supervisors chose the one year period with the remaining one opting for the shorter six-month interval.

A one year period during which prior supervisory approval was required before plans written by a new counselor might be implemented was standard in all three states, but some variation in the degree to which it was rigorously carried out appeared to exist among the states and among the individual supervisors.

The next question concerned the proportion of the new counselor's time spent on training activities. The

results derived from this question were summarized in the following table.

TABLE 1

AVERAGE PROPORTION OF COUNSELOR'S TIME ON TRAINING ACTIVITIES DURING PERIOD CONSIDERED A NEW COUNSELOR IN ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, AND TEXAS

	Arkansas	Louisiana	Texas	Combined
Average Proportion of Time (Percent)	24.38	27.22	13.57	21.59
Range of Estimates (Percent)	3-50	15-50	5-25	3-50
Number of Estimates	8	6	7	21

Source: Supervisor questionnaire, question 5.3.

Texas estimates showed a significantly lower average proportion of time and a lower range than did those in either Arkansas or Louisiana.

The next question about new counselors asked how much production was expected of a new counselor as compared to an experienced counselor. The answers to this question for Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas were summarized in Table 2. Arkansas supervisors expected more from their new counselors as compared to their experienced counselors than did supervisors in Louisiana and Texas. Evidence was their higher average expectation and a higher figure on the lower end of their range of estimates.

TABLE 2

AVERAGE PRODUCTION EXPECTED OF NEW COUNSELORS AS COMPARED TO EXPERIENCED COUNSELORS IN ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, AND TEXAS

	Arkansas	Louisiana	Texas	Combined
Average Expectation (Percent)	66.79	45.28	45.71	53.46
Range of Expectation (Percent)	40-75	25-66 2/3	25-75	25-75
Number of Estimates	7	6	7	20

Source: Supervisor questionnaire: question 5.4.

The final pair of questions directed toward the training of new counselors asked for an evaluation of each agency's in-service training program for new counselors and for suggestions for changes in these programs.

Arkansas supervisors used terms like "good," "pretty good," "fair," "pretty fair," and one "not adequate" to evaluate their agency's in-service training program. Their major complaint centered on the state office orientation portion of the program since this was the portion they did not control. Comments such as the following were gathered from the responses of the Arkansas supervisors to this question 4.4 of the supervisor interview:

"hits new man with too much information too quickly"

"program confuses without teaching"

"gives a good idea of what rehabilitation is all about"

"content is good; material should not be read to people; program too paper oriented"

Suggestions for improvements in their agency's in-service training program from Arkansas supervisors included the following items:

1. Some field training desirable before state office orientation so the orientation would be more likely to be absorbed.
2. More involvement in practical aspects of case-load management such as processing practice cases.
3. Extend orientation period to at least two weeks.
4. Incorporate more facility tours into the orientation.

Three Arkansas supervisors had no suggestions for improving the in-service training program.

In Louisiana, three of the four supervisors interviewed said relatively positive things about their agency's in-service training program. Their orientation period had been cut in the recent past from three months to three weeks and one labeled this as a desirable change. One supervisor said the orientation program was weak in the practical aspects of casework. Two supervisors noted the in-service training program was being strengthened from its previous condition.

One Louisiana supervisor had no suggestions for changes to improve the in-service training program. Two suggested more emphasis on policies, procedures and rules in the three week orientation period.

Texas supervisors differed markedly in their evaluations of their agency's in-service training program. Ratings offered were "top notch," "pretty good," "good up to a point," "fair" (2), and "limited". Gripes centered on the orientation process at the state level being too short and too concentrated.

Texas supervisors made the following suggestions for changes to improve the in-service training program in their state:

1. Some central office orientation after the counselor has been in the field long enough (at least three months) to understand the rehabilitation process fairly well (could be in place of or in addition to the present one week initial orientation) (4)
2. Better efforts to acquaint new counselor with the facilities and resources available for his use.
3. More use of the three phase regional program to orient counselors.

One supervisor in Texas recommended no changes in the in-service training program.

Arkansas and Texas supervisors voiced a common complaint about the short duration and poor timing of their state office orientation program.

They preferred at least two weeks of state office orientation to the present one week period and they suggested that at least half, if not all, of this orientation take place after the counselor had been in the field for some time.

This discussion concluded the analysis and presentation of data connected with the training of new counselors. The counselor training provided by graduate rehabilitation counselor training programs formed the next area of inquiry.

Rehabilitation Counselor Training Program Graduates

The supervisors were asked if they had experience with graduates of programs designed to prepare rehabilitation counselors. If they had worked with graduates, they were asked to name the programs whose graduates they had observed. Then they were asked to evaluate the programs on the basis of their experience with graduates and to make suggestions for changes in these programs to improve counselor effectiveness or productivity after employment.

Arkansas

Four Arkansas supervisors had experience with graduates of Oklahoma State University's Rehabilitation Counselor Training program. Another had experience with interns from

this program. One supervisor had employed a Texas Technological University graduate and another had experience with interns from the same school. In all, five of the eight Arkansas supervisors had worked with either graduates or interns of one of these two programs. The remaining three Arkansas supervisors reported no experience with graduates or interns of any program.

The evaluation of the Oklahoma State University program was generally favorable. The supervisors noted that graduates had a good knowledge of rehabilitation purposes and philosophies and that they were well versed in psychological testing. The few criticisms offered centered on the lack of practical knowledge and experience possessed by these graduates and the major suggestions for change offered focused on more simulated or actual practice in casework aspects of the counselor's job. One supervisor suggested that the counselor do his internship before his last semester in the training program.

Louisiana

All four supervisors in Louisiana reported that they had not employed graduates of an existing rehabilitation counselor training program. Two supervisors said they thought these programs were desirable. Another supervisor reported that a counselor training program had recently been started at the University of Southwest Louisiana in Lafayette.

Texas

All seven Texas supervisors reported experience with graduates of an existing program for preparing rehabilitation counselors. Programs at three schools were named. These schools were the University of Texas at Austin named by four supervisors, Texas Technological University named by four supervisors, and Oklahoma State University named by three supervisors. In addition, one of the supervisors was himself a graduate of the Texas Technological University program.

Of the three programs evaluated by the Texas supervisors, the Oklahoma State program was judged as the best followed by Texas Tech and Texas in that order. The supervisors' main criticism of these programs was that their approach was too academic and theoretical and not oriented enough toward training actual practitioners of vocational rehabilitation.

These supervisors' suggestions for changes in the programs were many and varied. They advocated building more practical experience into the program perhaps through a closer integration of classwork and internship. They also suggested less emphasis on the psychological aspects of counselor training such as testing, counseling and therapy and more emphasis on medical knowledge, effects of disabling conditions, communication of occupational information, and placement.

Certain aspects of the training offerings and opportunities available for experienced counselors were covered in the next section.

Experienced Counselors' Training

Four questions about training for experienced counselors were directed to the supervisors in Arkansas, Louisiana and Texas. Two questions focused on each agency's inside training programs for experienced counselors. The first asked for a description of these inside programs and the second for an evaluation of them. The second pair of questions was directed toward agency provisions for outside training of experienced counselors. Supervisors were first asked for a description of these agency provisions. Then, they were asked if these provisions should be continued, dropped, or modified. The reason for the choice indicated was then explored.

Arkansas

The inside training program for experienced counselors in Arkansas featured three area meetings and one statewide meeting, each of two days duration. These meetings are planned and conducted by the state office staff development personnel. A monthly special emphasis study focused on a selected topic with materials prepared by staff development and presented by the area supervisor comprised another portion of the in-service training effort. Regular

conferences of counselors with their area supervisors were a third portion of the in-service training effort in Arkansas.

Five of the eight Arkansas supervisors evaluated their agency's in-service training program as good and another labeled it as adequate. The only significant criticism stated that the presentations in the meetings tended toward being dry and dull and this opinion was voiced by only one supervisor.

Three provisions were made for experienced counselors to obtain outside training in Arkansas. These provisions were as follows:

1. A provision to pay expenses of tuition and books for approved courses relevant to the counselor's job in approved institutions of higher learning taken while employed.
2. A provision allowing counselors to take educational leaves without pay.
3. Provisions allowing counselors to attend appropriate rehabilitation workshops (usually two per year).

Seven of eight supervisors in Arkansas said provisions for outside training for experienced counselors should be continued. The other choices offered were to drop or to modify these provisions. The eighth supervisor opted for modification of the provisions.

Reasons given for the choices made centered on gaining specialized and general knowledge and keeping abreast of new developments in the field. Associations with their peers from other states and the chance for sharing knowledge these associations provided were also regarded as valuable. The prosthetics and orthotics workshop presented by the University of California at Los Angeles was named as an outstanding workshop by three supervisors.

Suggestions for desirable modifications in outside training provisions offered by Arkansas supervisors were as follows:

1. More opportunities for participation in workshops.
2. More involvement of field personnel in workshops or at least more emphasis on problems which might be encountered in the field.
3. Paying travel costs for counselors to attend college courses taken while working if they have to drive to reach the offering institution.

Louisiana

In service training for experienced counselors in Louisiana featured two statewide staff meetings and two bi-district in-service training sessions of two to three days each in the course of a year. These efforts were supplemented by periodic district conferences and by informal consultations of supervisors with their counselors.

The evaluation of the in-service training program given by Louisiana supervisors was that it was improving. The semiannual bi-district in-service training sessions were only in their second year of operation, but they were regarded very favorably by the supervisors. One supervisor indicated he would like to see the in-service training program for experienced counselors expanded.

The Louisiana agency's provisions for experienced counselors to obtain outside training were limited largely to promoting attendance at workshops. A limited provision for educational leave without pay also existed and counselors were given permission to take regularly scheduled courses at nearby colleges on a part-time basis while employed but the agency provided no reimbursement for tuition or books.

Three of the four Louisiana supervisors interviewed recommended modification of their agency's provisions for experienced counselors to obtain outside training. The two most important modifications suggested were for educational leaves with partial support and agency reimbursements for costs of work-related courses taken while employed. The workshop attendance provision was regarded favorably by the group although a more practical orientation centering on field problems would raise the value of workshops in the eyes of Louisiana supervisors. The remaining supervisor said that the agency outside training provisions for experienced counselors should be continued.

Texas

The inside training program for experienced counselors in Texas had several elements. Staff development workshops dealing with caseload management, advanced counseling techniques, and specific kinds of disabling conditions constituted the major thrust of the program. These workshops were held at various times and places throughout the state during the year. These workshops were augmented by periodic regional staff development meetings, weekly supervisory area staff development and medical information sessions, and informal consultation between supervisors and counselors as needed.

Four of the seven supervisors interviewed in Texas were mildly critical of the quality of the inside training program for experienced counselors. These supervisors simply did not think enough was being done in this area. The other three supervisors were more positive in their evaluations. They recognized that the program was limited, but felt that an acceptable effort was being made within those limits.

The Texas provisions for outside training for experienced counselors fell into three categories. First, Texas, like all other states, sent its counselors to federally-sponsored workshops. Second, counselors might take courses in nearby universities while employed if the course was previously approved by the supervisor and if the counselor

made up any time lost from his regular employment. No reimbursement for costs of these courses was given by the agency. Finally, the agency had a provision for educational leave without pay.

Four supervisors said provisions for experienced counselors to obtain outside training should be continued and the remaining three said the provisions should be modified. Suggested modifications included the following:

1. Elimination of the requirement for making up time spent in college courses taken while employed.
2. Adoption of a provision for educational leave with stipend or partial pay.

Supervisors generally felt the workshop attendance program should be continued. They emphasized that the peer interaction these workshops provided seemed equally as important as the formal presentations.

This discussion completed the presentation of data on experienced counselor training efforts. The next section viewed supervisory training efforts.

Supervisory Training

Two questions about their own training and development were addressed to the supervisors. The first question asked what opportunities were available for supervisory training and development, and the second asked what

training the supervisors desired but had not been able to get as yet. Arkansas had quarterly statewide meetings for its supervisors. A special supervisory meeting was held in the summer of 1967 and a regional meeting for new supervisors in the fall of 1967 had been attended by some of the states' supervisors. In addition, some workshops such as those offered by the University of Oklahoma are directed specifically toward supervisors. Tuition and books were paid for relevant courses taken in universities on a part-time basis while working full time.

Three supervisors in Arkansas thought they needed training in management. One desired training in testing. One desired training in his area of specialization--alcoholism. Two desired more opportunities to interact with their peers and one could think of no special area where he needed training.

Louisiana's supervisory training efforts were limited to attendance at federally sponsored supervisory oriented workshops although one supervisor did mention that he attended supervisory conferences conducted by related agencies.

One supervisor had no particular training needs. Two wanted training in counseling and guidance. One of these wanted to get a Master's degree in this field. One suggested holding supervisory conferences for exchange of information.

Texas had staff development meetings for supervisors, and as in other states supervisors could attend federally sponsored workshops. One supervisor also mentioned that he relied on his regional director for some guidance in carrying out his duties.

Five requests for training in management were voiced by Texas supervisors. One wanted special study in one of his areas of specialization--alcoholism, and one expressed no particular training needs.

Aspects of supervisory training were the last topic covered in the section on training. A summary of the chapter on staffing was then presented.

Summary

The two areas explored in this chapter on staffing were recruitment, selection, and placement, and training. Training of four groups--new counselors, graduates of rehabilitation counselor training programs, experienced counselors and supervisors--was examined.

In the recruitment/selection/placement area, placements were made primarily on the basis of need. Supervisors were considerably involved in recruitment, selection, and placement in Arkansas and Texas and minimally involved in Louisiana. College recruits, public school personnel and employees of other state agencies were the most common sources of recruits. Successful applicants had to be college graduates in all three states. Arkansas needed

higher salaries and Louisiana needed tighter job specifications to improve their recruiting processes. Texas had few current problems in recruiting because of high salaries.

New counselor training was primarily done on-the-job by supervisors and experienced counselors. The initial orientation period in the state office was longer in Louisiana, running at least three weeks, while it lasted only one week in Arkansas and Texas. One common suggestion for change in new counselor training was for some state office orientation following the initial period of field experience.

Three existing graduate programs for preparing rehabilitation counselors were evaluated by the supervisors. These programs were at Oklahoma State University, Texas Technological University, and University of Texas at Austin. On the basis of their experience with graduates, the supervisors ranked them in the order listed above. The major suggestion for change in these programs was more emphasis on practice of rehabilitation and less on psychological theory.

Inside and outside training for experienced counselors was explored. Inside training offerings featured state, region within state, bi-district and district short conferences dealing with counseling techniques or special disabilities. Supervisors also consulted with counselors as the need arose. Outside training provisions included

educational leave, permission to take courses part-time while employed, and opportunities to attend federally sponsored workshops. Louisiana and Texas supervisors wanted support provided during educational leaves.

Supervisory training came through state or region-within-state meetings and attendance at workshops oriented toward supervisory training. The greatest need for training expressed by supervisors was for management training.

Chapter VI on the staffing function concluded with this summary. Chapter VII stressed the directing function.

CHAPTER VII

THE DIRECTING FUNCTION IN ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, AND TEXAS

Introduction

This chapter on the direction function will delve into two areas--communication and motivation. Communication is explored with a series of questions about the flow of information. Information on motivation is sought by an exploration of the rewards derived from their work by supervisors and counselors. The data on communication from Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas will be treated first.

Communication

Four questions on communications were addressed to the supervisors. These questions were directed primarily toward communications between the supervisors and the central office since the nature and method of supervisory communication with counselors came out in answers to questions in other sections.

Specifically, the supervisors were asked what useful information they received from the central office, what useless information they received, and what information

they needed, but were not currently receiving from the central office. Then the supervisors were asked to judge the quality, adequacy, and timing of the flow of communications within the agency.

The analysis of the communication data obtained from the Arkansas supervisors follows.

Arkansas

Useful information received from the central office by the Arkansas supervisors included the following items:

1. Information on policy, procedure and rule changes
2. Information on innovations and new programs
3. The monthly master list of all state clients with certain classification data on these clients separated into individual counselor's caseloads.
4. A quarterly report showing comparative caseloads
5. A monthly report on amount of funds encumbered for case services
6. A monthly report on expenditures of funds by offices
7. Certain training materials
8. Certain general information letters and memorandums

The category of useless information yielded only a general plea for better screening of information with reference to its usefulness and applicability before it

was sent to the supervisor by the central office. Specific complaints centered on the large volume of publications from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare that some supervisors had either no time or no inclination to read.

In the category of information needed but not currently received, one supervisor would like to see the quarterly comparative workload report done each month. This supervisor also said he would like to see a relatively detailed monthly breakdown on expenditures of funds in order to see where the money had gone. Another supervisor would like to see a monthly summary of cases by status for individual counselors and supervisory districts. The specialty supervisor pleaded for a better understanding and acceptance of his program. Three supervisors expressed no requests for additional information.

The Arkansas supervisors generally evaluated the quality, adequacy, and timing of communication flow in their agency quite favorably. Some minor complaints about the speed with which travel checks, statistical information, or requests for information from facilities were processed were voiced, but no one complained about inaccurate or withheld information, and complaints about speed or timing were limited.

Louisiana communications data were treated next.

Louisiana

Louisiana supervisors noted information on changes in wording or interpretation of legislation, policies, procedures, and rules, and some production information for comparative purposes as useful information they received from their central office.

Information received for which these supervisors had little use included some Department of Health, Education, and Welfare publications and some administrative directives applicable only to the central office. The only needed information not currently being received was some more detailed statistical data indicating who was being served and who was not being served. One supervisor wanted such information. Three supervisors expressed no currently unmet needs for information.

Louisiana supervisors conveyed the following information about the quality, adequacy and timing of the flow of information in their agency. Three supervisors said that time lags were sometimes excessive. One of these said it took him from three and one half to six months to get a vacant secretarial position filled primarily because of slow authorization and hiring procedures. Another supervisor noted that field personnel sometimes had difficulty in understanding directives from the central office. Two supervisors gave positive general evaluations of their agency's communication flow. One of these said he usually

received one day service on memorandums. Three supervisors mentioned the agency's centrex telephone system as an aid to the communication process.

Texas supervisors' thoughts on their agency's communication process were presented next.

Texas

Information received by Texas supervisors from their central office which they found useful included directives on changes in wording or interpretation of policies, procedures, rules, and legislation; statistical and numerical data on production; status of clients and expenditures; in-service training bulletins; staff development offering flyers; information on new or special programs; and general information.

In the category of information for which these supervisors found little or no current use were some Department of Health, Education and Welfare publications and the Texas Education agency bulletin. One specialty supervisor said he received a lot of general information not relevant to his specialty. Two supervisors questioned the value of the statistical data they received from their central office because it had been highly inaccurate and unreliable in recent months. One of these went on to explain that he felt low quality inputs from field level personnel were partially responsible for the inaccuracies of the reports prepared by the central office.

Responses to the information needed but not currently received centered on the statistical and numerical data--four of the seven supervisors made some comment about it. Three requested that its accuracy and reliability be improved. One requested that the data be processed and disseminated more quickly. One requested more data be processed and that more sophistication characterize its processing. Another said he would like to see a monthly breakdown of caseloads by statuses prepared. Two supervisors wanted a directory of vendors of training services in the state prepared. Two expressed no needs for information not currently received.

The quality and accuracy of the flow of information in the Texas Agency were generally regarded as adequate but the timing was specifically criticized by five of the seven supervisors interviewed. Some of the reasons supplied by the supervisors for deficiencies in the flow of information in the agency were reproduction and distribution time lags, relative size and complexity of the agency and the state, and rapid expansion of the agency with the plethora of new people accompanying it. Specific complaints centered on the late payments of vendors, clients, and agency personnel travel claims discussed in the plans and policies section and the late, inaccurate, and unreliable statistical reports discussed above.

Rewards accruing to supervisors as a result of their vocational rehabilitation employment were the subject of the next section.

Supervisors' Rewards

The purpose of this section was to discover what satisfactions the supervisors derived from their jobs. Questions were asked about absolute and comparative pay, opportunities for advancement, recognition, and other non-monetary factors making the job attractive. The basic division was between monetary and non-monetary rewards and monetary rewards data were examined first.

Monetary Rewards

In this category supervisors were asked what their current salaries were and how well they were paid, comparatively speaking. On the comparative pay question, they were asked to specify their basis for comparisons.

Data on the amounts of pay received by the supervisors interviewed in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas were summarized in the table on the following page. Louisiana supervisors were the best paid group among the three states with Texas running a fairly close second while Arkansas showed as a poor third. However, Arkansas supervisors were furnished a state vehicle and this perhaps compensated in part for the lower pay they received. The starting salary for counselors in Texas was near the top of the range of

TABLE 1

ANNUAL SALARIES RECEIVED BY REHABILITATION SUPERVISORS IN ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, AND TEXAS

	Arkansas	Louisiana	Texas	All Three States Combined
Average Salary	$8,800	$11,375	$10,888.57	$10,111.58
Modal Salary	$8,500	$12,000	$11,232	$8,500 & $11,232
Median Salary	$8,500-8,700	$11,000-12,000	$11,232	$10,500
Range of Salaries	$8,500-9,300	$10,500-12,000	$9,840-11,612	$8,500-12,000
Number of Supervisors	8	4	7	19

Source: Supervisor Interview, Question 10.1.

of supervisory salaries in Arkansas to give some indication of the disparity in pay scales between states.

On the question of comparative pay, Arkansas supervisors compared themselves to other state rehabilitation organizations, public school employees, employees of other state agencies within their state, industry, and other supervisors. They thought they made less than rehabilitation supervisors in other states, the same or less than public school counselors and administrators, more than employees of other state agencies within their state and the same or less than they would earn in industry. Interestingly, Arkansas supervisors did not compare their earnings with those of their counselors.

Among Louisiana supervisors, one said he felt adequately paid in comparison with others in his community. One said his salary was above that of comparable positions in other state agencies within the state and was among the higher salaries in his own department, the state department of education. One said his salary was above that paid in the public schools; another said he made more than principals of large schools in his area; but a third said school administrators earned more than he did based on the number of hours worked. No comparisons with counselors or with other states' rehabilitation organizations were made by Louisiana supervisors.

Texas supervisors felt they earned more than other comparable employees of the state of Texas, more than rehabilitation supervisors in other states, and as much or more than educational administrators with one exception who said he earned less, but they thought they earned less than employees in private industry, less than employees of the Federal government and less than other comparable people employed in the professions. Two supervisors noted that their salaries were not much higher than counselors earned while one said his pay was adequate compared to other levels in the agency.

This exposition completed the discussion of monetary rewards received by rehabilitation supervisors in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. The next section covered information on non-monetary rewards of supervisors.

Non-monetary Rewards

Non-monetary reward questions included one on opportunities for advancement, one on formal and informal recognition and one asking supervisors to name other non-monetary rewards making their positions attractive. Responses from the Arkansas supervisors were described first.

Arkansas

Of the eight supervisors in the Arkansas general rehabilitation agency, three said they were definitely not interested in promotions to state office level positions in

their agency. Another four were only mildly interested in being promoted to a higher level position in their agency. As one of these gentlemen phrased it, they were not "campaigning for promotion." The one remaining supervisor was enthusiastic about moving up to a position in the state office. The supervisors were in general agreement that opportunities for advancement would be present for those who desired them. These openings would arise through turnover and program expansion.

Five supervisors exhibited positive reactions to the question on recognition. No formal award was given to the outstanding supervisor such as was given to the counselor-of-the-year, but good supervisory performance was recognized by special attention in state meetings, letters, and oral praise for good performance particularly in the area of production and training, and by the granting of annual salary increments. One supervisor was new to the job, one was somewhat at odds with the administration concerning the philosophy of treatment of clients in his specialty program, and one cited length of service and retirement recognition to round out the responses to this recognition question.

The three major items named in response to the questions about other non-monetary factors making the supervisor's position attractive were as follows (number of mentions shown in parentheses):

(1) Opportunity of serving fellow humans (6)

(2) Freedom or autonomy of job and local operations (4)

(3) Seeing results of training and development efforts with staff (3)

Several other items received individual mentions. Non-monetary rewards of Louisiana supervisors were explored in the next section.

Louisiana

All four supervisors interviewed in Louisiana indicated that they were not very interested in a promotion which would involve a geographical move. One of them answered no on the question of interest in promotion, saying he would not move to Baton Rouge for a salary of $15,000, $3,000 more than he presently earned. Two others answered, yes, but limited their affirmation to a promotion which would not involve moving. The remaining supervisor said he would consider moving only if granted a substantial raise--$3,000 or twenty percent of his current salary. All four supervisors felt their opportunities for advancement within their state agency were somewhat limited because they were as old or older than people filling slots above them, and because they did not want to move.

On the question of recognition, one supervisor mentioned his annual evaluation as formal recognition. Other methods of granting recognition were informal compliments in conferences, oral praise, and occasional written praise.

Other non-monetary factors making their jobs attractive mentioned by Louisiana supervisors were (number of mentions shown in parenthesis):

(1) Gratification derived from seeing clients helped (4)

(2) Freedom to make own decisions (2)

(3) Pleasant contacts with professional people provided by the job (1)

(4) Professional status in the community afforded by the job (1)

Rewards from seeing the results of efforts to train and develop staff were not mentioned by Louisiana supervisors.

Answers to non-monetary reward questions given by Texas supervisors were disclosed in the following section.

Texas

Five of seven rehabilitation supervisors interviewed in Texas answered no when asked if they were interested in advancement. Reasons varied. They included an unwillingness to move, a too small salary differential, limited experience in present position, and satisfaction with present job. Two of these five had rejected higher level jobs previously. Of the remaining two supervisors, one was definitely interested in advancing and one wanted to advance only if it did not require a geographical move and had rejected promotions requiring such a move. Five supervisors said that ample opportunities for advancement existed in their agency while

one made no comment and another thought his own chances for advancement were limited.

On the question of recognition, Texas supervisors were generally agreed that they received little specific recognition for doing high quality work. The occasional evidences of superior satisfaction with supervisory performance included oral praise, good performance ratings, and solicitation of opinions on various questions by superiors. Two newer supervisors cited their promotion to that position as recognition of good performance by superiors. One supervisor expressed a different view saying he had never heard anyone complimented by superiors.

The most important other non-monetary factors yielding job satisfaction for Texas rehabilitation supervisors were derived from seeing their vocationally handicapped clients helped (five mentions) and seeing their staff grow and develop (four mentions). Other factors receiving single mentions were the autonomy of the job, the status and dignity of the position, the interesting professional contacts it brought and the opportunity to observe and act in a larger sphere of operations than the counselor does.

The consideration of data on supervisors' rewards has been completed. The next section probed supervisory feelings about certain types of rewards derived from serving as a counselor.

Counselor's Rewards

Supervisors were asked in this section what criteria governed counselor promotion, what kinds of recognition were provided for counselors, and what other non-monetary factors made the counselor's position attractive. Data on counselor rewards gathered from Arkansas supervisors were described first.

Arkansas

The first criterion for promotion was, obviously, a vacant higher level position. This criterion was mentioned by two supervisors. Other factors mentioned by more than one supervisor were as follows (number of mentions shown in parenthesis):

(1) Personality (particularly the ability to get along and work well with people and groups) (6)

(2) Performance (includes productivity, organization of work, quality of work, and ability to do a complete job) (4)

(3) Seniority or length of service in the agency (3)

(4) Experience (2)

(5) Attitude (2)

Several other factors including place of residence, dependability, educational background, interest, innovation, knowledge, and respect of staff received individual mentions.

These criteria for promotion of counselors appeared not to have been very well defined by the agency since four

of the eight supervisors interviewed indicated they did not really know what the criteria for promotion were before they attempted to define them. Staff morale probably would be considerably improved by a clear definition of these criteria and opportunity for advancement could be used as a motivating tool by supervisors if subordinates could be told how to achieve promotions.

In response to the question on formal or informal recognition provided for counselors, Arkansas supervisors mentioned several items. First, in the category of formal recognition, a counselor-of-the-year award was made annually at the state meeting. The recipient of this award was selected by a committee from the Arkansas Rehabilitation Counselor's Association. Then, in the informal category, oral pats on the back, annual salary increments, and favorable performance reviews were seen as methods of recognizing good performance. One supervisor also mentioned that top producing counselors were recognized by the agency director at the annual state meeting. Some supervisors definitely evidenced more concern about recognizing good performance by counselors in their replies than others did. Supervisors could probably do more to motivate their counselors through recognition of outstanding performance.

Two other non-monetary factors making the counselor's position attractive were mentioned by Arkansas supervisors. The first of these was the satisfaction derived from helping

vocationally handicapped clients to help themselves in becoming gainfully employed. It was noted that results of providing service can often be seen on a relatively immediate basis. This factor was mentioned by all eight Arkansas supervisors interviewed. The second factor mentioned by seven supervisors was the freedom or autonomy the counselor enjoyed in defining and carrying out his job. The variety of the work and the opportunity for attending workshops were mentioned by single supervisors as other non-monetary factors making the counselor's position attractive. These other non-monetary factors must be recognized as contributors to the recruitment and retention of counselors.

Counselor reward data collected from Louisiana supervisors were examined next.

Louisiana

On criteria for counselor promotion in Louisiana, one supervisor noted that a vacant position was necessary. This supervisor went on to say that he saw excellence of performance of counselor tasks as the primary criterion for promotion. A second supervisor said that the persons to be promoted were selected at the state level, and he had been unable to get one of his subordinates promoted. The remaining pair of Louisiana supervisors said that their state had no set criteria for counselor promotion. One of these commented further that the gaining of promotions was almost a strictly political process. Better defined performance-based

promotion criteria could aid supervisors in motivating counselors seeking promotions.

On the question of recognition for counselors, two Louisiana supervisors mentioned the Louisiana Rehabilitation Counselor's Association presentation of the counselor-of-the-year award. Three supervisors said they gave counselors oral praise for good performance. One said he wrote a report for his district each month emphasizing the positive aspects of counselor performance, particularly those centering on client service. One supervisor stated that professional people were expected to do a good job. Better use could probably be made by supervisors of recognition as a tool to motivate counselors.

The freedom or autonomy to define and carry out their own jobs within broad limits and the opportunity to see the good results of the service provided were the two other non-monetary factors named by all four Louisiana supervisors as making the counselor position attractive. The only other such factor mentioned was the satisfaction a counselor derived from the good image his agency enjoyed in the eyes of the community. The power of autonomy and service in instilling positive job attitudes should be recognized and used by supervisors.

Data on counselor rewards obtained from Texas supervisors were presented in the next section.

Texas

Two of the seven Texas supervisors said their state had no set criteria governing counselor promotions. Another said he did not know what criteria were used, but he then proceeded to supply some. The five supervisors from Texas who did supply criteria submitted the following list:

(1) Performance including the ability to handle the total job, to meet client needs and to handle problems as they arise. Capability, quality of work and acceptance of responsibility might also be considered under the performance criterion. (5)

(2) Production (2)

(3) Decision-making ability or judgement (2)

(4) Human relations skill (individuals and groups) (2)

The following additional items received individual mentions. They were interest in the rehabilitation process, knowledge of work, tenure, political loyalty, philosophical allegiance, initiative, and toughness. Conspicuous by its absence among these criteria was the necessity for a vacant higher level position before a counselor could be promoted. Opportunity for advancement should not be overlooked by supervisors as an incitement to excellence in subordinate performance.

Recognition given to counselors in Texas, as named by their supervisors, included the following items:

(1) Counselor-of-the-month and counselor-of-the-year awards made by the Texas Rehabilitation Counselor's Association. (One supervisor interviewed was a former counselor-of-the-year).

(2) Oral praise for good work sometimes in front of peers and/or community functionaries

(3) Written commendations in the form of letters or memorandums sometimes sent to the regional director as well as to the subject counselor. These items become a part of the recipient's personnel file.

(4) Printing of counselor names and outstanding cases in the agency newsletter

(5) Granting of salary increments

(6) Positive and favorable performance evaluations

Recognition was probably more used by supervisors in Texas as a method to elicit good job attitudes among subordinates than in Arkansas or Louisiana.

The only other non-monetary factor making the counselor's job attractive mentioned by all Texas supervisors was the satisfaction a counselor derived from seeing his clients progress from dependency into financial independence and self-support. The freedom to define and carry out his own job was mentioned as one of these factors by three supervisors. The status provided by the job was named by

two supervisors. Single mentions were accorded to the challenge of the work and to the associations with other professional people it affords. Service and autonomy deserve recognition from supervisors as powerful influences on counselor job attitudes.

A summary of collected information related to the directing function will be presented in the following paragraphs.

Summary

Chapter VII has been concerned with the directing function in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. Data on communication, supervisor's rewards, and counselor's rewards have been presented in it.

The section on communication asked for a listing of useful, useless, and needed, but not sent, items of information received by supervisors from their respective state central offices. It also asked supervisors for an evaluation of the quality, adequacy and timing of the flow of information in their agency.

Statistical and financial reports and legislative and procedural change information were regarded as useful. Better screening was requested to prevent information of limited usefulness, particularly H.E.W. publications, from being sent to supervisors. More and better statistical data was requested. Texas supervisors wanted a directory of training service vendors for their state compiled. The major complaint

on quality, adequacy, and timing of information flow focused on timing, as it was sometimes slow, but Texas supervisors also noted that their statistical reports lacked accuracy.

The section on supervisor's rewards was divided into monetary and non-monetary categories. Louisiana supervisors were the best paid among the three states followed closely by Texas with Arkansas running a poor third. The highest earning Arkansas supervisor makes less than the lowest paid supervisor in either Louisiana or Texas. Most supervisors felt their earnings were adequate but that they could probably earn more somewhere else than they did in rehabilitation work.

Among non-monetary rewards, opportunity for advancement and recognition were not very important to supervisors, but they gained a great deal of satisfaction from seeing their counselors' clients progress and from seeing their staff grow and develop. They also regarded the freedom or autonomy with which they were able to conduct their jobs as an important non-monetary reward. Supervisors generally thought opportunities for advancement were available for those who desired them.

Criteria for advancement were not very well defined or understood by supervisors in Arkansas, Louisiana, or Texas. Recognition was limited largely to that provided through the counselor's association, and to what praise was given the counselors by their supervisors. Individual differences among supervisors in the importance they attached to this

praise were evident as some emphasized giving praise and others said they expected good performance as a matter of course.

The freedom to define and carry out their own jobs within broad limits and the thrill of seeing clients become self supporting were the most important non-monetary satisfactions counselors gained from their jobs.

More attention to non-monetary rewards as a means of motivating counselors is warranted from all supervisors interviewed.

This chapter on directing has been completed. The next chapter--chapter VIII-- explores the control function.

CHAPTER VIII

THE CONTROLLING FUNCTION IN ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, AND TEXAS

Introduction

The basic control process is commonly taken to involve three steps--namely, setting standards, measuring performance, and correcting deviations. In addition to these major considerations, four concepts relating to control are significant to this discussion. These concepts involve general control, caseload control, budgetary control, and the control of authority to make and review decisions. The former two areas occupied the major portion of this chapter since pertinent information on the latter concept pair--budget and level of decision and review--has been more appropriately placed in another section for a thorough investigation and explanation.[1]

Control

This lengthy section explored several aspects of the control process. The section opened with a discussion

[1]Budgets were discussed in Chapter V as a planning device and level of decision and review were examined in Chapter IV on organizing as a key to decentralization of authority.

of a pair of questions directed toward the nature of the control procedures used by a supervisor and the time schedule for implementing these procedures. Following these questions were two questions focused on controls for new counselors. The frequency of the supervisory visits to the field offices and the frequency and purpose of supervisory accompaniment of counselors in their field work formed the next trio of inquiries. Answers were then sought concerning criteria for plan approval. Two questions attempted to ascertain the limitations and/or weighting of costs in the process of plan approval. The final question of this section examined the process of evaluation of counselor performance and the method of feedback of the results to the counselor.

Control Procedures and Their Implementation Schedule

Thw two questions asked in this section sought a description of these procedures set up by supervisors for the indication of progress toward established goals and the time schedule used for the implementation of these procedures. The responses from the supervisors, beginning with Arkansas, will be given in the following sections.

Arkansas

Evidently Arkansas supervisors had few carefully defined procedures for the meeting of established goals and objectives. Three of these supervisors offered no

answer to the inquiry, and another stated that the goals and objectives themselves were poorly defined. One said his area was a new one and he, therefore, had no previous standards from the past year. The remaining three supervisors described their procedures in terms of individual and group conferences with counselors, references to statistical reports on workload, encumbrances, and expenditures from the state office, and periodic reviews of selected cases.

In response to the question about time schedules for implementation of these procedures, five Arkansas supervisors said they had no time schedules for impplementation of procedures. One reported he had no specific schedules but implemented as needed through group and individual conferences with counselors. Another said he implemented new procedures as he became aware of them from his superior. The final supervisor said he checked implementation monthly, quarterly, and semi-annually.

Louisiana

In Louisiana, five of the six supervisors took the question on procedures to indicate accomplishment of established goals and objectives to refer to production goals. In response, they noted that annual referral, plan, and closure goals were set for each counselor. Statistical reports from the state office, individual and group

conferences with counselors, and individual case reviews were given as other procedures to indicate goal accomplishment.

With regard to the timing with which these procedures were implemented the objectives referred to above were annual objectives, but supervisors indicated that progress was checked monthly and quarterly as well as annually. One supervisor also indicated that he practiced a daily review of the work of all his new counselors.

Texas

On procedures for checking goal achievement, Texas supervisors reported use of monthly statistical reports, reviews of case records and individual conferences with counselors. The supervisors indicated generally that annual production goals expressed in number of referrals, plans, and closures were set. However, one supervisor said that in his district, three-year projections of referrals by categories, population growth predictions, and possible new programs were made. Staff needs were also projected for this three-year period. Progress toward goals was normally checked on a monthly basis.

New Counselor Controls

Two questions on controls operating on new counselors were directed to the supervisors in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. These questions asked the length of

time during which a new counselor's plans were carefully reviewed and the criteria used by supervisors in deciding when to relax this careful review of a new counselor's plans.

Five possible choices were offered to the supervisors to answer the question inquiring about the period of time during which all plans of a new counselor were carefully reviewed. These choices were three months, six months, and nine months, one year, and more than one year. Among the Arkansas supervisors, seven of the eight chose the one year period which agency rules specify. The remaining supervisor said he carefully reviewed a new counselor's plans only during his first three months of employment.

In Louisiana, five usable answers to this question were received. Three of these answers specified the more-than-one-year answer, one chose the one year period, and one said he made careful reviews for three to six months.

The replies that could be used from Texas supervisors numbered six. Three of these chose the six months time limit while one said he made careful reviews for six months to one year. The remaining two Texas supervisors marked one year as their careful review period.

The criteria used in deciding when to relax this careful review of the new counselors and their plans were the subject of the next question. These criteria fell into

two general classes for the Arkansas supervisors. These classes were one class for the written materials associated with cases and the other for more general criteria concerned with the over-all performance of the counselor. The following items appeared in the former class or set of criteria:

1. completeness and accuracy of all records and forms
2. adequate determination of eligibility
3. adequate plan justifying this particular vocational objective for this individual person (vocational objective should be mutually determined by counselor and client)
4. adequacy of case narrative (particularly an indication of what services counselor has provided for this certain client)

In the latter more general set of criteria for relaxation of careful review of new counselor's plans named by Arkansas supervisors were the following items:

1. conformity of counselor with agency guidelines and procedures
2. dependability of counselor
3. quantity of his work
4. quality of his work
5. nature of the relationship of the counselor with the other people he contacts in his job

6. personal impression of supervisor gained from conversations with the counselor

Louisiana supervisors supplied the following group of criteria for deciding when to relax their careful review of the plans submitted by new counselors:

1. adequacy of casework including its accuracy and completeness
2. adequacy of diagnostic information
3. quantity of plans and closures produced by the new counselor
4. degree of acceptance counselor enjoys among personnel of other agencies and among members of the community where he works
5. judgment of the supervisor based on observation of the counselor and interaction with him

In Texas the supervisors mentioned the following criteria for determining when to relax the careful review of plans submitted by their new counselors:

1. absence or near absence of mistakes, errors, or omissions from case folders
2. when casework met all legal requirements including inclusion of all required forms, proper affixing of all necessary signatures, and inclusion of all relevant information in case recording

3. counselor's demonstrated knowledge of agency policies and procedures
4. counselor's judgment seemed sufficiently developed for him to make correct decisions
5. practicality, feasibility, and thoroughness characterized his plans and these plans properly justified the course of action suggested
6. adequacy of eligibility determination
7. amount and kind of supervisory assistance asked by the counselor
8. general quality of counselor's work

Supervisors in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas exhibited concern for the client and practicality and extent of service rendered to the client, and concern for the agency in seeing that its legal and procedural requirements were being met. They looked at what their counselors did, said, and wrote, and, then, relaxed their careful reviews of a new counselor's work when, in their eyes, his knowledge and his judgment had been developed enough to merit such a relaxation of careful reviews concerning his plans.

Field Office and Territory Visits by Supervisors

Three questions were asked in this section. The first one asked how often a supervisor visited each field office in his district. The second one questioned the

supervisor about the number of times he accompanied his counselors in their field work, if ever, and the third one inquired about the reasons for accompanying counselors in the field.

Seven of the eight Arkansas supervisors said they normally visited each of their field offices once a week while the eighth said he visited his field offices as often as he was requested to do so. Among the six supervisors in Louisiana, one said he visited each field office every two weeks; one said he visited from once every two weeks to once a month; two said they visited each office once a month; and one said he visited each office less often than once a month. One Louisiana supervisor gave no answer to this question. The seven Texas supervisors were fairly evenly distributed among three choices. Two said they normally visited each office once a week; three said they made their rounds once every two weeks; and two said they usually visited each office once a month.

Combining the responses on frequency of field office visits, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas showed a total of twenty-one responses. Nine were in the once a week category; four were in the once every two weeks category; one said he visited each office every two to four weeks; four fell in the once a month category; and one said he visited his offices less often than once a month. Two replies were not classifiable.

The next question asked supervisors in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas if they accompanied their counselors in the field and, if they did, how often. Six Arkansas supervisors said they did not normally accompany their counselors in their field work while one said he did try to go into the field with his counselors twice a year. One supervisor did not answer the question. One of those supervisors who said he did not normally go with counselors said he did go to the field with his men once a year.

Of the six supervisors questioned in Louisiana four said they did not normally accompany counselors in the field and two said they did accompany counselors in their field work. One said he went fairly frequently with new counselors and occasionally with old counselors while the other said he made field trips with his counselors every two or three months. One of the Louisiana supervisors who gave a no response said he went when he felt the counselor needed help.

The seven Texas supervisors gave five no answers and two yes answers to the question on field accompaniment of their counselors. The time periods specified by the two Texas supervisors answering affirmatively were every two months or so from one and annually from the other. One of those supervisors who gave a no answer said he made exceptions if a counselor was experiencing unusual difficulties and on those occasions where agency policy dictated that

supervisors make field visits to facilities with the counselor.

A summary of responses on the question of field accompaniment of counselors by supervisors in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas showed fifteen saying they did not normally accompany counselors, five saying they did accompany counselors, and one not responding among the total of twenty-one supervisors. No markedly different frequencies of negative responses were noted among the three states.

The next question asked supervisors for what reasons they would accompany their counselors on field trips. Arkansas supervisors advanced the following reasons for going with their counselors on field trips:

1. on-site inspection of the premises by the supervisor is required by agency regulations before the approval of plans financing clients in farming or small business operations
2. as consultants on particularly difficult or trying cases at the request of the counselor
3. for observation and evaluation of how the counselor conducts himself and carries out his job
4. to help the supervisor get acquainted with the territory, the people and conditions that prevailed in it and the nature of the counselor's relationship with those people with whom he worked

Louisiana supervisors expressed a slightly different group of reasons for accompanying counselors in their field work. These reasons were as follows:

1. for purposes of counselor training (to show him how to do his job)
2. for purposes of evaluation and observation; to see how he operated and to see how he got along with clients, representatives of third party agencies, and the general public
3. for purposes of consultation on problem cases when asked
4. to give support to the counselor in dealing with problems or challenges and in carrying out public relations activities

Texas supervisors supplied a third set of reasons for field accompaniment of their counselors. These reasons were as follows:

1. visits for evaluation of new training facilities and/or new hospitals in a counselor's territory
2. for training and development purposes (particularly with new counselors)
3. for observation and evaluation of the counselor (particularly in his interactions with clients and referral sources)
4. for consultation and information purposes on problem cases or appealed cases

5. when required to visit clients by agency policy (specifically inspection of small business enterprises before plan approval)

Criteria Used in Reviewing a Vocational Rehabilitation Plan for Approval

The answers offered by the supervisors in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas to the question asking what criteria they used in reviewing a vocational rehabilitation plan for approval showed a great deal of overlap with the answers to the previous question which asked the supervisors about the criteria they used in deciding when to relax the careful review of plans submitted by new counselors. An important distinction did exist, however, between new and experienced counselors. All plans of a new counselor must be approved by the supervisor before they were put into effect while the plans of an experienced counselor, though they also were reviewed by his supervisor, were put into effect before this review.

Arkansas supervisors used the following criteria in their review of plans for approval:

1. written records, including the original client survey instrument, case narrative, and certification of eligibility
2. adequacy of client information, including medical information, testing where appropriate, and educational and experiential background

3. feasibility of plan in view of client's abilities and limitations, adequacy of proposed services, and contribution of proposed services to achievement of the vocational objective
4. compliance of plan with agency regulations and policies
5. counselor's opinion of client
6. expenditures of funds required by the plan

Louisiana supervisors noted the following criteria they used in reviewing plans for approval:

1. absence of mistakes in case folders
2. conformity to agency policies and regulations
3. feasibility of plans from the standpoint of the client's aptitudes, abilities, and capacities
4. completeness of basic information and medical information
5. establishment of eligibility and its certification by the agency's medical consultant
6. costs of plan

Three criteria used in reviewing vocational rehabilitation plans for approval mentioned by each of five of the supervisors interviewed in Texas were as follows:

1. establishment of client eligibility
2. compatibility of vocational objective with clients' needs, abilities, and limitations

3. compliance of plan with agency policies, procedures, and regulations

Several other such criteria were less frequently mentioned by Texas supervisors. Among these criteria were the following:

1. Was diagnostic development wide enough in scope (had adequate diagnostic information from specialists been obtained)?
2. reliability of counselor
3. cost of plan (specifically, are maintenance payments realistic?)
4. quality and adequacy of services provided by plan
5. quality of case recording
6. adequacy of client contact reports

Cost Controls on Case Service

Two questions were asked of supervisors in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas in this section. They were asked to identify the dollar limit, if one existed, on expenditures for serving a single case that a supervisor in their state was authorized to approve. Then, they were asked if the projected cost of casework services between one plan and another was weighted in the approval process and, if so, how this cost was weighted.

The standard answer to the first question on limits on supervisor authorized expenditures for an individual

case, received from all nineteen supervisors interviewed in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas, was that no limit on supervisor authorized expenditures existed. Supervisors in Arkansas did note two specific instances where counselors must have supervisory approval before they could put a plan into operation. These instances involved physical restoration cases requiring expenditures of more than $750 and all small business enterprise cases. Texas supervisors also mentioned the existence of several specific limitations on amount of expenditure a counselor could authorize without prior approval of his supervisor. Two of these counselor limitations which specified prior supervisory approval were investments over $1,400 in small business enterprises and investments of over $625 for prosthetic applicances.

Some ten of the nineteen supervisors interviewed talked about the most expensive cases in their experience in response to this authorized expenditure limit question. These expenditures on a supervisor's most costly case ranged from $1,200 to $14,000 among the ten estimates. Several types of cases were named, including heart surgery, mental disorder, amputation, plastic surgery, and long-term training cases.

The second question in this section asked supervisors if the costs of one plan related to another affected the chances of that plan being approved and, if so, how the costs affected the chance of approval. Eighteen of

the nineteen supervisors interviewed in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas answered that costs of a plan did not affect its chances for approval. The lone exception came from a supervisor in Louisiana who said he was more likely to approve a cheap plan than an expensive one because less money would be lost if the plan was not successful.

In the comments they made following their answers that costs were not weighted in the process of approving plans, the supervisors in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas said that the two factors which would be most heavily weighted were (1) the degree to which a plan met client needs and (2) the chances for the success of the plan. Two supervisors in Arkansas said that perhaps costs should be weighted, but that they were not currently. One Texas supervisor noted that an expensive case might be considered more carefully than an inexpensive one, but if need existed, client was eligible for services, and the prognosis for success was favorable, then the plan would be approved anyway.

Methods of Counselor Evaluation and Feedback of Evaluation Results

In this section, the supervisors were asked to describe their methods for evaluating counselor performance and their methods for communicating the results of the evaluation to the counselor. Evaluation and feedback data obtained from Arkansas supervisors will be presented first.

Arkansas

Supervisors in Arkansas seemed to base their evaluation of counselors primarily on performance considering such factors as number of referrals, number of plans written, number of successful closures, and quality of work. The conditions under which a counselor had to work and the quality of his personal relationships with others in his own agency, other agencies, the community, and his clients were noted as other factors influencing the evaluation. Counselor participation in community activities was mentioned as a factor in the counselor's favor in evaluations by one Arkansas supervisor.

Two principal formal methods of evaluation were used by supervisors in Arkansas. They were the annual rating of counselors by means of Arkansas Rehabilitation Service Form P-11,[1] and case reviews of selected cases which were performed annually by all Arkansas supervisors and were done more often by some supervisors. Another noteworthy fact was that the annual counselor rating process was only in its second year of operation and was regarded with some skepticism by some of the supervisors probably because of its newness.

The methods used in the actual rating process also showed a considerable amount of variation. Rating sheets

---

[1]A copy of Arkansas Rehabilitation Service Form P-11 Counselor Rating Scale is exhibited in Appendix Three.

for their counselors were filled out by supervisors alone in four instances and by supervisor and counselor together in the other four instances. Two of those supervisors using the joint rating procedure reserved the final judgment for themselves. The other two arrived at a mutual resolution of rating differences with their counselors.

Three of those four supervisors using the joint rating procedure began the process by asking counselors to rate themselves before the supervisor got involved. Two of these three reported that they found they were raising more ratings than they lowered, while the third reported about an equal number of raised and lowered ratings.

Feedback of results of the evaluation was generally handled by an appraisal interview, but, as was disclosed from the above discussion of the rating procedure only two of Arkansas' eight supervisors attempted to reconcile differences of opinion between themselves and the person being rated by mutual consent. In the other six instances, supervisors alone made the final decision although one of these six admitted he might be influenced by discussion of ratings with the counselor being rated.

Two supervisors commented on the link between ratings and salary increments. These supervisors saw the rating process primarily as a method of determining which counselors would receive annual salary increments.

The case review process involved a selection of a random sample of cases from each counselor's case files

and a detailed evaluation of the quality of the casework exhibited in these sample cases. Supervisors then discussed the results of the case review with the counselor involved pointing out the strengths and deficiencies shown in the cases. One supervisor emphasized the importance of follow-up to see that any deficiencies disclosed by the case review were being eliminated in subsequent cases.

Louisiana

The criteria used by Louisiana supervisors to evaluate their counselors were number of referrals, number of plans, number of successful closures, types of cases handled, balance of caseload among the various statuses in the total process, and attitude of counselor including his ability to accept constructive suggestions.

No mention was made of case review as a method of evaluation and supervisory annual rating of counselors was only briefly mentioned by one supervisor. Concentration in Louisiana appeared to focus on the on-going continuous appraisal of counselor performance, rather than on periodic appraisals or annual reviews.

The method of feedback preferred by Louisiana supervisors was the individual face-to-face conference. One supervisor emphasized use of two-way communication to arrive at mutual agreement on evaluations.

Texas

Criteria for evaluation of counselors named by Texas supervisors were quantity of work, quality of work, work attitudes, work habits, and observation of counselor interactions with clients, referral sources, and the public.

With regard to methods of evaluation, Texas had an annual performance rating sheet featuring evaluation on the basis of the first four of the criteria listed in the above paragraph. This performance review form was filled out by the supervisor, who then let the counselor look at it. Following the counselor's review, the rating was reviewed by the regional director. Counselor, supervisor, and regional director were all required to sign these rating forms. One supervisor criticized the evaluation form, saying he thought it was a poor one.

Two other methods of evaluation were mentioned by individual Texas supervisors. One kept a notebook on the performance of each counselor, but he had difficulty keeping it updated because he had too many subordinates. Another supervisor said he wrote a written report on each counselor's performance based on the casework done by this counselor approximately three months after the counselor had completed his orientation at the state office. Then, after writing this report and giving the counselor time to study it, he went over the total rehabilitation program

with the counselor. In other words, he was providing some follow-up training on the state office orientation after the counselor had been on the job for three months. Case reviews were not mentioned as an evaluation technique in Texas.

The method of feedback of the results of counselor performance evaluation used in Texas was an individual discussion between counselor and supervisor which emphasized the strong and weak points of counselor performance. One supervisor used statistical reports to buttress his feedback presentation while another used critical incidents. One supervisor seemed to rely on his counselors' right of appeal to protect them from an unfair performance evaluation on his part.

The control function of this chapter on the controlling function has now been completed. The next section in this chapter will introduce data on counselors' caseloads.

Caseload

Three questions were asked in this section on caseload. The first of these questions sought to determine the average size of counselors' caseloads for each supervisory district. The second question asked about the supervisor's feelings about this average caseload size and the third question asked supervisors how they thought counselors felt about the average caseload size.

Arkansas

The average of counselor caseload sizes for the eight supervisory districts in Arkansas was 112 cases per counselor. The range of figures quoted by the eight supervisors was 75 to 175 cases. Three supervisors quoted figures from their production reports while five made estimates of average caseload size per counselor. The figures concentrated toward the lower end of the range. In fact, only one was greater than 135. The highest estimate came from the supervisor in the Little Rock area, which had the greatest concentration of population in the state.

Supervisory feelings about this average caseload size showed a predictable split. The four supervisors quoting average caseload size figures of 125 and above thought current caseload sizes were too large. The other four supervisors quoted average caseload sizes of 90 or less and they thought average caseload sizes were about right. One supervisor noted that he would like to see the range of caseload sizes among his counselors reduced. Two supervisors stated that specialty supervisors should carry fewer cases than general counselors because specialty cases were usually more difficult to handle.

Supervisory projections of counselor feelings about average caseload sizes were also split. Five of Arkansas' eight supervisors said counselors did not want caseload sizes reduced from their present levels because it

would be difficult to obtain enough closures from a smaller caseload. The other three supervisors (again those quoting caseload size figures of 125 or more) said counselors would like to see caseload sizes reduced so they would be able to render better service to current clients and serve more difficult cases.

Louisiana

Counselor caseload sizes in Louisiana showed an average of 265 cases per counselor for the four supervisory districts. Counselor caseload size estimates for the individual districts ranged from 200 to 300. All four supervisors gave estimates of average caseload sizes for their counselors, although one later looked at his production report without altering his estimate.

Three of the four Louisiana supervisors said they thought current caseloads were too large. The remaining supervisor who gave the smallest estimate of average caseload size among his counselors (200) said he thought current sizes were reasonable. One supervisor recommended establishment of a maximum limit on caseload sizes. Another said larger caseloads retarded the quality of services given, but his comment was countered by another supervisor who said he was not sure a higher quality effort would emerge automatically if caseload sizes were reduced. The average of the estimates of ideal caseload size among these four supervisors was 187 cases per counselor.

Two supervisors thought counselors felt average caseload sizes were currently too large, but the other two supervisors thought counselors felt current sizes were quite acceptable. The former pair said counselors wanted smaller loads so they could improve the quality of service while the latter pair of supervisors said closure goals were more easily achieved if caseload sizes were larger.

Texas

The average of the counselor caseload size figures submitted by Texas supervisors was 138 cases per counselor. The low estimate was 110 cases and the high estimate was 175 cases. Six of the seven supervisors interviewed in Texas gave estimated average caseload figures for their districts while the seventh quoted figures from his most recent production report.

Supervisory opinions about the average caseload size showed five supervisors saying they felt the current average caseload sizes were near ideal levels. One supervisor said he thought average current caseloads among his counselors (current level: about 100 active cases) were a little small. He thought the ideal size would be about 125 cases (active). The remaining supervisor wanted smaller caseloads (approaching a level of 60 active cases) for his mentally-ill counselors. The concern of one supervisor was directed toward narrowing the range of caseload sizes among his counselors. Five supervisors reported they thought counselors were satisfied

with current caseload sizes. One supervisor reported they were satisfied currently, but would like to see caseload sizes reduced. Two supervisors noted that specialty counselors would desirably have smaller caseloads because their cases were usually more difficult.

The next portion of this chapter on control examines budgets or expenditure controls.

Budget

The budget is generally regarded in organizations as a control, as well as a planning device. However, the budgeting process in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas was either absent or rudimentary so budgets could not and did not operate as control devices. Expenditure reports were processed in all states and Arkansas had a report on future encumbrances of funds, but both of these devices operate after the expenditure or encumbrance is incurred rather than before, as a budget properly would.

The control implications of level of decision and review are explored in the subsequent section.

Level of Decision and Review

The level at which decisions are made and the level and stringency of review of those decisions must certainly be seen as a control device. However, the results derived from the questions on level of decision and review presented in Chapter V show that most decisions are made at the lowest

professional level of the organization, the counselor level. They are reviewed either by the counselor himself or by his supervisor so no attempt to control operations by making a careful review of decisions at the state office level is made in Arkansas, Texas, or Louisiana.

The section on decision level and review looked primarily at casework services. Control of some other processes such as hiring is retained at the state office level in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.

Chapter VIII will now be summarized since all the data marked for presentation in it have been discussed.

Summary

The established goals and objectives referred to in the question on control procedures were assumed to be production goals by supervisors in Louisiana and Texas. These supervisors checked accomplishment through production reports, counselor conferences, and case review samples. Timing of checks normally occurred on a monthly, quarterly, and annual basis.

Arkansas supervisors listed few control procedures (Arkansas does not have production quotas for individual counselors) and time schedules for implementation were not specified.

The quality of service given to the agency and to the client were the major points of concern among supervisors as they controlled new counselors in Arkansas, Louisiana,

and Texas. Particular emphasis was placed on the scope and legitimacy of the new counselor's written work.

Field offices were normally visited by supervisors once a week in Arkansas; once every two weeks in Texas; and once a month in Louisiana. Supervisors did not normally accompany their counselors on field trips by a ratio of three who did not to one who did. The most common reasons for supervisory accompaniment of counselors in the field were for consultation on problem cases and for observation and evaluation of the counselor.

Common criteria used in reviewing plans for approval by supervisors were establishment of client eligibility, feasibility of plan, conformity of plan with agency regulations, and the cost of the plan.

No limits existed on the amounts supervisors in any of the three states were authorized to spend on an individual case. Eighteen of the nineteen supervisors interviewed said costs would not be weighted in the approval process. Rather need for services and chances for success of the plan would govern an approval.

Evaluation criteria for counselors stressed quantity and quality of production and quality of interpersonal relationships. Methods used were continuous appraisal on a daily basis (favored in Louisiana), case review (favored in Arkansas) and periodic appraisal (most discussed in Texas). Individual conferences were the preferred method of feedback in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.

Averages of individual counselor caseload sizes were much higher in Louisiana (265) than in Arkansas (112) or Texas (138). Supervisory opinion was divided in Arkansas as to whether caseload sizes should stay at their present levels or be reduced. Louisiana supervisors thought caseload sizes should be reduced and supervisors in Texas thought they should remain at current levels. Supervisory projections about counselor feelings were divided between maintaining current loads and reducing them in Arkansas and Louisiana, while Texas supervisors said counselors thought current sizes should be maintained.

Budgets and level of decision and review were not used as effective control measures in Arkansas, Louisiana, or Texas.

Chapter VIII has reached its conclusion. Chapter IX, the final chapter of this dissertation, will offer its summary, recommendations, and conclusions.

CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This concluding chapter consists of three major sections. The first of these sections is devoted to a brief description of the contents of earlier chapters. Following that, some concluding remarks about the fifteen concepts treated in connection with the five functions of management are made. These concluding remarks will highlight supervisory views on management practices in each of the four states--Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas--where the research was conducted. Finally, some recommendations for further research on management practices in state vocational rehabilitation organizations will be presented. These recommendations will be based on questions or problems raised in the present study.

Contents of Previous Chapters

Chapter I introduced this dissertation. The dissertation is titled: "A Management Analysis of Selected State Vocational Rehabilitation Organizations from the Perceptions of Their Supervisors." It was

conducted by personnel from the Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute, Region Seven, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma. A short history of the development of this Institute is contained in Chapter I. The material in the chapter traced the evolution of the federal enabling legislation under which the state vocational rehabilitation agencies, where the research was conducted, operate from its inception in 1920 through the 1965 Amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act.

The contents of the next section of Chapter I covered the purpose of the study and the need for the study. Then, a section was devoted to linking the present study to other organizational researches using similar kinds of research methodologies. The final section gave a summary of Chapter I and a preview of the contents of later chapters.

The material in Chapter II presented the research design employed to collect the data for the study and the framework which was to be used for the analysis of that data. The research design involved determining the scope of the study including the information to be sought, the places where it would be sought, and the people, particularly their quantity, from whom it would be gathered. The development and refinement of the research instruments and the formulation of a timetable for the field work were the other major parts of the research

procedure which were discussed.

The framework for analysis of data showed a classification of fifteen concepts or areas of management thought under one (or more) of five functions of management--organizing, planning, staffing, directing, and controlling.

In Chapter III, the findings of the rather extensive pilot study conducted in the Oklahoma Division of Vocational Rehabilitation were presented. This pilot study was a full-scale test of the validity of the research instruments and the research design used in the larger study. On the basis of the experience gained in the Oklahoma agency some rearrangements and some additions were made to the research instruments. No major changes in the research procedure appeared necessary.

The material in Chapter IV considered the organizing function of management in the state general rehabilitation agencies of Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. This chapter on organizing presented the findings from the five concepts grouped under the organizing functions. These five concepts were organization structure, activities and proportion of time, span of management, level of decision and review and caseload (as it related to method of departmentation).

Attention was focused on the planning function in Chapter V. Four concepts were researched in connection with the planning function in the Arkansas, Louisiana, and

Texas general rehabilitation agencies. These concepts were plans and policies, budget, resources and needs. The first two of these concepts sought data on current operations while the latter two dealt with future projections.

The staffing function of management was discussed in Chapter VI. Information on recruitment, selection, and placement and training were sought in this chapter. Training of new counselors, experienced counselors, and supervisors was investigated. Opinions of supervisors about the products of graduate programs for preparing rehabilitation counselors were also solicited.

The subject of Chapter VII was the directing function. Data on communication between the central office and supervisors were presented first. Then monetary and non-monetary rewards accruing to supervisors as a result of their vocational rehabilitation employment were discussed. The final section of Chapter VII looked at certain counselor rewards with a particular view toward their use by supervisors to motivate counselors to excell.

The information in Chapter VIII explored the controlling function of management. Most of the data it contained were explained in a section on control. Investigated in this section were general control procedures, controls exercised over new counselors, direct contact controls through visits to field offices and field trips with counselors,

criteria governing approval of plans, cost limits and weighting of costs in case service, and counselor evaluation. Other concepts considered in this chapter were caseload measurement, budgets, and making and review of decisions as they relate to the controlling process.

The next section of this chapter will summarize some conclusions about the concept areas investigated in this study.

Conclusions

Conclusions drawn from the investigation of the concept areas grouped under each of the five functions of management are expressed. The conclusions from the organizing concepts will be discussed first.

Conclusions from the Organizing Function

The organization structures were basically the same in all four of the states--Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas--studied. The rehabilitation agencies were located in the state Department of Education. They were typical line and staff structures. They had three basic levels--central office, supervisory, and counselor. Staff services were concentrated at the central office level primarily because of the size of the agencies. The hierarchy showed five levels or positions between counselor and state director in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. Oklahoma had only four positions

in the hierarchy at the time the research was conducted, but has since added one, so she has five like her sister states in the region.

Activities of both supervisors and counselors and proportion of time allotted to them were considered. The supervisors in all of the states saw the training and development of their staff, especially counselors, and consultations with counselors and their problem cases as the two most important parts of their jobs. These two activities achieved high rankings in proportion of supervisory time occupied in all four of the states, but they deserved more time in the opinions of the supervisors. Paperwork and travel time were seen as necessary evils to be reduced where possible by supervisors in all four states. More attention to planning appeared desirable in Arkansas and Louisiana. More time might profitably be spent on public relations in Arkansas.

Paperwork appeared to be the bane of the counselor's existence occupying not less than one-fourth of his time in any of the four states according to supervisory estimates. This burden could be reduced by delegation of paperwork to the counselor's subordinates if such delegation could gain official sanction. Texas and Arkansas are moving in this direction. Counseling was seen as the most important counselor activity while more counselor time on public relations and placement seems

warranted in all states visited except Oklahoma. Perhaps the answer to increased activity in these two areas, as suggested by some supervisors, is the hiring of full-time specialists to prosecute them.

The span of management measured in average number of counselors supervised ranged from 8.5 in Arkansas to 16.67 in Louisiana. Oklahoma was near Arkansas with an average of 9.1 while Texas supervisors averaged 13.0 counselors each. All states had average ideal spans lower than actual span averages except Arkansas where the ideal span average was slightly higher.

A change in the mix of specialized and general counselors should lead to either no change or to a decrease in the span of management, but it seldom should lead to an increase in span in the opinion of the supervisors.

Most casework decisions were made at the counselor level in these organizations in all of the four states visited. Occasional special cases specified in the policies and procedures of the individual states caused the level of decision to be raised. Some decisions other than casework (for example, personnel decisions) did appear to be made at the state office level of the organizations.

Most casework decisions were reviewed at either the counselor or supervisory levels in all of the agencies

where research was conducted. The state office personnel became involved in either the making or review of decisions only in exceptional cases and, then, usually in response to a request from lower levels.

Caseload was treated under the organizing function for the clue it gave to the method of departmentation employed by the state rehabilitation agencies. Two principal methods of departmentation are employed with regard to client services in the states visited. They are territorial departmentation and customer departmentation on the basis of particular disabilities. A trend toward more use of customer departmentation was evident particularly in areas of population concentration. Louisiana had the greatest specialization among the states visited, but Texas appeared to be moving toward more specialization faster than were Arkansas and Oklahoma.

Conclusions from the Planning Function

New programs or innovations were attributed to three sources--community interest groups, field level rehabilitation personnel, and state office program planning personnel in Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas, although Louisiana supervisors attributed less importance to the first two of these sources than to the third. Most supervisors thought the objective setting and planning process was operating well in their respective agencies and they made few suggestions for changes.

Production goals were set by the counselors in Oklahoma, Arkansas and Texas. However, counselors in all three of these states set their own goals with some knowledge of stated or implied agency guidelines. In Louisiana, supervisors with one exception said they set counselor goals by division of the district goals given them by the state office. The procedure which allowed counselors to set their own production goals was a relatively new one except in Arkansas. Oklahoma and Texas were in their third year of use when the research visit occurred while one Louisiana supervisor reported he had used it only in the current year. Supervisory feeling about this new procedure was positive from supervisors in Oklahoma and Texas and from the one Louisiana supervisor who employed it. Production had generally increased in Oklahoma and the Louisiana supervisor reported a fifteen percent increase in plans written. Texas had not met its production quota in the previous two years, probably because many counselors were inexperienced. The state quota in Texas had been met for the current year.

Pressure for additional closures late in the year was familiar to supervisors in Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Texas but it had not been experienced recently by Arkansas supervisors. This pressure was thought to emanate from Washington and to descend through the hierarchy to the supervisors.

The supervisors in all four states felt that current agency policies met the needs of the disabled very adequately. However, more complaints about current policies were voiced in Texas than in other states. Some supervisors in Texas and Oklahoma advocated policy changes to provide vocational rehabilitation services to the economically and socially deprived. Supervisors in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas noted that service to some more severely handicapped groups was restricted by resource limitations.

A formal budgeting process existed only in Oklahoma and Texas, although Arkansas planned to install one for the following year. Individual counselor budgets seemed desirable, but flexibility must characterize the budgeting process if it was to be used with favorable results.

The problem of exhausting the supply of available case service money before the end of a fiscal period was solved by either raising additional funds from inside or outside sources or by concentrating on work which did not require expenditures of case service funds.

Inside sources of reserve funds appeared to exist only in Oklahoma and Texas. These inside sources included transfers from other counselors and supervisory and state office reserves. Third party agencies were often tapped for outside reserves in emergencies.

The primary need in the resources area was for more staff in all four of the states. This included counselors and support staff, particularly secretaries. More professional personnel, particularly psychologists and psychiatrists, were requested in Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana.

In the physical facilities area more and better offices and facilities for serving the needs of special disability groups such as the mentally ill, alcoholics, public offenders, and the mentally retarded were commonly appearing items. Testing and evaluation units were desired by Texas supervisors.

Almost all supervisors interviewed thought full-value was being squeezed from current expenditures. The real need was increased appropriations, not reallocations of current money.

An added sum of money would have gone first to additions to staff in Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Texas. Arkansas would have spent additional money first on an expansion of casework services (They had no money for casework service at the time the research was conducted). In addition to the two items mentioned above money would have gone to salary increases, more and better offices, and specialized facilities.

The average of supervisory estimates of the volume of unmet needs for vocational rehabilitation services

was lowest in Oklahoma (46 percent) and highest in Texas (148 percent). Arkansas and Louisiana averages of supervisory estimates fell between these figures at 81 percent and 92 percent respectively. It was apparent from these figures that supervisors thought the volume of unmet needs was substantial in all the states visited.

Conclusions from the Staffing Function

Decisions on placement of new counselors were governed by existence of vacant positions and need for services in all states. Need for services is predicted on the basis of population, number of referrals, volume of intake, current caseload sizes, and location of present or new facilities or programs.

Point of involvement of supervisors in the recruitment/selection/placement process showed all Oklahoma supervisors involved in recruiting while only seven of eleven pictured themselves as involved in selection and placement. Arkansas showed decreasing involvement as the steps of the process progressed with respective response counts of six, five, and four on recruitment, selection, and placement. Texas showed almost universal involvement in all steps of the process while Louisiana supervisors were involved only in placement if at all.

Sources of applicants for counselor positions common to all states were (1) college and university recruits; (2) public school personnel; and (3) employees of other

state agencies such as welfare and employment and (4) self-referrals resulting primarily from contacts with present employees. Only Texas mentioned counselors "pirated" from other states.

Education and work experience were the most commonly cited criteria for selection of successful applicants for counselor positions in the four states. Personality variables were mentioned among these selection criteria in Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Texas. Positive interest in rehabilitation work was named as a criterion in Oklahoma and Arkansas. Politics played a major role in selection in Louisiana.

To ease current recruiting difficulties, Oklahoma and Arkansas indicated a need for higher salaries. Louisiana needed higher job specifications and less political involvement in the hiring process. Texas had few current problems in recruiting because salaries were relatively high. Hiring more women counselors was suggested in Oklahoma and Arkansas.

Training of new counselors, graduates or rehabilitation counselor training programs, experienced counselors, and supervisors was explored.

Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Texas had one-week orientation programs in the state office for new counselors, while Louisiana's orientation program runs for three weeks. After this initial orientation, the new counselor's

training became the duty of the supervisor and the experienced counselors with whom he worked. This on-the-job training was supplemented by attendance at appropriate workshops as traineeships were available and counselors could be spared from their work.

Counselors were considered as new counselors in all four states throughout their initial year of employment. However, some individual variations did appear in the degree to which this established probationary period was rigidly enforced.

The average of supervisory estimates of the proportion of a new counselor's time spent on training activities during probation was around twenty-five percent except in Texas where the average of estimates was about half that much. New counselors were expected to produce approximately half as many closures as experienced counselors in all four states. Suggestions for improving new counselor training were orientation after field experience, possible simulation training, and longer orientation periods.

Rehabilitation counselor training program graduates from Oklahoma State University, Texas Technological University, and the University of Texas at Austin were familiar to the supervisors interviewed. The Oklahoma State graduates drew the highest praise from their supervisors. The main criticism of graduates was that they

were too theoretical and too psychologically oriented and were not well versed in the practical aspects of rehabilitation casework.

In-service training for experienced counselors featured state, regional, bi-district, and district training sessions. The program was recognized as a limited one, but the supervisors felt it was improving.

Outside training provisions for experienced counselors covered workshop attendance, permission to take a limited number of courses while working, and educational leave. Arkansas and Oklahoma pay tuition and books for courses taken while employed and Oklahoma alone provides some support for employees on educational leave. Suggestions for improvement in outside training provisions were provision of support for educational study in Louisiana and Texas and for more support in Arkansas. More participation of and interaction among workshop participants and more field trips to other states to observe their operations and facilities were also suggested as outside training improvements.

The most frequently expressed need among the supervisors interviewed was for management training although some supervisors did indicate a desire for training in other areas. Supervisors were subject to the same outside training provisions governing counselors in all the states visited.

Conclusions from the Directing Function

Information on changes in wording or interpretation of legislation, policies, procedures, and rules, information on changes or innovations in programs and certain numerical and financial reports were the useful communications from their central offices noted most frequently by supervisors. Better screening of Health, Education, and Welfare Department publications was requested to prevent useless information from being transmitted to the supervisors. More extensive, more frequent, and, in the case of Texas supervisors at least, more accurate numerical and financial data were desired by supervisors in states other than Oklahoma. Oklahoma's statistical and numerical reporting system appeared to be noticeably superior to that of the other states studied.

Supervisors in Arkansas had no major complaints about the quality, adequacy, and timing of the flow of information in their agency. Louisiana supervisors said communications were sometimes slow. Those interviewed in Texas complained about the speed and accuracy of their financial and numerical reports. Oklahoma supervisors noted that the pending transfer of the vocational rehabilitation agency from the Department of Education to the Department of Welfare had disrupted operations and communication flow in their agency.

Supervisory salaries were decidedly lower in Arkansas than in the other states studied. Most

were too theoretical and too psychologically oriented and were not well versed in the practical aspects of rehabilitation casework.

In-service training for experienced counselors featured state, regional, bi-district, and district training sessions. The program was recognized as a limited one, but the supervisors felt it was improving.

Outside training provisions for experienced counselors covered workshop attendance, permission to take a limited number of courses while working, and educational leave. Arkansas and Oklahoma pay tuition and books for courses taken while employed and Oklahoma alone provides some support for employees on educational leave. Suggestions for improvement in outside training provisions were provision of support for educational study in Louisiana and Texas and for more support in Arkansas. More participation of and interaction among workshop participants and more field trips to other states to observe their operations and facilities were also suggested as outside training improvements.

The most frequently expressed need among the supervisors interviewed was for management training although some supervisors did indicate a desire for training in other areas. Supervisors were subject to the same outside training provisions governing counselors in all the states visited.

Conclusions from the Directing Function

Information on changes in wording or interpretation of legislation, policies, procedures, and rules, information on changes or innovations in programs and certain numerical and financial reports were the useful communications from their central offices noted most frequently by supervisors. Better screening of Health, Education, and Welfare Department publications was requested to prevent useless infor[redacted] being transmitted to the supervisors. [redacted]re frequent, and, in the case of [redacted]ast, more accurate numerical and [redacted]ed by supervisors in states other[redacted]a's statistical and numerical re[redacted]d to be noticeably superior to that o[redacted] studied.

Supervisors in [redacted] had no major complaints about the quality, adequacy, and timing of the flow of information in their agency. Louisiana supervisors said communications were sometimes slow. Those interviewed in Texas complained about the speed and accuracy of their financial and numerical reports. Oklahoma supervisors noted that the pending transfer of the vocational rehabilitation agency from the Department of Education to the Department of Welfare had disrupted operations and communication flow in their agency.

Supervisory salaries were decidedly lower in Arkansas than in the other states studied. Most

supervisors seemed reasonably content with their earnings but felt they could earn more elsewhere than they did working in rehabilitation.

Among non-monetary rewards, supervisors derived their greatest satisfaction from seeing the growth and development of their staff, from the freedom and autonomy they enjoyed in performing their job duties, and from the progress they saw clients make in becoming self-supporting. Neither opportunities for advancement or recognition appeared very important to the supervisors.

Supervisors thought counselors would be more interested in advancement if criteria for promotion were better defined so they would know how to seek higher level jobs.

Recognition was not being used by supervisors or the agency as a tool to motivate counselors to excell in their jobs to the degree that it could have been.

Counselors, like supervisors, seemed to like their jobs and stay in them because of the opportunity for gratification of the service motive through helping clients and the autonomy that prevailed in defining and carrying out their job duties.

Neither supervisors or counselors appear to be employed in rehabilitation with expectations of high monetary reward.

Conclusions from the Controlling Function

General control procedures and the schedule for implementing them, controls for new counselors, frequency of field office visits, frequency and reasons for field trips with counselors, criteria for plan approval, limits and weighting of costs in the approval process, and counselor evaluation were discussed in the control section.

The principal general control procedures named by supervisors in Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Texas were production controls. Production was checked on a monthly and an annual basis. General control procedures were relatively absent in Arkansas judging from the responses of her supervisors.

Most supervisors in all the states said they carefully reviewed a new counselor's plans for the first year of his employment. As a group, Louisiana supervisors displayed the greatest caution with half the supervisors saying they reviewed plans carefully for more than one year. Three Texas supervisors chose six months as the period of careful review.

The two major aspects considered in deciding to relax the careful review of plans written by new counselors in all the four states were the service proposed for the client from the standpoint of its adequacy, feasibility and practicality and the scope, completeness, accuracy, and legal and procedural conformity of the

written records.

Supervisors in Oklahoma and Arkansas normally visited each field office once a week while Texas supervisors were more likely to visit once every two weeks. Louisiana supervisors visited less often with some going only once a month. Among all supervisors in all states, half the supervisors visited at one week intervals.

Supervisors generally went on field trips with counselors in Oklahoma, while they generally did not go in the other states visited. Supervisors accompanied counselors as consultants and for observation and evaluation. Those who did not make field trips with counselors refrained for fear of undermining the counselor's self-confidence or his status with clients or third parties.

Criteria for review of experienced counselors' plans were not substantially different enough from those for new counselors to justify repetition in these conclusions. However, one added element, cost of plan, surfaced among these criteria.

No dollar limits on spending which could be authorized by supervisors on an individual case were discovered in any of the states visited. Thirty of the thirty-two supervisors interviewed said costs were not weighted in the approval process. Need and eligibility of client and prediction of success of the plan were more important than costs in approval.

Evaluation methods in use in the four states included continuous appraisal on the basis of day-to-day interactions, periodic evaluation, and case review. All three methods were used in Arkansas and Oklahoma while case reviews were not mentioned in Louisiana or Texas.

Criteria for counselor evaluation focused on quantity and quality of production and quality of interpersonal relationships. Some criticism of evaluation forms in use in their agencies was voiced by Oklahoma and Texas supervisors.

Feedback of evaluation was by the individual conference. Degree of subordinate participation in the evaluation and feedback processes varied widely among the individual supervisors.

Averages of counselor caseload size figures given by supervisors from the four states were Oklahoma: 185; Arkansas: 112; Louisiana: 265; and Texas: 138. Supervisory opinions about these caseload size figures were divided. Some supervisors reasoned that better service could be given to clients if caseloads were smaller. These generally were the supervisors whose counselors carried larger caseloads. Other supervisors said smaller caseloads made it harder to meet closure goals. However, Arkansas counselors with small caseloads have closure goals as high or higher than counselors in other states and they meet them consistently.

When asked how they thought counselors felt about average caseload sizes, most supervisors said they felt the counselors held the same view expressed by the supervisor in response to the preceding question. This meant some counselors thought caseloads should be reduced and others thought they should be maintained at present levels. Caseload sizes should probably be reduced in Louisiana.

The budgeting process was well enough developed to be operated as a control device only in Oklahoma. Self-control was exercised by the Oklahoma counselor since he knew how much he had to spend during the year, and the sequential release provision prevented him from spending it all in the first three months of the year. Development of a budgeting process incorporating adequate flexibility was probably desirable for the rehabilitation agencies in Arkansas and Louisiana.

Decision level and review gives an indication of control in organizations and near maximum decentralization of control over casework decisions was found in all the states participating in the research. Decentralization was not so extensive in all areas of operations as it was in casework, however.

The final section of this chapter will cover recommendations for further research.

Recommendations

This study points to several areas where further research seems desirable, including the following:

1. An in-depth study of uses of time by counselors and supervisors to see if their actual activities and time allocations correspond to what they reported in this study.
2. A study of the merits and demerits of counselor specialization in particular types of disabilities.
3. A study or field experiment attempting to maximize delegation of non-counseling activities, particularly paperwork, to sub-professional personnel with a view to effects of such delegation on quality and quantity of cases worked.
4. A comprehensive area study to determine the volume of needs for vocational rehabilitation services which are not currently being served.
5. A study to indicate the feasibility and possible consequences of instituting a formal budgeting process in states currently without one.

Summary

The material in Chapter IX first indicated the contents of previous chapters. Then it gave a limited description of the research findings and conclusions presented in Chapters III through VIII. The final portion of the chapter indicated some possible areas for further research brought to light by this study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Blau, Peter M. The Dynamics of Bureaucracy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Blau, Peter M. and Scott, Richard W. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.

Clover, Vernon T. Basic Business Research. Lubbock, Texas: Rodgers Litho, Inc., 1958.

Danak, Jagdish T. and Keown, William H. Administration and Management: A Selected and Annotated Bibliography, Monograph Number 1. Norman, Oklahoma: Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute, University of Oklahoma, 1969.

Fayol, Henri. General and Industrial Administration. London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd., 1949.

Ferber, Robert and Verdoon, P.J. Research Methods in Economics and Business. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1962.

Hamilton, Sir Ian. The Soul and Body of an Army. London: Edward Arnold Publishers, Ltd., 1921.

Harbridge House, Inc. Factors Influencing Agency Effectiveness, A Study for the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. Boston, Mass.: Harbridge House, Inc., 1963.

Herzberg, Frederick, Mausner, F., and Snyderman, B.B. The Motivation to Work. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1959.

Holden, Paul E., Fish, Lounsbury, S., and Smith, Hubert L. Top Management Organization and Control. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1941.

Holden, Paul E., Pederson, Carlton E., and Germane, Gayton E. Top Management. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1968.

Jaques, Elliott. The Changing Culture of a Factory. London: Tavistock Publications, Limited, 1951.

Katz, Daniel, et al. Productivity, Supervision and Morale in an Office Situation. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1950.

Koontz, Harold and O'Donnell, Cyril. Principles of Management. Fourth Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

Marrow, Alfred J., Bowers, David G., and Seashore, Stanley E. Management by Participation. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Morgan, Clayton A. and Porter, Edgar B. Some Aspects of Supervision in Vocational Rehabilitation. Stillwater, Oklahoma: The Clearing House, Oklahoma State University, 1963.

Obermann, Esco C. A History of Vocational Rehabilitation in America. Minneapolis: T. S. Dennison and Company, Inc., 1965.

Roethlisberger, F. J. and Dickson, W. J. Management and the Worker. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1943.

Sloan, Alfred P. My Years with General Motors. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1964.

U.S. Statutes at Large, Vol. 41 (1920).

U.S. Statutes at Large, Vol. 42 (1921).

U.S. Statutes at Large, Vol. 49 (1935).

U.S. Statutes at Large, Vol. 49 (1939).

U.S. Statutes at Large, Vol. 57 (1943).

U.S. Statutes at Large, Vol. 68 (1954).

U.S. Statutes at Large, Vol. 89 (1965).

Woodward, Joan. Industrial Organization: Theory and Practice. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Zalenznik, A., and Christensen, C. R. and Roethlisberger, F.J. The Motivation Productivity and Satisfaction of Workers. Boston: Harvard University, Graduate School of Business Administration Division of Research, 1958.

Articles

Moriarty, Edward J. "The Rehabilitation Agency," Journal of Rehabilitation, March-April, 1959, pp. 24-25.

Myers, M. Scott. "Who Are Your Motivated Workers," Harvard Business Review XLIII: 1 (January-February, 1965), pp. 73-88.

Scurlock, Voyle C. "Supervision in State Rehabilitation Agencies," Journal of Rehabilitation. July-August, 1958, p. 7.

Urwick, Lyndall. "Axioms of Organization," Public Administration Magazine. October, 1955, pp. 348-39.

Proceedings

Hunt, Joseph L. Proceedings of the National Advisory Conference for the Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute at the University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, June 23, 1967.

Worthy, James C. "Men, Management, and Organization," Proceedings, Fifth Personnel Management and Industrial Relations Seminar. Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles, October 30, 1951.

Unpublished Materials

Bishop, L. Doyle and Keown, William H. "A Proposal for the Establishment of a Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute for the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration at the University of Oklahoma." Submitted to the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, November 3, 1964.

Danak, Jagdish T. "An Analysis of the Managerial Aspects of the Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor Position in Selected States." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, in preparation.

Johnston, Addison M., Jr. "The Implementation of the 1965 Amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act by Selected Rehabilitation Agencies in the South Central United States." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Texas Technological University, 1969.

APPENDIX I

SAMPLE COVER LETTER

April 12, 1968

Mr. Jack Barbee, Supervisor
Oklahoma Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
508 Will Rogers Memorial Office Building
State Capitol Complex
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

Dear Mr. Barbee:

The Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute for Region VII has been established at the University of Oklahoma. This Research Institute is funded by the Rehabilitation Services Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. A primary objective of this Institute is to undertake research in the areas of administration and management practices of state vocational rehabilitation agencies.

Currently the Research Institute is engaged in a research project concerning the content and evaluation of the rehabilitation supervisor's job. Mr. Edward Strader of our staff will be doing the field work in connection with this project. Your position as supervisor was selected for study because of its crucial importance as the link between the central office of the state agency and the counselors. We solicit your help and cooperation in completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to us by April 19. The state director's permission to conduct this survey has been obtained. The information that you will provide us in this questionnaire will be coded and kept confidential. We also assure you that no individual, geographic area, or agency will be identified in reporting the research findings in any projects.

We will then follow up this questionnaire with an interview session designed to obtain the data about the areas not covered in the questionnaire and to clarify questionnaire responses, if necessary.

We will appreciate your cooperation in contributing to this research effort.

Yours sincerely,

Edwin W. Mumma
Acting Director

EWM/mp
Enc/2

Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute

SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE

General Instructions: Please fill out this questionnaire as completely as possible. Following open-ended questions, space is provided for your answer. If the space is not adequate, please continue your answer on the back of that sheet. If you do not understand a particular question, please indicate what you do not understand about the question and then answer it to the best of your ability.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Questions:

1 Personal Data

1.1 Name _____

1.2 Professional title _____

1.3 Sex ( ) male ( ) female

1.4 Age ____

1.5 Marital status ( ) single ( ) married

( ) widowed ( ) divorced ( ) separated

1.6 Number of dependents ____

1.7 Your background

1.71 Please name the city and state where you spent the major part of your "growing up" years. City _____ State _____

1.72 What sort of environment was it?

( ) rural ( ) small town ( ) suburban

( ) urban ( ) other Please specify _____

1.73 Population of community

( ) under 1,000 ( ) 1,000-2,500

( ) 2,500-10,000 (2) 10,000-50,000

( ) 50,000-250,000 ( ) over 250,000

1.74 Father's occupation (categories from Bureau of Labor Statistics)

( ) 0 Professional & managerial

( ) 1 Clerical & sales

( ) 2 Service

( ) 3 Agricultural, fishery, forestry

( ) 4 Skilled

( ) 5 Semiskilled

( ) 6 Unskilled

1.75 Father's class of employment (by type of employer)

( ) private wage & salary worker

( ) government worker

( ) self-employed worker

1.8 Education and training

1.81 Number of years completed _____

1.82 Highest degree attained _____

1.83 Major field or area of concentration _____

1.84 Any additional or special training?

( ) yes ( ) no

Areas

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

1.9 Experience

1.91 Number of years in vocational rehabilitation _____

1.911 Number of years in public organizations _____

1.912 Number of years in private organizations _____

1.92 Please list the full names of all vocational rehabilitation organizations, or organizations doing a similar kind of work, with which you have been associated and the dates of your tenure in them.

	Organization	Dates of Tenure
1.	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____

1.10 Professional affiliations and recognition

1.101 Please list the professional associations of which you are a member. If you hold or have held any offices in these associations in the past five years, list the offices held and the dates of your tenure.

	Association	Offices	Tenure dates
1.	_____	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____	_____

1.102 Please name any professional honors and awards received in the past five years and indicate when the award was received.

Award	When received
1. _____	_____
2. _____	_____
3. _____	_____

2 Organizational Data

2.1 Name of agency _____

2.2 Number of years in present organization _____

2.3 Title of present position _____

2.4 Number of years in present position _____

2.5 Have you held previous positions in this organization? ( ) yes ( ) no

If yes, please list the titles.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

3 District Information

3.1 Name or number of district supervised _____

3.2 Number of field offices in district ( ) total

( ) general field offices ( ) specialized field offices

3.3 Geographic dimensions of the area served by the district (estimated square miles) _____

3.4 Population of area served by district _____

3.5 Estimated number of people in area who could benefit from vocational rehabilitation services _____

4 Recruitment, Selection, and Placement

4.1 How do you decide where to place a new counselor?

4.2 At what point in the recruitment-selection-placement process do you become directly involved?
( ) recruitment ( ) selection ( ) placement

4.3 What are the sources of applicants for counselors' positions?

4.4 What criteria are used for selecting counselors from the pool of applicants for counselors' positions?

5 Training

5.1 After new counselors arrive on the job, what do you do to train or develop them?

5.2 For how long is a counselor normally considered a new counselor? ( ) 3 months ( ) 6 months
( ) 9 months ( ) 1 year ( ) more than 1 year

5.3 While he is considered a new counselor, what proportion of his time is spent on training activities? _____%

5.4 How much production is expected of a new counselor as compared to an experienced counselor? _____%

5.5 Please describe any inside training programs the agency provides for experienced counselors.

5.6 Please describe any provisions the agency makes for experienced counselors to obtain outside training.

5.7 In what areas are opportunities available for your own training and development?

Control

6.1 What procedures have you set up to indicate whether the district's established goals and objectives are being met? Please describe these procedures.

6.2 Do you have any time schedule for implementing these procedures? ( ) no
If yes, please describe.

6.3 What is the normal length of time during which you carefully review all rehabilitation plans submitted by a new counselor? ( ) 3 months ( ) 6 months ( ) 9 months ( ) 1 year ( ) more than 1 year

6.4 Normally how often do you visit each field office in your district? ( ) once a week ( ) once every two weeks ( ) once a month ( ) less often than once a month

6.5 If you accompany counselors in their field work, how often do you do so? ( ) do not normally accompany counselors ( ) accompany counselors
Normal time interval between visits _____

7 Level of Decision and Review

7.1 Please check the agency level authorized to make each of the following decisions:

Decision	Counselor	District Supervisor	Central Office
(a) Acceptance of client	_____	_____	_____
(b) Formulation of case plan	_____	_____	_____
(c) Commitment of funds for diagnosis, physical restroation, and training	_____	_____	_____
(d) Closure	_____	_____	_____

7.11 Comments:

7.2 Please check any of the following factors which cause the decision-making level to be raised to a higher within the agency?

(a) Difficulty of case _____

(b) Cost of case _____

(c) Money for services or training will be spent out-of-state _____

(d) Experience level of counselor _____

7.21 Comments:

7.3 Please check the agency level authorized to review each of the following decisions:

Decision	Counselor Decision normally not reviewed	District Supervisor	Central Office
(a) Acceptance of client	_____	_____	_____
(b) Formulation of case plan	_____	_____	_____
(c) Commitment of funds for diagnosis, physical restoration, and training	_____	_____	_____
(d) Closure	_____	_____	_____

7.31 Comments:

7.4 Please check any of the following factors which cause the review level to be raised to a higher level within the agency:

(a) Difficulty of case _____

(b) Cost of case _____

(c) Money for services or training will be spent out-of-state _____

(d) Experience level of counselor _____

7.41 Comments:

8 Span of Management

8.1 How many counselors do you currently supervise? _____

8.2 How many counselors should you supervise under ideal circumstances? _____

8.3 Why do you consider this number ideal?

8.4 How would a change in the mix of specialized and general counselors affect the number of people you should supervise?

( ) raise it ( ) leave it unchanged ( ) lower it

Why?

9 Budget

9.1 How is the budget request for the operation of the district determined?

( ) individual counselor needs determined and totalled

( ) total needs estimated for district

( ) other (Please describe briefly.)

9.2 What criteria are used in determining the budget allocation of an individual counselor?

9.3 What happens if a counselor exhausts his budget allocation before the end of the fiscal year?

9.4 Do reserve funds or other methods of stretching resources exist? ( ) no

If yes, please name the source of the reserve and indicate the amount, or describe other methods of stretching resources.

Source and amount of fund or description of stretching method

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

10. Any additional comments:

APPENDIX II

Regional Rehabilitation Research Institute

SUPERVISOR INTERVIEW

1 Structure

1.1 Please draw a small chart of that part of the organization which affects you directly, showing all your direct contacts of a horizontal, vertical, or diagonal nature.

1.2 How does this structure help or hinder you in doing the organization's job?

1.3 If given the opportunity, what changes, if any, would you make in this structure, and why would you make these changes?

2 Caseload

2.1 What is the average size of the counselor's caseload?

( ) from production report ( ) estimated

2.2 What are your feelings about this average caseload size?

2.3 What do you think counselors feel about this average caseload size?

3 Recruiting

3.1 How could the recruiting process be improved?

4 Training

4.1 Do you have, or have you had, any counselors who have completed an existing graduate program for preparing rehabilitation counselors? ( ) yes ( ) no

4.2 Which programs?

4.3 Please give us a short evaluation of existing graduate programs for preparing rehabilitation counselors (on the basis of your experience with graduates or any other knowledge of programs you have).

How would you change these programs to improve the counselor's effectiveness or productivity?

4.4 Please give us a short evaluation of the agency's in-service training program.

What changes would you make to improve this program?

4.5 How would you evaluate the quality of the agency's inside training programs for experienced counselors?

4.6 Should the provisions for allowing experienced counselors to obtain outside training be ( ) continued ( ) dropped ( ) modified?

If modified, how?

Why did you give the above response?

4.7 Are there any areas where opportunities are currently unavailable, and where you would like to see opportunities provided for aiding your own training and development?

5 Plans and Policies

5.1 How are agency objectives and the plans for achieving these objectives determined? For example: if a new program is begun or a major change in an old program is effected, who conceives and pushes for implementation of the innovation or change?

5.2 How, if at all, would you like to see the agency objective-setting and planning process changed?

5.3 How are production goals set and implemented in the agency?

5.4 Are you sometimes asked to produce additional closures late in the year? ( ) no ( ) yes
If yes, what is the source of this pressure for additional closures?

5.5 How well are the current policies of the organization tailored to the needs of the disabled people of the state?

5.6 What policies, if any, would you like to see changed to increase the effectiveness of the vocational rehabilitation effort?

6 Control

6.1 What criteria do you use in deciding when to relax the careful review of all plans submitted by new counselors?

6.2 For what reasons would you accompany a counselor in his field work?

6.3 What criteria do you use in reviewing a vocational rehabilitation plan for approval?

6.4 What is the dollar limit, if one exists, in expenditures for servicing an individual case that you are authorized to approve?

6.5 Is the projected cost of casework services between one plan and another weighted in the approval process? ( ) no

If yes, how?

6.6 Please describe your methods for evaluating counselor performance and for communicating the results to the counselor.

7 Communication, Consultation, and Cooperation

7.1 What types of useful information do you get from the central office?

7.2 What types of information do you currently get from the central office for which you find little or no current use?

7.3 What types of information do you need from the central office that you are not currently getting?

7.4 How would you judge the quality, adequacy, and timing of the flow of communication within the agency? Why?

8 Budget

8.1 If the budget requested differed from actual monies appropriated, would changes in individual counselor or field office allocations be made on ( ) an across-the-board basis ( ) a selective basis
If a selective basis would be used, what criteria would be used for selection?

8.2 What criteria are used to make decisions among competitors for the allocation of reserve funds?

9 Activities and Proportion of Time

9.1 What activities do you perform, and what proportion of your time goes to each activity?

	Proportion of Time
1. _____	_____%
2. _____	_____%

9 Activities and Proportion of Time

Based on responses received from supervisors from another state in this region, the following list of activities performed by supervisors has been developed. Would you please list under the "other" category any activities which take a substantial proportion of your time and estimate the proportion of your time which is spent on each activity.

Activity	Proportion of Time
1. Travel	_____%
2. Review of plans and approval of closures	_____%
3. Consultation with counselors about problem cases	_____%
4. Public relations activities including speaking engagements, working with third parties, developing referral sources, seeking new placement openings, and talking to community functionaries.	_____%
5. Planning	_____%
6. Training your staff, particularly new counselors but also including old counselors and clerical staff	_____%
7. Training and continuing orientation for supervisor himself	_____%
8. Evaluation of your staff day-to-day as well as required periodic appraisals	_____%
9. Correspondence	_____%
10. Other (please specify)	
_____	_____%
_____	_____%

Separating the paperwork parts of all activities mentioned above, what proportion of your total work time is spent on paperwork? _____%

3. _____ _____%

4. _____ _____%

5. _____ _____%

6. _____ _____%

9.2 Would you change this format and/or time allocation if you could? ( ) no How and why?

	Reason Desired
1. _____	_____
2. _____	_____
3. _____	_____
4. _____	_____

9.3 What activities performed in connection with your job do you like or enjoy and why?

	Reason
1. _____	_____
2. _____	_____
3. _____	_____

9.4 What activities performed in connection with your job do you dislike, and why?

1. _____ _____

2. _____ _____

3. _____ _____

9.5 What activities do counselors perform, and how much of their total time do they spend on each activity?

		Proportion of Time
1.	_____	_____%
2.	_____	_____%
3.	_____	_____%
4.	_____	_____%
5.	_____	_____%
6.	_____	_____%

9.5 Activities performed by counselors and proportion of their time spent on each activity.

	Activity	Proportion of Time
1.	Intake work processing referrals	_____%
2.	Determining eligibility--gathering all information necessary for determination of eligibility	_____%
3.	Counseling with client to determine services needed	_____%
4.	Writing plans	_____%
5.	Arranging for services with persons other than the client	_____%
6.	Follow-up activities including counseling	_____%
7.	Closures	_____%
8.	Public relations activities	_____%
9.	Inservice training	_____%
10.	Staff meetings and consultations	_____%

11. Travel _____%

12. Planning _____%

13. Other (please specify)

_____ _____%

_____ _____%

100 %

Separating the paperwork parts of all activities mentioned above, what proportion of the counselor's total time is spent on paperwork?

_____%

9.6 In your opinion what, if any, changes are desirable in either the activities performed by the counselor, or the time allocated to their performance?

Why are these changes desirable?	Reason
1. _____	_____
2. _____	_____
3. _____	_____

10 Supervisor's Rewards

10.1 What is your current salary? $_____ per month

10.2 Comparatively speaking, how well are you paid?

10.3 What are your opportunities for advancement?

Are you interested in advancement? ( ) yes ( ) no

10.4 What kind of formal or informal recognition do you receive from your superior or the agency for doing high quality work?

10.5 Please name any other non-monetary factors that make your position attractive.

11 Counselor's Rewards

11.1 What are the criteria for determining if and when a counselor will be promoted?

11.2 What kinds of formal and informal recognition do you or the organization provide for counselors?

11.3 What other non-monetary factors make the counselor's position attractive?

12 Resources

12.1 Human resources

12.11 How could the utilization of the human resources involved in the vocational rehabilitation effort be improved by either additions to the current staff or changes in the ways staff is used?

12.2 Physical facilities

12.21 What changes in, or additions to, physical facilities would improve the quality of the vocational rehabilitation effort?

12.3 Money

12.31 How could the money currently appropriated for vocational rehabilitation be utilized more effectively?

12.32 If you were to immediately receive a sizable increase in your allocation of funds, with no strings attached except that it be used to contribute to vocational rehabilitation efforts, how or on what would you spend these funds?

13 Needs

13.1 Please estimate the volume of unmet needs for vocational rehabilitation services that exists in your unit or geographical area.

Why do you express this opinion?

14 Any additional comments:

APPENDIX III

OKLAHOMA VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION
STATE BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

PERFORMANCE RATING
(Professional)

EMPLOYEE'S NAME _____ DATE _____

JOB TITLE _____ GRADE _____ OFFICE LOCATION _____

PERIOD COVERED BY REPORT: From _____ To _____

Circle the appropriate score for each factor that most nearly applies to the work performance of the employee being rated and write a short statement, in the space provided, for each factor explaining why the employee was rated at the particular level in that factor.

NOTE: EMPLOYEES SHOULD BE RATED IN RELATION TO THE AMOUNT OF TIME THEY HAVE BEEN ON THE JOB, NOT AGAINST IDEAL STANDARDS FOR A SEASONED EMPLOYEE. ALSO THE ATTITUDES AND WORK OF THE UNIT SUPERVISED SHOULD BE GIVEN CONSIDERATION AS A REFLECTION OF THE SUPERVISOR'S PERFORMANCE.

I. OUTPUT - Ability of the unit supervised to meet required standards as to quality and quantity.

1	2	3	4	5
Unsatis-factory	Needs Improvement	Satis-factory	Above Average	Out-standing

WHY _____

II. TRAINING - Ability to determine training needs - To design and implement training programs to specific needs.

1	2	3	4	5
Unsatis-factory	Needs Improvement	Satis-factory	Above Average	Out-standing

WHY _____

III. ORGANIZATION AND PLANNING - Ability to devise work methods - To anticipate needs - Systematic - Etc.

1	2	3	4	5
Unsatis-factory	Needs Improvement	Satis-factory	Above Average	Out-standing

WHY _____

IV. JUDGMENT - Ability to make effective decisions without undue delay, etc.

1	2	3	4	5
Unsatis-factory	Needs Improvement	Satis-factory	Above Average	Out-standing

WHY _____

V. WORK RELATIONS - Builds morale - Public relations - Personal relations - Shows leadership qualities, etc.

1	2	3	4	5
Unsatis-factory	Needs Improvement	Satis-factory	Above Average	Out-standing

WHY _____

VI. DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY - Frees self of details - Unit continues to function in absence, etc.

1	2	3	4	5
Unsatis-factory	Needs Improvement	Satis-factory	Above Average	Out-standing

WHY _____

VII. MANAGEMENT PARTICIPATION - Suggests solutions to agency problems - Assumes responsibility readily, etc.

1	2	3	4	5
Unsatis-factory	Needs Improvement	Satis-factory	Above Average	Out-standing

WHY _____

VIII. CAPACITY FOR ADVANCEMENT - Can assume additional responsibility - Understanding of related functions - etc.

1	2	3	4	5
Unsatis-factory	Needs Improvement	Satis-factory	Above Average	Out-standing

WHY _____

IX. OVER-ALL PERFORMANCE - Consider all factors

1	2	3	4	5
Unsatis-factory	Needs Improvement	Satis-factory	Above Average	Out-standing

WHY _____

Add scores on each factor and divide by nine

_____

(Round to nearest whole number)

Adjective Rating_____

COMMENTS AND/OR RECOMMENDATIONS:

PREPARED BY:_____ TITLE_____
(Immediate Supervisor)

I HAVE READ THE ABOVE EVALUATION.

COMMENTS:

SIGNATURE OF EMPLOYEE RATED_____ DATE_____

APPROVED BY:_____TITLE_____

RATING CODE

5 - Excellent
4 - Very Good
3 - Good
2 - Fair
1 - Unsatisfactory

STATE OF OKLAHOMA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

CASE REVIEW

Date _____

COUNSELOR_____ SUPERVISOR_____

CASELOAD STATISTICS

I. TRAINING CASES (Status 18)

1. College _____
2. Bus. College _____
3. Trade or Tech _____
4. On-the-job _____
5. Other _____
TOTAL _____

II. PHYSICAL RESTORATION CASES (Status 16)

1. Dental only _____
2. Dental w/other _____
3. Other _____
TOTAL _____

III. OBJECTIVES (Status 18)

1. Teacher _____
2. Auto Mechanic _____
3. Barber or Beauty _____
4. Other _____

IV. CASELOAD MANAGEMENT

1. Total plans _____
2. Total referrals _____
3. Total cases accepted _____
4. Total #26 closures _____

NARRATIVE SUMMARY:

USE REVERSE SIDE IF NEEDED

ARKANSAS REHABILITATION SERVICE
COUNSELOR RATING SCALE

Date _____

Counselor _____ Office _____

RATINGS:

1. Does NOT meet requirements of position.
2. PARTIALLY meets requirements of position.
3. MEETS requirements of position.
4. EXCEEDS requirements of position.
%. FAR EXCEEDS requirements of position.

TOTAL RATING SCORES:

Counseling Ability _____
Job Application _____
Mental Factors _____
Personal Factors _____
TOTAL _____

COUNSELING FACTORS	FACTORS TO CONSIDER	RATING
Acceptance of Disabled	Acceptance of the disabled without showing fears or prejudices toward the disabled in general or toward certain disability groups. Does the counselor treat all clients on an equal basis?	
Case Recording	Thoroughness and skill of case recording and documentation of information. Consider frequency with which information is documented and reported and whether or not this is done routinely.	
Counseling Skills	Ability to create an atmosphere with clients which makes it easier for them to deal with their problems, and the ability to give clients appropriate and meaningful information, guidance and support. The ability to assist clients in understanding the agency's goals and services.	
Evaluative Skills	Ability to analyze and evaluate all the information regarding a client and the symptoms presented relate to the overall rehabilitation process. Consider familiarity with basic elements of psychology.	

COUNSELING FACTORS	FACTORS TO CONSIDER	RATING
Knowledge of Personalities	Knowledge and insight as to how the personality of a client and the symptoms presented relate to the overall rehabilitation process. Consider familiarity with basic elements of psychology.	
Knowledge of Testing	Knowledge, administration and use of standardized tests. If the counselor is not involved in testing of clients, consider his ability to analyze and make effective use of test results.	
Medical Information	Knowledge and ability as it relates to medical aspects of rehabilitation, medical terminology, physical restoration, disabilities, and physical limitations. The ability to comprehend and make effective use of medical information and reports.	
Occupational Information	Knowledge about jobs, their availability, requirements, salaries, etc. Consider knowledge about training methods, facilities, training methods.	
Placement Skills	Effectiveness of the counselor's placement efforts. If the counselor is not directly involved with placement, consider his ability to prepare and motivate the client for job hunting and eventual employment.	
Planning Ability	Planning done as it relates both to office and field work. Consider the ability to collect and utilize available information prior to making an evaluation or developing a rehabilitation plan.	
Professional Relations	Ability to relate with other professional workers in a cooperative and professional manner. Consider relations with physician, social workers, other counselors and employees.	
Utilization of Resources	Utilization of resources present in the community to serve clients. If the counselor is employed in a facility, consider his utilization of facility resources and other departments.	
	TOTAL COUNSELING ABILITY POINTS	

JOB APPLICATION	FACTORS TO CONSIDER	RATING
Dependability	Reliability in execution of assigned tasks, dependability in following instructions, punctuality, attendance and adherence to working hours and established breaks.	
Initiative	Demonstration of enthusiasm and interest on the job, capacity for sustained effort, motivation, industry and stamina. Ability to take necessary and appropriate action as required.	
Knowledge of Job	Awareness of job duties and responsibilities, ability to function effectively in application of assigned tasks, knowledge of the agency, its services, rehabilitation concepts, etc.	
Organization	Ability to organize ideas and work into a smooth flowing process, to coordinate and manage work activities in an effective and meaningful way.	
Quality of Work	Care, neatness, accuracy and exactness. Consider orderliness of work. Does the quality of work meet the requirements of the job?	
Quality of Work	Rate of production, productivity, rapidity and economy with which assigned work is accomplished. Is the counselor productive?	
	TOTAL JOB APPLICATION POINTS	

MENTAL FACTORS	FACTORS TO CONSIDER	RATING
Adaptability	Adaptability to changes, mental flexibility, open mindedness, receptivity to suggestions and ideas. Does the counselor judge new ideas on merit rather than by prejudices?	
Alertness	Speed with which new ideas are grasped, awareness and speed with which counselor understands and comprehends thoughts, ideas and instructions.	
Comprehension	Ability to grasp situations and draw correct conclusions, power of analysis, ability to reach a logical conclusion, to assimilate, understand and to plan accordingly.	
Concentration	Thinking power, ability to think effectively and to devote close mental attention to a problem and give it exclusive attention.	

MENTAL FACTORS	FACTORS TO CONSIDER	RATING
Judgment and Insight	Common sense, ability to reason, ability to recognize his own bias and prejudices and how these affect his relations with others.	
Resourcefulness	Imagination, originality, versatility, creativeness and ingenuity. Consider the counselor's ability to find solutions to problems regardless of obstacles.	
	TOTAL MENTAL FACTORS POINTS	

PERSONAL FACTORS	FACTORS TO CONSIDER	RATING
Acceptance of Supervision	Consider counselor's acceptance of and benefit derived from supervision. Does the counselor accept his role as a "team member" in the rehabilitation setting?	
Appearance	Suitability and appropriateness of dress in view of position held. Consider grooming, physical appearance, carriage and poise.	
Attitude	Attitude toward work, the agency, other employees and the disabled. Consider cooperativeness, relations with co-workers, friendliness, courteousness, socialability, compatability and sensitivity to the needs of others.	
Character	Sense of social and moral responsibility, sincerity, honesty, integrity and courage of conviction. Consider respect for the confidentiality of information regarding clients, the agency and its administrative policies, other employees, etc.	
Conduct	Does the counselor regard and conduct himself as a person comparable to the job he holds? Consider ethics, professional memberships, civic participation, etc. Does the counselor create a favorable "agency image"?	
Self-Confidence	Self-assurance, ability to conduct assigned work with confidence, ability to speak logically and convincingly and to express himself clearly and to the point.	
	TOTAL PERSONAL FACTORS POINTS	

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (Use Additional Sheet if Necessary)

Signature

Title