

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.** Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

# **UMI**

A Bell & Howell Information Company  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA  
313/761-4700 800/521-0600



**SOCIAL SERVICE BLOCK GRANT (SSBG) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT:  
ORGANIZING EDUCATIONAL AND SOCIAL ACTION NETWORKS  
AT THE LOCAL LEVEL**

**by**

**Barbara A. Bielawski**

**A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty  
in Social Welfare in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Social  
Welfare, The City University of New York.**

**1997**

**UMI Number: 9732894**

**Copyright 1997 by  
Bielawski, Barbara Ann**

**All rights reserved.**

---

**UMI Microform 9732894  
Copyright 1997, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.**

**This microform edition is protected against unauthorized  
copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

---

**UMI**  
**300 North Zeeb Road**  
**Ann Arbor, MI 48103**



©1997

**Barbara A. Bielawski**

**All Rights Reserved**

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Social Welfare in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Social Welfare.

4/15/97  
Date

4/15/97  
Date

Irwin Epstein  
Prof. Irwin Epstein  
Chair of Examining Committee

Harold Weissman  
Harold Weissman  
Executive Officer

Michael Fabricant

David Liederman

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

## Abstract

### **SOCIAL SERVICE BLOCK GRANT (SSBG) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT: ORGANIZING EDUCATIONAL AND SOCIAL ACTION NETWORKS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL**

**Adviser: Professor Irwin Epstein**

In the early 1980's major changes in federal and state social welfare policies spurred the National Association of Social Workers' (NASW) social action efforts on behalf of poor, disadvantaged, and disabled persons. One such effort--the Social Service Block Grant (SSBG) Demonstration Project--was conducted in an eastern state from January 1983 through June 1985. It was one of several states where block grant planning and allocation responsibilities were being partially or fully transferred to counties. This devolution of responsibilities to the states and localities created important new arenas for the profession's social action activities.

This dissertation describes and evaluates the SSBG Project. A State Chapter of NASW acted as a catalyst to enlist other organizations (schools of social work and county government human service advisory councils) in an effort to help social workers understand and influence the evolving implementation of SSBG state- and county-level policies and procedures.

The "differential evaluation" model of social program evaluation was utilized to assess the project's process and outcome at each of its four developmental stages--program

initiation, program contact, program implementation, and program stabilization. A case study research strategy was used in conjunction with the program evaluation model. The study employed an embedded single-case research design.

Findings indicate that the county networks were more successful in developing procedures for learning about the state and county SSBG planning and allocation processes and for disseminating that information to NASW members and their allies than they were in organizing collective social action efforts. Possible reasons for this difference in effectiveness are addressed.

The study's findings are related to other empirical studies that address social workers' individual and/or collective involvement in political and social action on behalf of the poor. The author notes that the basic changes in social welfare policy initiated by the Reagan administration continue to have an impact on the availability of social services in the 1990s. Social work organizations need to continue to explore ways in which their members can become effective advocates for the poor.

In addition, the efficacy of the "differential evaluation" model of social program evaluation for program managers as well as for researchers is assessed.

### Acknowledgments

Due to my promise of confidentiality, I cannot thank by name everyone who participated in the Social Service Block Grant Demonstration Project. However, I would like to recognize the support of the volunteer and staff leaders of the [State] Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers (NASW), the faculty and student liaisons from the participating schools of social work, and the social work liaisons from the participating county human service advisory councils. A special note of appreciation is due to the project secretary who kept track of the burgeoning amount of information that assembled as I became an integral part of the study state's block grant "network."

The analytic framework for this dissertation is the "differential model" of social program evaluation that views programs as typically evolving through sequential and interrelated stages of development. I've learned that dissertations, too, evolve through different phases. My committee members remained steadfast as the dissertation moved through its stages--some fruitful, some fallow. Irwin Epstein provided invaluable assistance as chair of my committee. He encouraged me to follow my interest in political and social action and was an inspiring and creative mentor during the years that I worked on this project. Michael Fabricant graciously joined the committee when Simon Slavin retired. Dr. Slavin helped shape the project in its earlier phases. Dr. Fabricant was

particularly creative in identifying areas for further research engendered by the study's findings. David Liederman, Chief Executive Officer of the Child Welfare League of America, began his social work career as a youth worker in public housing projects. He introduced me to political and social action during the 1960s when we both lived in Massachusetts. And Harold Weissman, Executive Officer of the doctoral program, was consistently reassuring at crucial points during my studies.

I started this dissertation when I was a faculty member at one of the study's participating schools and finished it while teaching at Iona College. My colleagues at each of these institutions provided insightful comments and encouragement. Dr. Greg Tully's "gentle" prodding was especially helpful during the final stage of editing the manuscript. And Susan Laudenback, who produced the manuscript, remained patient, creative, and accommodating.

My family gave me a great deal of emotional support during the years I worked on this project. At times they were understandably ambivalent about it--they would have preferred my presence at various family events when I was absent because I was working on "the dissertation." So a special thank you to my husband, Chet; to Karen and Amy; to Linda, Michael, Austin, Kristen, Taylor, and Haylee; and to Stephen and Stevie.

Finally, I owe a deep debt of gratitude to Dr. Max Goldberg, who "kept the champagne on ice."

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                       | PAGE |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .                                            | vi   |
| LIST OF TABLES . . . . .                                              | x    |
| LIST OF CHARTS/FIGURES . . . . .                                      | xii  |
| CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION AND SOCIAL WELFARE<br>POLICY CONTEXT . . . . . | 1    |
| CHAPTER II METHODOLOGY . . . . .                                      | 26   |
| CHAPTER III REVIEW OF LITERATURE: SOCIAL ACTION . . .                 | 117  |
| CHAPTER IV INTRODUCTION TO EVALUATION OF<br>PROGRAM STAGES . . . . .  | 155  |
| CHAPTER V EVALUATION OF PROGRAM<br>INITIATION STAGE . . . . .         | 189  |
| CHAPTER VI EVALUATION OF PROGRAM<br>CONTACT STAGE . . . . .           | 242  |
| CHAPTER VII EVALUATION OF PROGRAM<br>IMPLEMENTATION STAGE . . . . .   | 325  |
| CHAPTER VIII EVALUATION OF PROGRAM<br>STABILIZATION STAGE . . . . .   | 389  |
| CHAPTER IX RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS . . . .                    | 417  |

# TABLE OF CONTENTS (con't)

|                                                                                                            | PAGE |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| APPENDICES                                                                                                 |      |
| A. Case Study Protocol . . . . .                                                                           | 434  |
| A.1 Overview . . . . .                                                                                     | 435  |
| A.2 Major Tasks . . . . .                                                                                  | 441  |
| A.3 Evaluation Questions/Research Strategies . . . . .                                                     | 446  |
| a. Program Initiation Stage . . . . .                                                                      | 446  |
| b. Program Contact Stage . . . . .                                                                         | 449  |
| c. Program Implementation Stage . . . . .                                                                  | 452  |
| d. Program Stabilization Stage . . . . .                                                                   | 456  |
| B. Continuing Education Program Evaluation Forms . . . . .                                                 | 459  |
| B.1 County Meeting Evaluation Form . . . . .                                                               | 460  |
| B.2 Spring Forum Evaluation Form . . . . .                                                                 | 463  |
| C. NASW Delegate Assembly Priorities for 1982-84 . . . . .                                                 | 467  |
| D. NASW Areas of Concentration for 1983-84<br>Program Year, Adopted by the<br>Board of Directors . . . . . | 469  |
| E. [State Chapter's] Action Plan<br>Program Fiscal Year 84 . . . . .                                       | 471  |
| F. Summary of Selected Block-Grant Features<br>(From Peterson et.al 1986) . . . . .                        | 481  |
| G. Characteristics of Evaluation Questions<br>Selected for Analysis . . . . .                              | 484  |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY:                                                                                              |      |
| Reference List . . . . .                                                                                   | 490  |
| Selected Materials from the Case Study Data Base . . . . .                                                 | 500  |



# LIST OF TABLES

|                                                                                                                         | PAGE      |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Table 1.1 Project-Related Organizations . . . . .                                                                       | 14 - 17   |
| Table 2.1 Evaluation Questions and Strategies:<br>Program Initiation Stage . . . . .                                    | 31 - 33   |
| Table 2.2 Relevant Situations for Different Research<br>Strategies (from Yin 1989) . . . . .                            | 48        |
| Table 2.3 Characteristics of Study Counties . . . . .                                                                   | 69 - 70   |
| Table 2.4 Characteristics of Participating Schools . . . . .                                                            | 74        |
| Table 2.5 Case Study Tactics for Four Design Tests<br>(from Yin 1989) . . . . .                                         | 84        |
| Table 2.6 Evaluation Questions and Strategies:<br>Program Contact Stage . . . . .                                       | 89 - 91   |
| Table 2.7 Evaluation Questions and Strategies:<br>Program Implementation Stage . . . . .                                | 92 - 95   |
| Table 2.8 Evaluation Questions and Strategies:<br>Program Stabilization Stage . . . . .                                 | 96 - 98   |
| Table 6.1 Estimated Number of Direct and<br>Indirect Project Beneficiaries . . . . .                                    | 243 - 244 |
| Table 6.2 Number of Participants at Continuing<br>Education Events . . . . .                                            | 283 - 284 |
| Table 6.3 Estimated and Actual Number of Categorical<br>Positions Filled: Four Continuing<br>Education Events . . . . . | 291 - 292 |
| Table 6.4 Participants' Reasons for Attending Selected<br>Continuing Education Events . . . . .                         | 297 - 298 |
| Table 6.5 Participants' Interest in Social Action:<br>Chester and Dover County Continuing<br>Education Events . . . . . | 301       |
| Table 7.1 Block Grant Demonstration Project: CEP,<br>Summary of Evaluations/Quality<br>of Program . . . . .             | 347       |
| Table 7.2 Block Grant Demonstration Project: CEP,<br>Summary of Evaluations/Usefulness of<br>Information . . . . .      | 350       |

**LIST OF TABLES**  
**(con't)**

|                  |                                                                                                                                                              |            |
|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Table 7.3</b> | <b>Block Grant Demonstration Project: CEP,<br/>Spring Forum's Critical Issues<br/>Workshops, Summary of Evaluations/<br/>Increase in Knowledge . . . . .</b> | <b>352</b> |
|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|

## LIST OF CHARTS/FIGURES

### Charts

|                                                                                                                 | PAGE      |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Chart 2.1 NASW/XX Organizational Structure<br>According to Functional Areas<br>(Initiation Stage) . . . . .     | 59        |
| Chart 2.2 Criteria for Selecting<br>Branch Units of NASW/XX . . . . .                                           | 66        |
| Chart 2.3 Embedded Units of Analysis: Organizations . .                                                         | 81        |
| Chart 2.4 Embedded Units of Analysis: Austin-Bedford<br>County Network . . . . .                                | 82        |
| Chart 4.1 Block Grant Demonstration Project's Continuing<br>Education Program (CEP) . . . . .                   | 161 - 163 |
| Chart 6.1 Attributes Related to Effective and Ineffective<br>Project Contact . . . . .                          | 303 - 304 |
| Chart 7.1 NASW/XX Organizational Structure According to<br>Functional Areas<br>(Implementation Stage) . . . . . | 330       |

### Figures

|                                                                                                   |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Figure 2.1 Block Grant Demonstration Project's Movement<br>Through Developmental Stages . . . . . | 42 |
| Figure 2.2. Basic Types of Designs for Case Studies<br>(from Yin 1984, 1989) . . . . .            | 77 |

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION AND SOCIAL WELFARE POLICY CONTEXT

#### Overview

In the early 1980's major changes in federal and state social welfare policies spurred the National Association of Social Workers' (NASW) social action efforts on behalf of poor, disadvantaged, and disabled persons. One such effort--the Social Service Block Grant (SSBG) Demonstration Project--was conducted in an eastern state from January 1983 through June 1985.<sup>1</sup> A State Chapter of NASW acted as a catalyst to bring county-based practice and education organizations together so they could help social workers understand and influence the evolving implementation of SSBG policies and procedures. That demonstration project is the foundation for this dissertation.

The study first assesses the effectiveness of the demonstration project in meeting its objectives and then relates the findings to the professions's on-going dialogue about the extent of social workers' involvement in social action efforts on behalf of vulnerable populations. While "much of the literature on social workers in politics deals with the involvement of individual social workers" (Schacter 1992, 222), this study assesses the capacity of the professional association and selected social work educational institutions to involve practitioners, faculty and students in collective social and political action activities.

Prior to describing the project's purpose and intervention plan, changes in the economic and political environment engendered by the Reagan administration are recounted. Additionally, the professional association's response to one of these changes--the block grants authorized by the 1981 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (P. L. 97-35)--is discussed.

### Changing Economic and Political Environment

The election of Ronald Reagan to the presidency of the United States in 1980, launched a restructuring of the relationship between the federal government and the states in the area of social welfare that has continued into the 1990s. (Chubb and Peterson 1985, Midgley 1992, Wills 1996) Under the label "New Federalism" the Reagan administration proposed several key initiatives: a federal/state "swap" of several major entitlement programs, a consolidation of numerous categorical programs into a few block grants, a concomitant decrease in federal funding for services at the state/local levels of government, and the elimination of specific federal regulations protecting client rights.

The administration's program also called for large cuts in individual and corporate taxes, fewer governmental restraints on the business sector, as well as major increases in spending for defense. (Dinerman 1983, Jirovec 1983, Phillips 1990)

When Ronald Reagan announced his plan to cut back federal spending in February, 1981, few items attracted as much attention as his proposal to consolidate about 90 of the more than 300

categorical program grants providing federal assistance to state and local governments into a few block grants, at significantly reduced funding levels. (Peterson et al. 1986, 1)

The block grant system--merging federally-funded categorical programs, reducing the amount of the funding, and giving states the responsibility for administering the grants and for choosing which services to fund--was fundamental to the Reagan administration's plan to restructure federal-state relations.

Proponents of the change believed that block grants would provide more flexibility and autonomy to state and local levels of government. Decisions about developing and funding social welfare programs would be made by those most closely affected by those decisions. The federal regulatory system that many felt was burdensome would be reduced.<sup>2</sup>

Opponents felt that states would not be willing and/or able to maintain previous levels of funding, might not continue to support controversial or unpopular services, and would not necessarily enact state laws to replace basic protection for consumers that was lost in the deregulation process.

In July, 1981 Congress approved nine of Reagan's block grants consolidating fifty-seven categorical grants with a fiscal 1982 budget authority of \$9.7 billion. This represented a \$1.4 billion decrease in funding for the categorical grants "bundled" into block grants. (Peterson et al. 1986, 6)

Appendix F presents a summary of the principal characteristics of eight of the nine block grants: Social Services; Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health; Community Services; Maternal and Child Health; Education; Home Energy Assistance; Primary Health Care; Preventive Health and Health Services; and Community Development.<sup>3</sup>

When President Reagan signed the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 in August, he said it represented "a turn-around of almost a half a century of a course the country has been on." (New York Times, August 14, 1981, A-10) Block grants were viewed by the president as a "half-way station" measure on the road to more sweeping federalism reform.

They were meant to remove the federal government's categorical restrictions on how states and localities used federal funds. At the same time, they were part of an administration strategy to restore the states to a primary role in the federal system, since it was state governments that exercised most policy discretion under block grants. (Peterson et al 1986, xv)

However, the philosophical underpinnings of the block grant concept were very quickly overshadowed by the fact that they were also being used as an instrument to cut domestic spending for health, social welfare, and education programs. Conlan (1988) reports that

During congressional hearings, witnesses drew ties between the administration's budgetary and block grant strategies. In testimony before the Senate, the executive director [of the Coalition on Block Grants and Human Needs] concluded that 'the problem with block grants. . . is that by removing the targeting [to specific clients], you remove the constituency for funding. Pretty soon you can

pretend there was no need for funding at all.  
(166)

The SSBG--the major source of federal funds to states for a range of essential social services for all age groups--was cut by almost \$600 million (20%). In FY 1981 the program was funded at \$2,991 billion; in FY 1982 it was reduced to \$2.4 billion. The federal requirement that half of the federal dollars go to welfare recipients was eliminated. (Peterson et al. 1986, 8)

Social welfare critics of the philosophy and the budget reductions variously described the legislation as "a major reversal of American social policy" (Dinerman 1983); "a wake for the welfare state" (Stoesz 1981); and as "a watershed in federal domestic policy" (Fulton 1981).

#### Significance of the Study

Chubb and Peterson (1985) argued that during the presidency of Ronald Reagan, the American political system "has been transformed to an extent unknown since the days of Franklin Delano Roosevelt." (1) They suggested that in 1981 "major pieces of legislation reversed the course of domestic social spending, initiated the largest sustained peacetime increase in defense spending, and by creating an unprecedented budget deficit, constrained federal policy making for years to come. (21) These changes represented a significant threat to the social work profession's goal of providing needed assistance to poor, disadvantaged, and disenfranchised groups in society. It is therefore



important to understand the professional association's response to this change in direction.

**The National Association of Social Workers'  
Response to Block Grant Funding System**

Social workers attending the Seventh Professional Symposium of the National Association of Social Workers in November of 1981 heard a "rousing call to action that enjoined them to enter the political arena to fight and to bear witness to the injustice and inhumanity of the new policies and the pain they inflicted on the old, the very young, minorities, the working poor, and the disabled." (Dinerman 1983, 5)

NASW was deeply concerned about the major shift in policy embodied in the block grant concept. To help social workers respond to this "rousing call to action," the professional association recognized that it had to collect and disseminate information about changing policies at three levels of government.

National office staff members were instrumental in organizing and supporting the Washington, DC-based Coalition on Block Grants and Human Needs. Two demonstration projects were funded by the association's Program Advancement Fund (PAF). PROJECT BLOCK GRANT was designed to prepare the NASW Chapters and the social work community in nine selected states "to oversee block grant implementation at the state level and to advocate [for] a state process that maximizes public participation, program standards and recognition of social needs." (Gonzalez et al. 1983, 21)<sup>4</sup>

### Origins of the Study

When NASW discovered that some states were transferring these functions to lower levels of government, a PAF grant was awarded to the study state. It was one of several states where block grant planning and allocation responsibilities were being partially or fully transferred to counties.<sup>5</sup>

This devolution of responsibilities to the states and localities created important new arenas for the profession's social action activities.<sup>6</sup> It also created a need to adapt the professional association's structure for involving members in collective social action to fit with the shift in the locus of decision making. (Dinerman 1983, Morrell 1982, Patti 1983a)

The Educational Legislative Action Network (ELAN), one of NASW's two mechanisms for involving members in political action, was originally developed in 1971 to supplement and strengthen the social action activities of the professional association's national office. Patti (1983a) reports that an additional ELAN objective was to connect social workers in a particular state with each other as well as with the national office, thus facilitating information exchange and coordinated action on state as well as on federal legislation. (98)

There was, however, no system for linking members with elected county officials or for developing NASW positions on county-level human service issues. The existing ELAN

structure did not mesh with federal and state initiatives to decentralize decision making for social service programs.

According to Richan (1981), "As one moves from the national to the state level in the United States, the problems in trying to acquire strategic knowledge are multiplied." He cited the difficulties NASW encountered in mounting a major licensure campaign in 50 different states with as many different political environments.<sup>7</sup> Richan contends that "state government is least well known. . . with the result that social workers within a state have frequently been relatively ignorant about the political forces with which they were dealing." (219-220)

When you consider that county political entities are even more of a mystery than state government to most citizens (Kushner 1978, 73; Zukin 1989, 15) as well as to most social workers, the professional association was confronted with a formidable challenge in states where block grant functions were being partially or fully transferred to counties. Block grant policies, committees and advisory bodies, and processes were mushrooming in the executive and legislative branches of state and county governments.

In the study state, mandated county human service advisory councils (CHSACs) were created and assigned coordinating, expenditure allocation, planning, and program evaluation roles for the Social Services Block Grant. ([State] Department of Human Services 1982) The state

intended to gradually broaden the councils' coordinating roles to include other human service funding streams.

All of this presented challenges for NASW. They included:

1. acquiring strategic information from the burgeoning number of governmental units involved in block grant decision making;
2. revamping the association's structure for involving members in social action activities to conform to a decentralized social welfare system; and
3. deciding who speaks for the profession at the county level.

The issues introduced above will be discussed in more detail in subsequent chapters. This overview was meant to establish a context for introducing the project that was the basis for this dissertation.

#### Doctoral Study

This dissertation uses a case study research strategy to describe the SSBG Demonstration Project, to assess its effectiveness, and to relate the findings to other studies of social work activism--at both individual and organizational levels.

In describing the advantages of the case study research strategy,<sup>8</sup> Yin states that "the case study contributes uniquely to our knowledge of individual, organizational, social and political phenomena." He goes on to say that "the case study allows an investigator to retain the

holistic and meaningful characteristics of real life events." (1989, 14) This study attempts "to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics" of a project that was conducted at the state and county levels, that covered a turbulent two-and-a-half year period, and that involved several organizations and over 350 individuals.

#### Purpose of the Study

There is a three-fold purpose to this study. The first objective is to describe how the SSBG Demonstration Project evolved and to identify effective strategies for use by other Chapters. The second is to relate the findings to other empirical studies that document social workers' individual and/or collective involvement (or lack of involvement) in political and social action on behalf of the poor. The third objective is to demonstrate the usefulness of the "differential evaluation" model of social program evaluation for program managers as well as for researchers.

More specifically, the intent is to accomplish the following:

1. To describe the unfolding of a program in which the professional association acted as a catalyst to bring together regional (county) practice and education organizations so they could help social workers understand and influence the evolving implementation of new block grant policies;
2. To utilize the "differential evaluation" model to assess the program's process and outcome so that

workable and unworkable aspects could be identified at each program stage;<sup>9</sup>

3. To make recommendations regarding those aspects that could be replicated by NASW Chapters in several other states with organizational and policy implementation patterns similar to those in the study state;

4. To make recommendations regarding those aspects that were difficult (or impossible) to initiate and/or sustain; and

5. To see what implications can be drawn that reflect on the continuous dialogue about the profession's political and social action efforts on behalf of vulnerable populations.

#### Description of Demonstration Project

The NASW Chapter in the study state applied for and was awarded a PAF Grant in the amount of \$15,000 for the July 1983-June 1984 period. The Chapter provided an additional \$5,000 in matching funds. Beginning in January 1983, the author began working with the Chapter's volunteer and staff leadership to develop the grant proposal and to secure the support of key organizations and individuals. During the grant period, the author served as Project Director, working one-quarter time for the Chapter.<sup>10</sup>

The project was designed to build upon the work of the national office's two-year (July 1981-June 1983) PROJECT BLOCK GRANT. The national Project Director shared

information and materials developed by the nine State Chapters that participated in the national office's effort.

This demonstration project focused on developing educational and social action efforts at the state and county levels.

State-level efforts centered on two areas:

1. working with the [State] Block Grant Coalition to secure passage of a Senate Bill [#S-X0] that would establish an Interdepartmental Advisory Council on Block Grants<sup>11</sup>; and
2. co-sponsoring state-wide continuing education activities on selected block grant issues with standing state-level Chapter committees and programs.

The main focus of the enterprise, however, was at the county level. The project attempted to initiate, implement, and stabilize practice/education organizational networks in the geographical area covered by three local units of the State Chapter (four counties in the northern and metropolitan parts of the state). The networks' tasks included:

1. sponsoring educational activities related to evolving state and county Social Service Block Grant (SSBG) implementation policies; and
2. mobilizing participants to become advocates for an equitable allocation of SSBG funds in their respective counties and for a new state regulatory system that

would protect consumer rights and ensure accountability [Bill #S-X0].

Network participants in each area included a regional school of social work, an NASW branch unit, and representatives from the newly-mandated county human service advisory council. The various organizations and individuals that were formally and informally connected to the project are arrayed in Table 1.1. Those participants that were connected directly to the project are highlighted. Those not highlighted were important sources of information, sanction, regulations, and/or collaboration although they did not have formal ties to the project.



**Table 1.1**  
**PROJECT-RELATED ORGANIZATIONS, INDIVIDUALS**

| <b>Levels</b>   | <b>National Association of Social Workers (NASW)</b>                                                                                                                               | <b>Schools of Social Work</b>                                                                                                         | <b>Human Service Coalitions/Block Grants</b>                | <b>Government</b>                                                                 |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>National</b> | NASW Board of Directors<br><br>Delegate Assembly<br><br><b>Program Advancement Fund Subcommittee (PAF)</b><br><br>PROJECT BLOCK GRANT                                              | Council on Social Work Education (CSWE)                                                                                               | Coalition on Block Grants and Human Needs, Washington, D.C. | Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (P.L. 97-35)                            |
| <b>State</b>    | Chapter Board of Directors<br><br><b>Administration Section</b><br><br><b>Education Legislative Action Network (ELAN)</b><br><br>Income Maintenance and Social Services Task Force | Eliot University School of Social Work/Administration Sequence<br><br>Center for Social Action/Eliot University School of Social Work | [State] Block Grant Coalition<br><br>Fair Budget of [State] | State Department of Human Services' State Human Services Advisory Council (SHSAC) |

Continuation of Table 1.1

| Levels | National Association of Social Workers (NASW)     | Schools of Social Work                                                                                                                                            | Human Service Coalitions/Block Grants | Government                                                     |
|--------|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| County | Austin-Bedford Unit<br>Chester Unit<br>Dover Unit | Altmeier-Buell University - BSW Program<br>Coyle College-BSW Program<br>Dunham Falls University BSW Program<br>Eliot University/Dover Branch MSW and BSW Programs | Austin County Coalition for Children  | Austin County HSAC<br>Chester County HSAC<br>Dover County HSAC |

Continuation of Table 1.1

| Levels          | National Association of Social Workers (NASW)       | Schools of Social Work                                 | Human Service Coalitions/Block Grants                                             | Government                                                                                                                                                  |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Key Individuals | NASW/National:<br>Co-Chairs,<br>PROJECT BLOCK GRANT | Chair, Eliot University,<br>Administration<br>Sequence | Chair, [State]<br>Block Grant<br>Coalition<br>Chair, Fair<br>Budget of<br>[State] | County HSAC<br>Chairpersons<br>Selected<br>Social<br>Workers<br>appointed to<br>County<br>HSAC's<br><br>SDHS<br>Representa-<br>tives to<br>County<br>HSAC's |

Continuation of Table 1.1

| <b>Levels</b>                  | <b>National Association of Social Workers (NASW)</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | <b>Schools of Social Work</b>                                                               | <b>Human Service Coalitions/Block Grants</b> | <b>Government</b>                                       |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Key Individuals (con't)</b> | <b>NASW/State Chapter:</b><br><br><b>Executive Director</b><br><b>President, Board</b><br><b>President-Elect, Board</b><br><b>1st Vice-President, Board</b><br><b>Chair, ELAN</b><br><b>Chair, Administration Section</b><br><b>Chair, Income Maintenance and Social Services Task Force</b><br><b>Selected Unit Officers</b> | <b>Chairpersons, BSW Programs</b><br><br><b>Faculty Liaisons</b><br><b>Student Liaisons</b> |                                              | <b>Director, SDHS Office of Human Services Planning</b> |

The county networks were more successful in developing procedures for learning about the county planning and allocation processes and for disseminating that information to members than they were in organizing collective social action efforts. Possible reasons for this difference in effectiveness are addressed in Chapters VII and IX.

#### Organizing Framework/Methodology

The organizing framework for this study is the extended "differential evaluation" model. (Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978; Bielowski and Epstein 1984) This model is based on a developmental view of social programs and asserts that these programs typically evolve through four stages of development: initiation, contact, implementation, and stabilization.<sup>12</sup> The evaluation paradigm will be discussed in more detail in Chapter II, Methodology. However, the following definition of the process is stated here to provide a context for understanding its usefulness from an administrative perspective.

Differential evaluation is a process of asking different evaluation questions of program efforts, effectiveness, and efficiency for each program stage of development and then choosing those evaluation strategies that are most appropriate to evaluation objectives. (Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978, 10)

The model was originally developed by Tripodi and his associates to help administrators improve their programs by using systematic feedback at each phase of program development. This investigator used this model and found it to be a helpful guide for "thinking through" the

development, implementation, and evaluation of new programs. (Bielawski 1976) No studies utilizing the model have been published. Filling this gap will make a modest contribution toward understanding the program development and policy implementation process.

The "differential evaluation" format can be used for several purposes: to anticipate and prepare for stage-related tasks; to guide administrative decision-making; to select an appropriate research strategy or strategies; to develop a protocol for data collection; to organize data collection and analysis; and to provide a structure for writing the research report. Each of these purposes will be discussed further in Chapter II, Methodology. However, one of the above purposes--the selection of a research strategy--will be featured at this time.

As mentioned above, the case study was selected as the primary research strategy for this doctoral project. Yin defines a case study as an empirical inquiry that:

investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, when

the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which

multiple sources of evidence are used. (1989, 23)

The underlying assumptions and the procedures utilized in the case study research strategy as explicated by Yin (1989) are quite compatible with the "differential evaluation" model's basic concepts and with the purpose of the doctoral project. A description of the evaluation

model, the case study research strategy, and the "fit" between the two is discussed in the Methodology chapter.

Relating the Demonstration Project to Research  
on Social Work Activism

In their study, Professionalism and Activism in Social Work, Reeser and Epstein (1990) state that a glut of articles and books speculating or expressing concern about the extent of activism among social workers have been written. However, only a few empirical studies describing the actual political behavior of rank and file social workers have been published. (Epstein 1968 and 1969, Ezell 1993, Mathews 1983, Pawlak and Flynn 1990, Reeser 1992, Reeser and Epstein 1987 and 1990, Wolk 1981)

An even smaller number of research studies have examined social and political action endeavors sponsored by the professional association. Some studies of NASW's national and state-level collective social action undertakings have been conducted. (Mott 1976; Richan 1981; Lause 1979; National Center for Policy and Practice 1988, 1989; Salcido and Seck 1992)

In 1992 Schachter conducted a research project that described the New York City Chapter's efforts to involve its membership in political action over a 15 year period.

This dissertation addresses another facet of this subject--it describes a project where the professional association acted as a catalyst to enlist other organizations (schools of social work and county government

human service advisory councils) in an effort to facilitate practitioner, faculty, and student involvement in chapter-sponsored, state- and county-level political action activities. Hopefully, this investigation will add to the growing body of knowledge in an area of long-standing interest to the profession.

### Organization of the Study

Chapters II through IX of this study address the following topics:

Chapter II, Methodology, includes (a) a description of the "differential evaluation" model of social program evaluation; (b) a description of the case study research strategy; (c) the rationale for selecting demonstration sites and organizations; (d) characteristics of the participating organizations and county networks; and (e) the author's management of "entry" and ethical issues.

The literature review is presented in Chapter III. The primary focus is on empirical studies related to social action: (a) social workers' individual and/or collective involvement in social action on behalf of people who are poor and/or disadvantaged and (b) the professional association's efforts to involve its constituents in social action endeavors.

Chapter IV includes two sections that assist the reader in understanding the findings: (a) a synopsis of the project's continuing education programs and (b) the format



used in subsequent chapters to present the study's stage-related findings.

Chapters V-VIII assess how well the project managed stage-related administrative (Patti 1983b) and programmatic tasks (NASW [State Chapter] PAF Proposal 1983). Exemplary evaluative questions for each stage of program development are used to organize the data in Chapters V-VIII.

Selected processes related to managing programs in a developmental context (Patti 1983b) are interspersed throughout these chapters. For example, selecting the service technology is discussed in Chapter V, Evaluation of the Program Initiation Stage, because the intervention strategy was conceived during this phase of the project. Similarly, acquiring a clientele is discussed in Chapter VI, Evaluation of the Program Contact Stage, and establishing the program's domain is addressed in Chapter VII, Evaluation of the Program Implementation Stage.

Chapter IX concludes this study. It contains (a) recommendations emanating from the stage-related evaluations of the project's effectiveness, (b) the study's implications for what Alexander (1982) has called the profession's long-standing "love-hate" relationship with social and political action, and (c) a brief assessment of the evaluation model's contributions to administrative decision making.

## Ethical Issues

### Confidentiality

To protect participants' rights to confidentiality, names of the study state, counties in the demonstration area, participating organizations, and key individuals have been disguised. While these changes did not alter the study's findings, they did limit the author's ability to describe unique characteristics of the study state and the participating organizations that hindered or facilitated the accomplishment of project objectives.

### Funding for PAF Project

The project which is the basis for this study was funded by the Program Advancement Fund, National Association of Social Workers, Washington, DC. As indicated above, while the author served as the project director she was a part-time employee of the State Chapter.<sup>13</sup> However, the conclusions are the author's and do not necessarily reflect the views of the professional association or participating organizations and individuals.

## Chapter Endnotes

1. Names of the study state, cooperating organizations, and individual participants are disguised.
2. Ginsberg states that "President Reagan's convictions were the most visible source of reduced federal commitment to and support for social programs, but they were not the only source. For several years, governmental and private agencies that studied the growth of federal social welfare programs had voiced concern that the growth of social spending was unwarranted and. . .out of control. Public opinion polls. . .tended to reflect voter hostility to 'welfare' programs. Many members of Congress and federal and state officials became wary of continuing social programs as they were." (1983, 32)
3. The Primary Health Care Block Grant was not implemented. (Peterson, et. al. 1986, 102)
4. The nine state chapters that participated in the project included Pennsylvania, Florida, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, Illinois, Minnesota, Colorado and California.
5. Some of the states that were beginning to "block grant" their block grants to counties included: California, Iowa, Minnesota, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin.
6. The terms "locality" and "county" are being used interchangeably to refer to the lowest level of government involved in block grant decision making.
7. In 1945 California became the first state to pass a social work regulatory act. In 1950 San Diego, California, initiated licensing for independent social work practice. It was not until 1961 that Rhode Island became the third jurisdiction to pass a law regulating social work practice. (Barker 1991, 266-267) It took another 32 years before "all states and the District of Columbia had some form of legal regulation for social work practice. (Biggerstaff, 1995, p. 1618)
8. Yin distinguishes the case study as a research strategy "from (a) the case study as a teaching tool, (b) ethnographies and participant observation, and (c) 'qualitative' methods." (1989, 11)
9. The essence of the "differential evaluation" model of social program evaluation is the matching of research strategies to evaluation objectives at sequential program stages. (Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978)
10. The author's workload at Altmeyer-Buell University was reduced to three-quarter time for the 1983-1984 academic year.

11. The Council would make recommendations to apply across all state departments administering block grants to insure public participation, civil rights protection, access to information and targeting of funds to those who need them. Federal regulations covering these areas were weakened and in some cases eliminated when states assumed responsibility for the block grants.

12. Examples of similar conceptions of organizational and/or program development stages can be found in the works of Perlmutter 1969; Hage and Aiken 1970; Patti 1978, 1983b; Kimberly and Myles 1980; and Vosburgh and Perlmutter 1984.

13. PAF guidelines required that project directors be an employee of rather than a consultant to the State Chapter.

## CHAPTER II

### METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

##### Study Questions

This study asks three questions. The first is, "How effective was the professional association's SSBG Demonstration Project in helping social workers understand and influence block grant implementation policies and procedures on the state level and in four selected counties?" The answer to this question will help guide the professional association's social action efforts in the state's other counties as well as in those states that have block grant implementation patterns similar to those in the study state.

The second question is, "How useful is the 'differential evaluation' model of social program evaluation in helping administrators develop, implement, and evaluate a program?" This question is of a different nature. The focus is on the selected evaluation model rather than on the case study topic.

The third question is, "What does the experience of the SSBG Demonstration Program have to say about the capacity of the professional association to involve practitioners and students in social action activities on behalf of low-income and disadvantaged persons?" The answer to this third question will augment the knowledge gained from a small group of empirical studies that address social workers'

involvement in individual and/or collective political and social action activities.

### Evaluation Model/Research Strategy

The "differential evaluation" model of social program evaluation is being utilized to assess the project's process and outcome at each of its four developmental stages--program initiation, program contact, program implementation, and program stabilization. (Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978; Bielawski and Epstein 1984) Among its other features--discussed below--this evaluation model requires the selection of an appropriate research strategy (or strategies). The author selected the case study research strategy and utilized an embedded single-case research design. (Yin, 1989)

According to Yin, the case study research strategy has a distinct advantage when "a 'how' or 'why' question is being asked about a contemporary set of events over which the investigator has little or no control." (1989, 20)

The block grant project fits Yin's criteria for using a case study research strategy. A "how" question is being asked about the implementation of major changes in federal, state, and county human service policies over which the social work profession has no control. The study describes policy implementation processes as they were unfolding at the state and county levels so the professional association could influence these processes before they crystallized.

### Synopsis of Project's Intervention Plan

The SSBG Demonstration Project served as a prototype for developing ways in which the professional association could gather "strategic intelligence" (Richan 1981, 7)<sup>1</sup> on county- and state-level block grant processes and transmit this knowledge to the social work community. NASW recognized that members needed to be aware of how changes were being carried out in their respective counties as a prerequisite for engaging in effective social action on behalf of clients and programs. Once members were informed, NASW hoped to recruit them to become involved in the association's system for collective political action--ELAN.

The block grant project established informal practice/education networks in the geographic area covered by three of the State Chapter's branch units located in the northern and metropolitan parts of the state. These networks were developed:

1. to sponsor continuing education activities related to state and county block grant implementation policies and procedures; and

2. to mobilize participants to join ELAN (or other political action groups) and become advocates for an equitable allocation of social service block grant funds in their respective counties and for state replacement of procedural safeguards for clients.

As the project progressed, the need for a state network became apparent, and an already existing linkage between the

Chapter's Administration Section and the Eliot University School of Social Work's Administration Sequence was strengthened with the infusion of project resources.

The remainder of this chapter concentrates on a detailed discussion of the methodology that was utilized to obtain answers to the study questions posed above. The presentation focuses on (a) the evaluation model's concepts and processes, (b) the case study research strategy components, and (c) the study's research design.

### "Differential Evaluation" Model<sup>2</sup>

In their book entitled, Differential Social Program Evaluation, Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein (1978) offer a guide to program assessment based on a three-stage conception of social program development. Within this paradigm, social programs are viewed as moving routinely from program initiation to client/participant contact and, finally, to program implementation. In 1984, Bielawski and Epstein extended the model by adding a fourth stage--program stabilization.

The extension of the model seemed particularly timely given the worsening economic conditions and changes in federal and state policies that were having a profound impact on social services in the early 1980's. At that time administrators were faced with improving social programs "not through major increases in funds but through more effective and efficient use of current resources."

(Miringoff cited in Bielawski and Epstein 1984, 15) Program



stabilization and survival in the 1980's had a more positive connotation than it had in the preceding two decades. In the late 1960's and early 1970's, the political and economic climate was considerably different, and program stabilization was often seen as being synonymous with stagnation, resistance to change, and displacement of organizational goals. (Etzioni 1964; Bernard, 1975)

This study utilizes the four-stage extended model. Each stage has unique informational requirements and evaluation objectives.

At each stage, questions about program efforts, effectiveness, and efficiency may be asked to achieve evaluation objectives and to inform administrative decision making. The essence of the "differential evaluation" approach to program evaluation is the matching of **evaluation strategies/methods to evaluation objectives** at different **program stages**. (Bielawski and Epstein 1984, 13) Before embarking on a discussion of the specific aspects of the evaluation model, an illustration of how the whole model is structured is presented in Table 2.1, Evaluation Questions and Strategies, Program Initiation Stage.

In this table the **Program Initiation Stage** is used to demonstrate the relationship among the model's various components. Similar tables for the three other program stages were developed as part of the case study protocol and are presented in the research design section of the chapter.

**Table 2.1**  
**EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND STRATEGIES**  
**PROGRAM INITIATION STAGE\***

| <b>Evaluation Objectives/Questions</b>                                                                                                                                                                                   | <b>Evaluation Strategies/Methods**</b> |                             |                  |                               |               |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | <b>Case Study Strategy</b>             |                             |                  |                               |               |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | <b>Documen-<br/>tation</b>             | <b>Archival<br/>Records</b> | <b>Interview</b> | <b>Partici-<br/>pant Obs.</b> | <b>Survey</b> |
| <b>Effort</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                                        |                             |                  |                               |               |
| 1. How much time and activity are devoted to identifying liaison people from each constituent group (faculty, students, NASW unit membership, county human services advisory council)?                                   | X                                      | X                           | X                | X                             |               |
| 2. What is the extent and type of activity devoted to procuring cooperation from the schools, NASW/NJ local units, and chapter committees that are essential to carrying out the project?                                | X                                      |                             |                  | X                             |               |
| 3. What efforts are focused on learning about the content of the proposed continuing education program (social service block grant implementation policies and procedures at the state and county levels of government)? | X                                      |                             |                  | X                             |               |

Continuation of Table 2.1

| Evaluation Objectives/Questions                                                                                                                 | Evaluation Strategies/Methods**<br>Case Study Strategy |                     |           |                       |        |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------|
|                                                                                                                                                 | Documen-<br>tation                                     | Archival<br>Records | Interview | Partici-<br>pant Obs. | Survey |
| <b>Effectiveness</b>                                                                                                                            |                                                        |                     |           |                       |        |
| 4. How many of the liaison positions are filled?                                                                                                | X                                                      |                     |           |                       |        |
| 5. To what extent do schools and NASW/NJ units perceive the program as related to their needs?                                                  |                                                        |                     | X         | X                     |        |
| 6. To what extent can potential participants be identified: students, ELAN members, other NASW members, human service advisory council members? | X                                                      |                     |           |                       |        |
| 7. To what extent is a program plan specified?                                                                                                  | X                                                      |                     |           |                       |        |
| 8. To what extent are data collection procedures established?                                                                                   | X                                                      |                     |           |                       |        |
| 9. To what extent have beginning relationships been formed and/or strengthened among target groups in each county?                              |                                                        |                     | X         | X                     |        |

Continuation of Table 2.1

| Evaluation Objectives/Questions                                                                                                                                                                                            | Evaluation Strategies/Methods**<br>Case Study Strategy |                     |           |                       |        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Documen-<br>tation                                     | Archival<br>Records | Interview | Partici-<br>pant Obs. | Survey |
| <b>Efficiency</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                        |                     |           |                       |        |
| 10. To what extent are there duplicated liaison functions that could result in possible ambiguity?                                                                                                                         | X                                                      |                     | X         | X                     |        |
| 11. To what extent do liaison persons perceive project objectives as similar or dissimilar; to what extent do the organizations that they represent have competing objectives that are at cross purposes with the project? |                                                        |                     | X         | X                     |        |

\* Based on format developed by Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978.

\*\* Methods are defined in Case Study Research Section of chapter. Note: An "X" indicates that the method in a particular column can be used to answer the evaluation question in the same row.

As can be seen from Table 2.1, this approach to social program evaluation is an all-inclusive one. It includes both qualitative and quantitative measures, i. e., participant observation as well as surveys. It includes evaluating program process as well as outcome. And it includes the use of a variety of data collection methods. For example, Question 3 asks "What efforts are focused on learning about the content of the proposed continuing education program (SSBG implementation policies and procedures at the state and county levels of government)?" The content of the question refers to one of the stage's main administrative tasks--resource acquisition. (Patti 1983b, 69) Documents and participant observation were the selected methods for gathering information related to this question. These and the other research methods included in Table 2.1 are defined in the latter part of the chapter.

#### Basic Concepts and Processes

The evaluation model's basic concepts and processes, supplemented with material from Patti's (1983b) developmental model of program management, are presented in the following section. These include: (a) definitions of social programs and program stages, (b) discussion of the match between management tasks and program stages, (c) suggestions for determining which stage a program is in at any particular time, (d) definitions of general evaluation objectives for each stage, (e) specification of evaluation questions to "flesh out" the more general objectives, and

(f) selection of appropriate research strategies and data collection methods.

### Definition of Social Programs

Tripodi, Fellin, and Epstein (1978) define programs as "organized efforts to accomplish planned objectives." (23) They can focus on individual or social change.

Social programs can be relatively small, single goal agencies such as a group home for mentally retarded adults; they can be part of a larger system such as a nutrition program for low-income families in a large urban hospital; or they can be large-scale national or state-wide programs such as the National Human SERVE (Service Employees Registration, Voting and Education) Fund Campaign.

Despite differences in size and complexity, the program development process is seen as being similar with all programs moving through "sequential and interrelated stages." (Tripodi et al 1978, 6)

### Definitions of Stages

As stated above, the four stages of the extended "differential evaluation" model are program initiation, client/participant contact, program implementation, and program stabilization. A brief description of each stage follows:

#### Stage 1 - Program initiation

This is the stage where necessary resources (material, social, and technological) are secured. Program directors<sup>3</sup> are involved with determining a need for the program;

specifying program objectives and appropriate technologies for reaching these objectives; identifying a target population of individuals and/or organizations; developing a management plan, etc. (Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978, 26-27) Chapter V tells the story of the project's initiation stage.

#### Stage 2 - Program contact

Following successful accomplishment of the objectives described in Stage 1, programs move into the second stage where "contact must be made with potential program beneficiaries." Program administrators "concern themselves with the physical, material and social factors that prevent or facilitate program contact" with potential participants (Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978, 28-29) The project's contact stage is assessed in Chapter VI.

#### Stage 3 - Program implementation

In the implementation stage, "the program fully engages its clientele and gives service and/or applies a change technology." Movement into this stage is contingent upon the satisfactory resolution of issues related to the previous two stages. "The purpose of the program implementation stage is synonymous with the ultimate goals of the program." It is during this stage that evaluations of program outcome can be undertaken. "Questions about unanticipated positive and negative consequences of program interventions can also be answered. . . Additionally, the relative efficacy and efficiency of the program's various

strategies can be evaluated" (Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978, 32) The accomplishments of the project's implementation stage are assessed in Chapter VII.

#### Stage 4 - Program stabilization

"The point at which a program achieves a degree of autonomy from its external environment is also likely to mark the beginning of its stabilization phase," according to Patti (1978, 280). He cites Clark and Wilson's definition of autonomy to augment the description of this stage. Autonomy means "the extent to which a [program] possesses a distinctive area of competence, a clearly demarcated clientele or membership, and an undisputed jurisdiction over a function, service, goal, issue or cause. . . (Clark and Wilson, cited in Patti 1978, 280) In the stabilization stage, the program's continued existence is not in question and it has successfully accomplished the tasks embodied in each of the prior stages.

However, demonstration projects supported by grant funds are vulnerable when the outside revenue ends. "Death, curtailment or absorption by other units of the parent organization are not uncommon under these circumstances," according to Patti. (1983b, 203) From its inception, one of the block grant project's objectives was to be absorbed by other Chapter entities. Although the project officially ended in June 1984, efforts were made to integrate the project's activities into the on-going work of the Chapter.



This process was monitored through June 1985, and these data are reported in Chapter VIII.

#### Similarities/differences between stage 1 and stage 4

There are similarities between the first stage of initiation and the stabilization stage. The administrator must continue to systematically collect and analyze data from various aspects of the program's environment. This information provides the basis for making decisions about the efficacy of the current program and about the potential benefits and costs associated with alternative approaches to service delivery.

However, one of the major differences between the first and last stages is the existence of special interest groups in the stabilization stage that may resist and/or advocate for change. Groups of clients and/or members, senior staff members, board members, or groups of unserved or underserved members may have strongly held opinions about the need for changes in the program. This issue, which is discussed in Chapter VIII, played a part in the extent to which the Chapter was able to continue the work of the project once the grant period ended.

#### Summary of stages

To summarize, although programs vary in many ways, they all must solve common developmental problems. They include: securing sufficient resources to initiate a program (initiation stage); making contact with designated participants (contact stage); effectively supplying a

service and/or applying a technology (implementation stage); and sustaining the program (stabilization stage).

#### Matching Administrative Tasks to Specific Stages

Employing a similar developmental schema, Patti (1983b) developed "a model of management practice, set in the context of stages of development." (xii) According to Patti, "Each stage of development is characterized by certain structural characteristics and development goals that call forth a configuration of management tasks." (60)

Patti's delineation of stage-related administrative tasks is utilized in conjunction with the differential social program evaluation paradigm. Each stage's constellation of development goals and tasks is presented in the corresponding chapter that evaluates how effectively the project accomplished its stage-related tasks. For example, one of the stabilization stage's developmental goals "is to build a capacity in the program that permits it to deal creatively with internal problems and emerging environmental contingencies and to change accordingly." (162)

The analogous managerial "change task involves those planned efforts initiated by managers to improve the effectiveness or efficiency of program operations and to increase the satisfaction of those who participate in the program." (189) Chapter VIII, Evaluation of the Program Stabilization Stage, assesses how well the SSBG project accomplished this and other administrative tasks.

### Determination of Program Stages

Because the "differential evaluation" model requires the matching of evaluation objectives and strategies to particular phases of the developmental cycle, researchers must be able to determine which particular stage (or stages) a program is in. The length of time that a program stays in one stage can vary, and programs can recycle through earlier stages if new circumstances require that earlier tasks need to receive attention again.

The following guidelines for determining the developmental stage(s) that dominates a social welfare program are based on information from Differential Social Program Evaluation (1978). However, some changes have been made to incorporate the stabilization stage and the nature of the specific project under study.

1. How does the program allocate most of its staff time and resources? Are present efforts devoted to securing resources (initiation), recruiting participants (contact), giving a service (implementation) or assessing alternative modes of operation (stabilization)?
2. When there are conflicts between the needs of the different program stages, how are they resolved? Which stage dominates?
3. What kinds of data and information does the program routinely collect? Does the intelligence system focus mainly on the availability of alternative program resources (stabilization), or the description of participants (contact), or the impact of program on participants (implementation)?
4. What tasks/roles are viewed as most valuable to the project's operation? For example, according to Patti, the task of sustaining reciprocal relations with selected agencies in the external environment assumes more importance in the implementation stage. (1983b, 119-126)

5. If there were a major cutback in funding, which functions would be sacrificed first? which last?

These questions can help an administrator or a researcher determine which program development stage(s) is dominant at any point in time. Tripodi and associates define a dominant stage as one which uses more than 50 per cent of program activities, efforts, and resources. "Two or more stages may be sufficiently overlapping. . .so there may be no single dominant stage. In that instance, the administrator would regard both stages as representative of the state of program development." (1978, 36)

Patti speculates that it takes approximately three to five years for a program to move through a complete developmental cycle. However, he notes that a "number of variables [such as the length of the funding period or the stability of the parent organization] may shorten or extend this period." (1983b, 54) Because demonstration projects are time-limited, Vosburgh and Perlmutter (1984) emphasize the fact that project administrators are often under a heavy burden to gear up and initiate programs rapidly.

Figure 2.1 depicts how the block grant project moved through the developmental stages described above.

| <b>FIGURE 2.1</b><br><b>SSBG Demonstration Project's Movement</b><br><b>Through Developmental Stages</b> |                        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>Time Period</b>                                                                                       | <b>Stages*</b>         |
| Jan.-April, 1983                                                                                         | INITIATION/Contact     |
| May-Sept., 1983                                                                                          | CONTACT/Initiation     |
| Oct. 1983-June 1984**                                                                                    | IMPLEMENTATION/CONTACT |
| July 1984-June 1985                                                                                      | STABILIZATION          |

\* The capitalized stage is dominant.

\*\* During this period, two stages represented the state of the program.

The project's funding period was from July 1983 to June 1984. However, the initiation stage actually began in January 1983 when the author began working with the Chapter leadership on ideas for the grant proposal. Project phase-out activities extended beyond June 1984. And, although the author was no longer a part-time staff member, she continued to monitor the extent to which project tasks were being assumed by other Chapter staff and/or entities through June 1985.

The next step in the "differential evaluation" model process involves the specification of evaluative criteria for each of the forementioned stages.

### General Evaluation Objectives for All Stages

"Differential evaluation involves. . .selection of evaluation strategies for answering evaluation questions for stages of program development. Within each program stage, three objectives or criteria of evaluation should be considered: program effort, program effectiveness, and program efficiency." (Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978, 39) These three basic objectives of program evaluation are described below.

#### Effort

Program effort refers to descriptive information about the type and quantity of program activities considered necessary for the accomplishment of program goals within a particular stage of development. Effort refers not only to gathering information about staff and volunteer time, activity and commitment, but also to the allocation and use of material resources such as funds, space, equipment, etc. Information regarding effort is typically quantitative although it may be qualitative as well. It describes the extent of activity. For example, Question 2, Table 2.1 asks, "What is the extent and type of activity devoted to procuring cooperation from the schools, local units, and Chapter committees that are essential to carrying out the project?"

#### Effectiveness

Program effectiveness concerns itself with whether the intended goals for a particular stage have been obtained as

a result of program efforts. It may also include information on the achievement of goals in relation to the need for the program. "Comprehensiveness is an index of effectiveness which relates goal achievement to community needs; it indicates the impact a program has on the community in which it is located." (Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978, 43) In addition, an evaluation of effectiveness can also consider both desirable and undesirable unanticipated consequences that may be a result of the program. Information regarding effectiveness can be quantitative as well as qualitative. For example, Question 4, Table 2.1 asks, "How many of the liaison positions are filled?"

### Efficiency

Program efficiency focuses on the relationship between effort and effectiveness.

"Questions regarding efficiency are familiar to administrators who are involved in making programmatic decisions within the constraints of relatively fixed budgets. Evaluation of efficiency often involves comparison of two or more techniques. . .with respect to their relative costs and program outcomes. However, questions may also be raised about duplications of effort irrespective of whether one has knowledge of the effectiveness of those efforts." (Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978, 45).

Information regarding efficiency can be both qualitative and quantitative. Question 10, Table 2.1, is an example of a question that addresses program efficiency. That question asks about the extent of duplicated liaison functions that could result in possible ambiguity.

### Specification of Objectives/Evaluation Questions

Evaluation questions concerning program effort, effectiveness, and efficiency for each stage of development guide the data collection and analysis processes. Question content was gleaned from several sources. (Tripodi, et al 1978; Bielawski & Epstein 1984; Chommie and Hudson 1974) Additional information came from Patti's (1983b) conceptualization of stage-related developmental goals and administrative tasks, programmatic tasks that were included in the project's grant proposal, and the author's prior experience. The answers to these questions allow the researcher to assess how well the program is accomplishing its stage-related tasks. Table 2.1 above illustrates the linkage between a stage of development; the evaluation objectives of effort, effectiveness, and efficiency; and the evaluation questions that elaborate the three general objectives.

### Selection of Research Strategies

The evaluation process continues with the selection of research strategies that can be used to answer the evaluation questions for each program stage. Tripodi and associates suggest three groupings of possible research strategies: monitoring strategies, social-research strategies, and cost-analytic strategies. (The authors note that this is a suggestive rather than an exhaustive list of strategies.) This project utilizes social-research strategies.



Experiments, surveys, and case studies are cited by Tripodi and associates as examples of social-research strategies. The purpose of the case study strategy is to provide a "detailed description of a social program as it unfolds in its process of development." (1978, 84)

Tripodi and associates present an overview of selected evaluation strategies, noting that their aim is not to discuss them in detail. Their primary goal is to introduce administrators to various strategies so they will feel more confident when selecting evaluation consultants. (1978, chap. 4) Yin is the primary "evaluation consultant" for the case study research strategy used in this study. (1989, 1994) His work is supplemented with information from Gilgun (1994) and from Weller and Romney (1988). Yin's book, described below, concentrates on the design and analysis of case studies.

The following section begins with a presentation of the case study research strategy and is followed by a discussion of its compatibility with the evaluation model.

### Case Study Research Strategy

#### Overview

In his book, Case Study Research, (1989) Yin discusses a non-hierarchical "repertoire" of five major research strategies used in social science investigations. In addition to the three strategies suggested by Tripodi and associates--experiments, surveys and case studies--Yin adds archival analysis and histories. Espousing a pluralistic

view of the major strategies, he contends that "Each strategy can be used for. . .explanatory, descriptive or exploratory" purposes. The distinction among the strategies, he asserts, is not based on classifying them according to the forementioned purposes. What distinguishes their use are the following conditions: "a) the type of research question posed, b) the extent of control an investigator has over actual behavioral events, and c) the degree of focus on contemporary as opposed to historical events." (15-16)

The following table from Yin's book, arrays these three conditions and shows how they relate to the five research strategies.

**Table 2.2**  
**RELEVANT SITUATIONS**  
**FOR DIFFERENT RESEARCH STRATEGIES**

| <b>Strategy</b>                             | <b>Form of Research Questions</b>              | <b>Requires Control Over Behavioral Events?</b> | <b>Focus on Contemporary Events?</b> |
|---------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Experiment                                  | how, why                                       | yes                                             | yes                                  |
| Survey                                      | who, what,*<br>where,<br>how many,<br>how much | no                                              | yes                                  |
| Archival analysis<br>(e.g., economic study) | who, what,*<br>where<br>how many,<br>how much  | no                                              | yes/no                               |
| History                                     | how, why                                       | no                                              | no                                   |
| Case study                                  | how, why                                       | no                                              | yes                                  |

\* "What" questions, when asked as part of an exploratory study, pertain to all five strategies?

From Case Study Research (p.17) by R. Y. Yin, 1989, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. Reprinted by permission.

Table 2.2 indicates that the case study strategy has a distinct advantage when "a 'how' or 'why' question is being asked about a contemporary set of events over which the investigator has little or no control." (20) This study fits this configuration of attributes.

Yin notes that "Each strategy is a different way of collecting and analyzing empirical evidence. And each strategy has its own advantages and disadvantages." (15) For example, two of the case studies' advantages are its ability "to trace events over time" (119) and its ability

"to deal with a full variety of evidence--documents, artifacts, interviews, and observations . . ." (20) One of its disadvantages is an inability to describe the prevalence of a phenomenon. If this was the research goal, a survey would be the preferable strategy.

Yin does point out that in practice there is an overlap among the strategies and that they are not mutually exclusive. An investigator can use more than one strategy in a study. (1989, 20) This study utilizes two strategies, i. e., a survey within the case study.

At this point, it seems appropriate to restate Yin's definition of a case study. It was cited in Chapter I but warrants repeating here. He states that "A case study is an empirical inquiry that:

- \* investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when
- \* the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which
- \* multiple sources of evidence are used. (1989, 23)

Yin debunks the long-held stereotype of the case study as a "weak sibling among social science methods" and presents this strategy as "a rigorous method of social research." (1989, 10-11) In doing so, he extricates the case study as a research strategy from its use as a teaching or recording tool, from ethnographic and participant observer methods of data collection, and from being equated with the use of qualitative evidence only.

In describing the multiple uses of case studies, Yin asserts that they have "a distinctive place in evaluation research." (1989, 25) Within this context, he identifies a range of applications that can also have explanatory, descriptive or exploratory purposes.

The "differential evaluation" model and the case study research strategy are complementary. Similarities between the two are highlighted in the following section.

#### Compatibility with the "Differential Evaluation" Model

The case study research strategy described above fits well with the premises of the "differential evaluation" model that is the organizing framework being used in this study. Some of the corresponding features include:

- \* "Differential evaluation" is a model of program evaluation. Yin states that case studies have a "distinctive" place in evaluation research. (1989, 25)
- \* The "differential evaluation" model is based on a stage theory of program development. One of the case study's strengths is its ability "to trace events over time." (1989, 119) Yin asserts that "The analysis of chronological events is a frequent technique in case studies and may be considered a special form of time-series analysis." (1989, 118-9)

- \* Both the evaluation model and the research strategy recommend the use of multiple sources of qualitative and/or quantitative data.

- \* The evaluation process involves developing evaluation questions for each stage of program development and matching research strategies and data collection methods to these questions. Yin recommends developing a case study protocol (discussed in the next section) that includes substantive questions for the investigator to keep in mind. These questions should be accompanied by a list of probable sources of evidence. (1989, 76-77)

- \* Pre-developed evaluation questions such as those listed in Table 2.1 can be used to organize a presentation of the study's findings.

Similarly, Yin suggests a question and answer format (based on the case study data base) as one of several ways to organize the final report. (1989, 139)

These examples demonstrate the potential match between the "differential evaluation" model and the selected research strategy.

As a conclusion to this section on the case study research strategy and as an introduction to the next section on the specific techniques used when conducting a case study, it is important to note Yin's contention that "The

case study, like other research strategies, is a way of investigating an empirical topic by following a set of pre-specified procedures." (1989, 25)

### Case Study Process

The case study process includes problem definition, design construction, data collection, and data analysis. The problem definition was discussed earlier in this chapter. As the project's research design is laid out in the following section, the remaining steps in the process will be discussed and the procedures that make for a rigorous case study will be presented, along with a description of how they were utilized in this study.

### The Project's Research Design

#### Parameters of the Political Environment

The case study is about the SSBG Demonstration Project developed by an NASW Chapter in an eastern state. The project covered the period from January 1983 to June 1985. The PAF grant funding period was from July 1, 1983 to June 30, 1984. However, as shown in Figure 2.1 above, the project's initiation stage actually began in January 1983 and systematic monitoring of the stabilization stage ended in June 1985.

As the lead organization, the Chapter recruited selected social work educational programs and members of county human service advisory councils to participate in the project. Geographically, the project was conducted on the state level and in four counties in the northern and

metropolitan regions of the state (as defined by the [State] Department of Human Services).

Because the main focus of the project was at the county level, pertinent information about the state's counties and the state-mandated county human service advisory councils is presented next.

### County Government

"County government has frequently been called 'the dark continent of American politics,' for it is the level of government about which the average citizen knows least." (Kushner 1978, 73) Counties are geographical and administrative subdivisions of a state, a pattern of governmental structure brought by the English to the new world. In the study state the legislature established county legislative boards elected at large as the legislative and administrative heads of county government in the early 1800's. While the operations of county government have greatly increased since Colonial times, the principles on which such government rests remain substantially unchanged. The county is primarily an agent of the state performing (not always willingly) functions within its territory that the state has specifically delegated to it. The state's delegation of social service block grant responsibilities to the counties in 1982 gave them additional functions to perform.

Since 1972, the study state's counties have had five organizational options. They could retain the model from



earlier days whereby the elected board had some policy-making powers and also administered the daily operation of county government except as provided by law. Under this model individual legislators or legislative committees managed various administrative units such as human services or public safety. This model was critiqued because it created fragmentation and inefficiency. ([State] County and Municipal Government Study Commission 1986, 51)

The Optional County Charter Law of 1972 offered non-charter counties the opportunity to modernize their structures and increase their efficiency by selecting one of four alternative organizational plans. These plans included: 1) elected county executive with appointed administrator; 2) strong appointed county manager; 3) elected supervisor with appointed administrator; and 4) board president with appointed administrator. The plans differ from one another in the degree of authority they give to the chief executive, the board of county legislators, and the professional administrator. However, they all separate the legislative and executive powers of county government. (Kushner 1972, 73-80)

When the project began, three-quarters of the study state's counties retained their non-charter status. Twenty-four per cent of the counties opted for the county executive form of government, and one county chose the county manager alternative.

Various governmental and administrative offices in the study state group the counties into regions--all using different boundaries. Because the [State] Department of Human Services (SDHS) was responsible for the administration of the SSBG and the county human service advisory councils (CHSACs), the project utilized that agency's regional structure. The SDHS divided the state into four regions--northern, metropolitan, central, and southern. Thirty-eight per cent of the counties were in the northern and metropolitan regions, twenty-eight per cent in the central region, and thirty-three per cent in the southern region.

#### County Human Service Advisory Councils

The [State] Department of Human Services issued guidelines mandating the formation of county human service advisory councils in the Fall of 1982. The CHSACs were created to share the state agency's responsibility for assessing local needs, developing human service plans, allocating funds, and monitoring programs related to the social service block grant. The CHSAC was envisioned as the principal human service advisory body in the county. It was anticipated that other existing governmental advisory groups, such as mental health boards and youth service commissions, would eventually become satellites or subcommittees of the CHSAC.

The state gave counties two options regarding the organizational structure for CHSACs--they could be part of county government or independent of, but sanctioned by,

county government. (SDHS, 1982, 3) When the project was conceived early in 1983, each county was involved in designing its council's structure and composition within the guidelines set by the state. Informal contacts indicated that social workers were being appointed to serve on these CHSACs. The first group of councils were certified by the SDHS in July 1983.

#### Parameters of the Professional Environment

Two organizations responsible for training social work practitioners and students to be effective participants in the political arena participated in the project: the professional association and schools of social work. A description of these two social work organizations follows.

#### Professional Association

Alexander (1983) described the NASW as follows:

The National Association of Social Workers (NASW) is the organizational representative of the profession of social work in the United States. Its 92,000 professional members constitute the critical mass of trained social workers who, through democratic participation in NASW's policy-making activities, define the qualifications for the profession, establish practice standards, and advance the expert views of the profession. (87)

Alexander considers the NASW to be the vehicle for bringing the "collective wisdom" of the association's members into the political arena. (1982, 28-29)

The 55 Chapters in the 50 states and in the District of Columbia, New York City, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Europe are the basic administrative units of the association. According to Battle (1987) the Chapter's

purpose is to advance the programs and plans of the NASW as a whole at the state level with special emphasis on the needs and interests of its particular members. A Chapter's policies and programs must be consistent with the positions sanctioned by the association. (338) Because the study Chapter had over 2,000 members, the national office placed it in the "large chapter" classification.

#### State Chapter's Organizational Structure

The work of the Chapter was carried out by professional and support staff; the Board of Directors and its standing committees; statewide Task Forces, Practice Sections, and Committees; and branch units. Just as counties are agents of the state, units are agents of the Chapter. According to the Chapter By-Laws, "Units are established to increase the opportunity for members to join together in strengthening their professional identity." (NASW/[XX] 1979, 7) Local units coincide with one or more counties. For example, Henderson, Ipswich, and Kearny counties comprise one local NASW branch unit. Thus, all the state's counties are subsumed within 12 local units of NASW/[XX].

In 1983, the Chapter's work was accomplished by over 30 practice sections, committees, and/or task forces and 12 branch units. Because they are elected by the membership, unit chairpersons are voting members of the Board; appointed chairpersons of task forces, etc., are non-voting Board members. The various committees, sections, task forces, etc.,

grouped according to NASW's four functional areas are listed below. There is also a management function.<sup>4</sup>

1. professional advancement--to further the quality of social work practice, improve the knowledge base required for such practice, and to promote professional development;

2. professional standards--to promote the strength, unity and recognition of the profession and the acceptance and utilization of its standards;

3. social policy--to promote and advance sound public policies and programs aimed at human need and improved quality of life;

4. membership and organization--to improve the functioning of NASW and to improve the ways in which it serves its members; and

5. management--to establish and implement general policies, programs, and budgets; to plan, administer, coordinate and evaluate the program of the Chapter

Chart 2.1 depicts the Chapter's structural components during the project's initiation stage.

| <b>CHART 2.1</b><br><b>NASW/[XX's] Organizational Structure</b><br><b>According to Functional Areas *</b><br><b>(Program Initiation Stage)</b> |                                                            |                                                                                                |                                                                          |                                                 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Profess-<br/>ional<br/>Advance-<br/>ment</b>                                                                                                | <b>Profess-<br/>ional<br/>Standards</b>                    | <b>Social<br/>Policy</b>                                                                       | <b>Membership<br/>and Organi-<br/>zation</b>                             | <b>Manage<br/>ment</b>                          |
| Continuing<br>Education<br>Committee                                                                                                           | Committee<br>on Inquiry                                    | <u>Policy<br/>Council**</u>                                                                    | Affirmative<br>Action Unit                                               | <u>Board<br/>of<br/>Direc-<br/>tors**</u>       |
| <u>Social<br/>Workers'<br/>Day Con-<br/>ference<br/>Comm.**</u>                                                                                | Licensure<br>Committee                                     | Task<br>Forces<br>(7)<br><br><u>Income<br/>Mainten-<br/>ance<br/>and Social<br/>Services**</u> | Delegate<br>Assembly                                                     | By-<br>Laws<br>Com-<br>mittee                   |
| Practice<br>Councils/<br>Sections<br>(4)<br><u>Adminis-<br/>tration<br/>Section**</u>                                                          | Profess-<br>ional<br>Standards<br>Utilization<br>Committee | <u>ELAN/<br/>State**</u>                                                                       | Membership<br>Recruit-<br>ment and<br>Retention<br>Committee             | Execu-<br>tive<br>Com-<br>mittee                |
| Practice/<br>Education<br>Committee                                                                                                            | <u>Public<br/>Relations<br/>Committee**</u>                | <u>PACE**</u>                                                                                  | Nominations<br>and Leader-<br>ship Iden-<br>tification<br>Committee      | Fi-<br>nance<br>Com-<br>mittee                  |
| Student<br>Affairs                                                                                                                             |                                                            | <u>Social<br/>Service<br/>Block<br/>Grant<br/>Project</u>                                      | Units<br>(12)<br><u>Austin-<br/>Bedford,<br/>Chester and<br/>Dover**</u> | <u>Pro-<br/>gram<br/>Com-<br/>mittee<br/>**</u> |
| Social<br>Worker as<br>Psycho-<br>therapist<br>Institute                                                                                       |                                                            |                                                                                                | Ad Hoc Unit<br>Study<br>Committee                                        |                                                 |

\* Source: Leadership Handbook and Minutes of the Board of Directors.

\*\* Underline indicate entities that SSBG Project developed or attempted to develop reciprocal relationships with.

## Professional Association's Mechanisms for Collective Social Action

In the 1970's, the NASW established two mechanisms for collective political action--Political Action for Candidate Election (PACE) and the Education Legislative Action Network (ELAN). As a political action committee PACE endorses and makes financial contributions to candidates that support the association's legislative programs. ELAN is a decentralized national legislative network that helps the association lobby effectively at the state and federal levels of government.

The communication system is used to express to congressional and other legislative leaders the various needs and interests of the social work profession and its clients. . . .[It is also used] as a means for building coalitions through informing and mobilizing both social workers and their natural allies, such as lay persons on local social agency boards, community leaders, non-social work providers and consumers of social services. (Dempsey 1982, 227)

A rudimentary ELAN structure had existed in the State Chapter since 1972. In the spring of 1982--six months prior to the inception of the Block Grant Demonstration Project--the executive director instituted an ELAN reorganization project. Everyone who had submitted an ELAN enrollment form during the previous ten year period was contacted to reconfirm their interest and to assign them to a national and/or state legislator.

After the reorganization, each of the local units that encompassed the state's counties had an ELAN coordinator. Approximately 3% of the Chapter's 4,000 members were

believed to be active in the Education Legislative Action Network (ELAN).<sup>5</sup>

ELAN unit coordinators were considered the most vital part of the network. With assistance from selected "ELANers" and the state-wide chairs of PACE and ELAN, the coordinators served as liaisons to the state's congressional representatives and senators. The ELAN unit coordinators also served as district organizers for one or more of the state's legislative districts. Because units and legislative districts were not coterminous, there was some discontinuity built into this structure.<sup>6</sup>

As part of the ELAN reorganization project, each ELAN Unit Coordinator received the following materials:

1. a description of ELAN roles for the state steering committee, the unit coordinator, the district captain, and the "ELANer";<sup>7</sup>
2. the Chapter's process for selecting issues that would receive ELAN's attention;<sup>8</sup> and
3. the Chapter's range of five action strategies (from "no action" to "no holds barred, everything committed to the issue")<sup>9</sup>

The Chapter's process for selecting social action issues gave specialized state-level task forces, such as the Income Maintenance and Social Services Task Force, the responsibility for informing the Policy Council (composed of Task Force Chairpersons and the Executive Director) and the state ELAN Committee of critical issues. The Council then



assigned one of five "action levels" to each issue, recognizing that the association "has wide interests but limited resources for action."<sup>10</sup>

### Social Work Educational Programs

The Council on Social Work Education is responsible for professional social work education in the United States. One of its main responsibilities is accrediting undergraduate and graduate educational programs. The Curriculum Policy Statement adopted in May 1982, discussed required content for BSW and MSW programs in the social welfare and policy area as follows:

The major aims of study in this area are to prepare professionals to function as informed and competent practitioners in providing services and as knowledgeable and committed participants in efforts to achieve change in social policies and programs. . . .

The knowledge and skills students accumulate in these areas should prepare them to exert leadership and influence as legislative and social advocates, lobbyists, and expert advisors to policy-makers and administrators. Social work students should also gain an understanding of political processes and learn to use them in ways that will further the achievement of social work goals and purposes. (CSWE 1982)

There were 88 accredited graduate programs with 5 in candidacy and 343 accredited undergraduate programs with 6 in candidacy in July 1983. Graduation from an accredited MSW or BSW program is a criterion for acceptance into NASW. (Katz 1983, 84-87)

When the project began, there were thirteen accredited social work programs in the study state. There were seven independent undergraduate programs (three public and four private) located in five counties. The joint masters/

baccalaureate program, located in the state university, had six graduate and undergraduate programs located on its main campus in Ewell County and on two branch campuses in Dover and Henderson counties.

### Informal Networks

The project plan was based on the assumption that several counties had loose networks of social-work related organizations that could form the nucleus for influencing how SSBG policies and procedures were implemented in their respective counties. This assumed that the organizations and their members would be interested in block grant issues. The organizational members of each network would include an NASW branch unit, a social work educational program, and a county HSAC.

This study utilizes Coleman and Barton's (1982) conceptualization of informal networks.<sup>11</sup> In their article, "Solving the Effectiveness Dilemma: How Can an Informal Network Create Change?," they state that

Networks are generally considered to be unbounded systems of linkages among individual elements. The elements can be persons, or other parties, such as agencies. . . . Elements can be linked to each other directly or indirectly through intermediate elements. . . . [they] are less likely to have stable goals or internal hierarchies. As a result, they are more flexible; and. . . are more able than tightly structured groups to respond to new demands from changing environments. (1982, 75)

Much of the value of a network as perceived by its members comes from informal information sharing in a non-threatening social context. (73)

When some members of the network want to take "potentially controversial action" the network's informality

is threatened. Based on their experience with informal networks, Coleman and Barton suggest one solution: "A network can remain informal and operate by consensus but give rise to subgroups which take potentially controversial action in their own names." (72) Action groups whose purposes involve task-related social action can emerge and take action in their own. (76) In one sense, ELAN could be considered such an action group.

#### Selecting Project Participants from Target Organizations

Because resources (time, money, and staff) were limited, the project director and the leadership of the Chapter felt that it was important to work from strength and draw upon the resources and expertise of key informants, existing social service organizations and coalitions, the social work education community, and the project director's professional network.

Therefore, this investigator decided to use the following criteria in selecting participants from the three target organizations:

1. organizations should be located in the northern or metropolitan regions of the state (as defined by the SDHS);
2. local units of the State Chapter should have a regional school of social work willing to participate in the project within their geographical boundaries;

3. local units should have stable leadership persons and a core work group willing and able to work on the project;
4. to the extent possible, counties should reflect the three different forms of county government (non-charter, county executive, and county manager) found in the state;
5. study counties should not include the three counties (Norfolk, Ewell, and Ottawa) that were part of an in-depth report (Schreiber and Botsko 1983) on the initial implementation of the social service and community development block grants conducted by the [State] Association of Counties (SAC);<sup>12</sup> and
6. the project director should be part of or known to the human service and educational networks in selected counties.

Chart 2.2 arrays the six local units in the northern and metropolitan regions of the state and shows how they matched up with the selection criteria outlined above.

| <b>CHART 2.2</b><br><b>Criteria for Selecting Branch Units of NASW</b> |                            |                          |                                     |                                 |                                     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Local Unit</b>                                                      | <b>SDHS Region<br/>(1)</b> | <b>Number of Schools</b> | <b>Form of County Govt.<br/>(2)</b> | <b>SAC Study County<br/>(3)</b> | <b>Strength of Author's Network</b> |
| <u>Austin-Bedford</u>                                                  | N<br>N                     | 2 BSW<br>0               | NC<br>NC                            | no<br>no                        | high<br>high                        |
| Park (inactive)                                                        | N                          | 0                        | CE                                  | no                              | low                                 |
| Johnson                                                                | N                          | 0                        | NC                                  | no                              | low                                 |
| Norfolk-Rutland                                                        | N<br>N                     | 0<br>0                   | NC<br>NC                            | yes<br>no                       | low<br>low                          |
| <u>Dover</u>                                                           | M                          | 1 MSW<br>3 BSW           | CE                                  | no                              | high                                |
| <u>Chester</u>                                                         | M                          | 1 BSW                    | CM                                  | no                              | medium                              |

**Notes:**

1. N=Northern Region; M=Metropolitan Region
2. NC=Non-Charter; CE=County Executive; CM=County Manager
3. SAC=[State] Association of Counties

After reviewing the selection criteria, three units emerged as being most suitable for the project--Austin-Bedford, Dover, and Chester. These three units had approximately 1700 members and 58 "ELANers." This constituted 45 per cent of the total membership and 46 per cent of the total ELAN complement.

Three county networks were formed. Each included one of the selected units, at least one regional school of social work, and selected members from one or two CHSACs. The Austin-Bedford network was composed of the Austin-Bedford NASW Unit, Altmeyer-Buell University's undergraduate social

work department, and selected social work members and staff of the Austin and the Bedford CHSACs. The Chester network included the Chester NASW Unit, Coyle College's undergraduate department of social work and sociology, and selected social work members of the Chester CHSAC. The Dover network consisted of the Dover NASW Unit, Dunham Falls University's undergraduate social work department, Eliot University's Dover campus MSW and BSW programs, and selected social work members of the Dover CHSAC. A state-level network was subsequently added to the project. It included the Chapter's Administration Section and the Administration Sequence of Eliot University's Graduate School of Social Work located on the main campus in Ewell County.

Chapter V assesses the initiation stage of the project and discusses the process used to recruit these organizational and individual project participants.

The following section includes: (a) data on the four study counties and (b) characteristics of the organizations in the networks.

#### Characteristics of Demonstration Counties and Participating Organizations

##### Counties

Although the four demonstration counties were located in the northern or metropolitan regions of the study state, they differed in various ways. Table 2.3 compares the counties in several fundamental areas: total population, the percent of the population living below the poverty level,

the average monthly caseload for three critical social services, the predominant political party, and the racial and ethnic breakdown of the population.

| <b>TABLE 2.3</b><br><b>Characteristics of Study Counties</b>                  |                  |                  |                  |                |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|
| <b>Character-<br/>istics</b>                                                  | <b>Austin</b>    | <b>Bedford</b>   | <b>Chester</b>   | <b>Dover</b>   |
| <b>Population</b><br>(1984) <u>1</u>                                          | 844,535          | 457,675          | 506,235          | 841,528        |
| <b>Percent<br/>Persons<br/>Below<br/>Poverty<br/>Level</b><br>(1979) <u>1</u> | 4.1%             | 12.8%            | 7.5%             | 17.9%          |
| <b>Predo-<br/>minant<br/>Political<br/>Party</b><br>(1983) <u>3,d</u>         | Competi-<br>tive | Competi-<br>tive | Competi-<br>tive | Demo-<br>crats |
| <b>Medicaid<br/>Recipients</b><br>(1986) <u>2,a</u>                           | 9,253            | 26,585           | 15,499           | 71,039         |
| <b>AFDC<br/>Recipients</b><br>(1986) <u>2,a</u>                               | 6,126            | 28,386           | 18,941           | 98,353         |
| <b>Food Stamp<br/>Recipients</b><br>(1986) <u>2,a</u>                         | 8,655            | 29,971           | 21,754           | 120,654        |



Continuation of Table 2.3

| Character-<br>istics                    | Austin | Bedford | Chester | Dover |
|-----------------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| Racial/<br>Ethnic<br>Composi-<br>tion:_ |        |         |         |       |
| White                                   | 93%    | 80%     | 81%     | 58%   |
| Black                                   | 4%     | 13%     | 16%     | 37%   |
| Hispanic                                | 3%     | 14%     | 8%      | 9%    |
| Asian/<br>Pacific<br>Islander           | 2%     | 1%      | 1%      | 1%    |
| (1986)<br>2,b,c                         |        |         |         |       |

## Sources:

1. [State] County and Municipal Government Study Commission (1986)
2. Clements, J. (1988)
3. Pomper (1986)

## Notes:

- a. Average caseload per month
- b. Hispanics can be of any race; "Hispanic Origin" is an ethnicity not a race.
- c. Totals round to more than 100%.
- d. Classified according to the average Democratic vote cast in the elections for the General Assembly during the 1975-1983 time period.

Austin County was the most populous county in the state. It was an affluent county with "invisible" pockets of poverty. There was a small but growing Asian population in the county.

Dover, the second most populous county, was a declining urban center and had the state's highest number of persons with incomes below the poverty level. It had the largest Black population of the four study counties.

Chester County, encompassing one of the state's most important industrialized areas, was fifth in population. It had a growing Hispanic population.

Bedford was eighth in population. One half of the county was industrialized and urbanized while the other half was more rugged and less populous. Its Black and Hispanic populations were increasing.

Using the vote for state assembly as a measure of a county's "partisan alignment" can be misleading. (Salmore 1986) Voters have increasingly split their tickets and how they vote at the national and state level may be different from how they vote at the county level. For example, although Austin County is listed as "competitive" using Salmore's measure, the Republican Party usually is dominant at the county level.

Labelling a county as Democratic or Republican can also "mask variations that [emerged] in the large urban counties. While still Democratic overall, counties such as [Dover]

. . .were developing strong Republican suburban areas."

(Salmore 1986, 81)

### Organizational Participants

#### Participating CHSACs

The four counties in the demonstration area chose similar organizational structures for their CHSACs--being part of county government (rather than the alternate structure of being independent of, but sanctioned by, county government).

Asking councils to officially endorse the Chapter's block grant project and appoint liaison persons was not politically or strategically feasible. Reports from the counties indicated that it was taking several months for county legislators to endorse staff recommendations for council membership. Therefore, individual social workers associated with CHSACs as members or staff had to be identified and recruited to serve as project connections to these nascent organizations.

One of the project's objectives was to learn more about the councils' membership, policies, and procedures.

#### Participating Branch Units

The Chapter's Ad Hoc Unit Study Committee was in the process of surveying former and current unit leaders in an effort to find ways to "strengthen" units. Preliminary findings indicated that many unit chairs did the bulk of the unit's work and that they felt they were not acknowledged or "rewarded" by the association.

Most unit steering committee members were recruited by the chair from among people that worked in the same agency or field of practice. Steering committee membership was drawn 60 per cent from the public sector and 40 per cent from the private. The latter group was equally divided between those who work for private, non-profit agencies and those who have a private practice. Ninety-five per cent of the steering committee members were MSWs. Units held an average of four meetings per year; average attendance was 20 persons. (Ad Hoc Committee 1983)

The Dover Unit had 552 members, and 13 of them were "ELANers." The chairperson was also the ELAN coordinator.

The Chester Unit had 340 members 16 of whom were "ELANers." This unit had the largest steering committee of the three participating units. A new ELAN coordinator (with a BSW degree) was recruited for that position shortly after the project began.

The Austin-Bedford Unit had a membership of 809. Twenty-eight of the members belonged to the social action network. The unit had a small steering committee--the chairperson was from Austin County and the vice-chairperson from Bedford. The author was the unit's ELAN coordinator.

#### Participating Schools

Selected characteristics of the participating schools are presented in Table 2.4.

| TABLE 2.4                                |                                       |                                                 |                                       |                                                                   |
|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Characteristics of Participating Schools |                                       |                                                 |                                       |                                                                   |
| Charac-<br>teristics                     | Altmeyer-<br>Buell<br>University      | Coyle<br>College                                | Dunham<br>Falls<br>University         | Eliot<br>Univ.                                                    |
| Auspice                                  | Private                               | Public                                          | Private                               | Public                                                            |
| Size of<br>Host<br>Institu-<br>tion*     | <u>See Note 4</u>                     | <u>See Note 3</u>                               | <u>See Note 3</u>                     | <u>See<br/>Note 5</u>                                             |
| Type of<br>Program                       | Independent<br>Bacca-<br>laureate     | Independent<br>Bacca-<br>laureate               | Independent<br>Bacca-<br>laureate     | Joint<br>MSW/<br>BSW                                              |
| Location<br>of Social<br>Work Unit       | Separate<br>social work<br>department | Joint Dept.<br>Social Work<br>and<br>Sociology) | Separate<br>social work<br>department | School<br>of<br>Social<br>Work                                    |
| No. of<br>Full Time<br>Faculty           | 6                                     | 6                                               | 3                                     | 50**                                                              |
| No. of<br>Students:<br><br>Jrs.<br>Srs.  | 25<br>30                              | 35<br>30                                        | 20<br>18                              | Dover<br>BSW<br>Pro-<br>gram<br><br>Data<br>not<br>avail-<br>able |
| No. of<br>Students:<br><br>MSW           | --                                    | --                                              | --                                    | Dover<br>MSW<br>Pro-<br>gram<br><br>Data<br>not<br>avail-<br>able |

\* Note: 1 = under 2,000  
2 = 2,000 to 4,999  
3 = 5,000 to 9,999  
4 = 10,000 to 19,999  
5 = 20,000 and over

\*\* Total full time faculty in all programs

The characteristics listed in Table 2.4 are the same as those used by Dinerman (1981) in her study, Social Work Curriculum at the Baccalaureate and Masters Levels.<sup>13</sup>

Dinerman surveyed "a stratified 20% sample" of all accredited social work programs in 1979. ". . . characteristics of the sample programs were compared with those of the universe of programs along all known and available dimensions." (6)

This study used a different methodology and did not choose "sampling units." However, comparison of the educational programs that participated in the project with all accredited programs and with those in the Dinerman study can provide an indication of how feasible it would be to replicate this program in other areas of the study state and in other states. Although Dinerman's study used 1979 CSWE information and this study was initiated in 1983, the change in the number of accredited programs was nominal.

Auspice. Sixty percent of all programs were in public institutions and 40 percent were in private institutions. The project participants were evenly divided between public and private.

Size of host institution. The educational programs participating in the project were in the larger enrollment categories. None had enrollments under 4,999 whereas 38 percent of all programs and 32 percent of Dinerman's sample were in smaller institutions.

Type of program. The study schools more heavily represented independent baccalaureate programs, and none represented independent master's programs. The breakdown for all accredited programs was 67 percent independent BSW, 19 percent joint MSW/BSW, and 14 percent independent MSW. Dinerman's sample closely paralleled the divisions of the entire universe.

Number of full-time faculty in BSW programs. Dinerman reports that two-thirds of the independent BSW programs have a faculty of four or less. She states that "All else being equal, a faculty of four or less probably means that students do not get a breadth of exposure; those faculty are stretched thin as they try to cover field and class and all aspects of curriculum." (62) Her study does not report on the use of adjunct faculty members. Two of the project's three independent BSW programs had six full-time faculty and one program had three. These programs frequently utilized part-time faculty as well. The joint MSW/BSW program had approximately 50 full-time faculty members; however, information on how the faculty was deployed among the MSW and BSW programs on the main and branch campuses was not available.

The baccalaureate programs that participated in the project were affiliated with larger institutions and had more faculty members than many of the undergraduate programs in the country. It is possible that they were more stable and had more resources than typical BSW programs. The

stability and resources of the undergraduate programs in a geographic area would need to be considered if one replicated this study.

The next section addresses the rationale for selecting the embedded, single-case study research design. It includes information on the configurations of participating organizations in the county demonstration areas.

Embedded, Single-Case Design

Yin (1989) discusses four types of case study designs based on whether they are single- or multiple-case and whether they involve unitary or multiple units of analysis. He arrays these components in the following 2 x 2 matrix.

(46)

|                                       | Single Case Designs | Multiple-Case Designs |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Holistic (single unit of analysis)    | TYPE 1              | TYPE 3                |
| Embedded (multiple units of analysis) | TYPE 2              | TYPE 4                |

Figure 2.2      Basic Types of Designs for Case Studies

From Case Study Research, (p.46) by R. Y. Yin, 1989, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. Reprinted by permission.

This case utilizes a Type 2 pattern--an embedded single-case design.



### Single-Case Design

Yin presents three reasons for using a single-case design. They include those single cases that are critical in testing a well-formulated theory, those that represent an extreme or unique situation or those that reveal a phenomenon previously inaccessible to scientific observation. (46-49) In one sense, this study is a variation of the revelatory case. The professional association was interested in learning how a major change in social welfare policy was being implemented at the county level of government so social workers could begin to influence that process.

Although the project was implemented in three local NASW units, it fit the single-case rather than the multiple-case design. The study is about a single demonstration project in one state and the program was implemented simultaneously in the three locations.

According to Yin, use of a multiple-case design requires that each case be chosen with care so that literal or theoretical replication can be predicted at the outset of the investigation. (1989, 52-59) Because the study dealt with describing a new phenomenon, outcomes could not be predicted. In addition, the selection of participating organizations was limited to those in the northern and metropolitan regions of the state for reasons discussed above. They were not selected in accordance with Yin's criteria.

### Multiple Units of Analysis

A single-case study can have single or multiple units of analysis. "This occurs when, within a single case, attention is also given to a subunit or units. . ." (Yin 1989, 49)

The holistic design is appropriate when no logical subunits can be identified. Potential problems arise when the use of a unitary approach allows the investigator "to avoid examining any specific phenomenon in operational detail" and to conduct the case at an abstract level. (Yin 1989, 49)

The embedded design serves as an important device for focusing a case study and for dealing with potential "slippage." According to Yin, "slippage" occurs when the researcher begins with one orientation but shifts direction as the case proceeds; thus, making the original design unsuitable. Yin does suggest caution when using an embedded design to ensure that the whole is not forgotten with too much attention given to the subunits. (1989, 50)

The SSBG Demonstration Project is the main unit of analysis. The study involves several "logical subunits" and therefore incorporates multiple units of analysis. The analysis units include:

1. the Block Grant Demonstration Project as a whole;
2. the three types of participating organizations, their subunits, and certain individual members;

3. state and county level networks organized under the project's aegis with their subunits and key individuals; and

4. selected "episodes" or activities, i.e., continuing education events not connected with network activities and participation in the Human SERVE voter registration drive. (Lofland and Lofland 1984, ch.6)

Chart 2.3 delineates the embedded units of analysis associated with the study's cooperating organizations. The specific organizational subunits and individuals listed in Chart 2.3 are not meant to be exhaustive.

| <b>CHART 2.3</b><br><b>Embedded Units of Analysis: Organizations</b>                                                                                                                                 |                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                           |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Professional Association</b>                                                                                                                                                                      | <b>Social Work Educational Program</b>                                                            | <b>Governmental Advisory Body</b>                                                                                                         |
| <u><b>Overall:</b></u><br>State Chapter                                                                                                                                                              | <u><b>Overall:</b></u><br>BSW Program                                                             | <u><b>Overall:</b></u><br>County HSAC                                                                                                     |
| <u><b>Subunits:</b></u><br>Board of Directors<br>Task Forces<br>Practice Sections<br>Standing and Ad Hoc Committees<br>Branch Units                                                                  | <u><b>Subunits:</b></u><br>Faculty<br>Field Agencies<br>Student Body<br>Alumni                    | <u><b>Subunits:</b></u><br>Membership Categories:<br>Consumers<br>Private Non-Profit Agency Reps.<br>Public Agency Reps.<br>Council Staff |
| <u><b>Individuals:</b></u><br>Executive Director<br>President-Elect<br>Chair, Administration Section<br>Chair, State ELAN<br>Chair, Income Maintenance and Social Service Task Force<br>Unit Officer | <u><b>Individuals:</b></u><br>Chair, Social Work Department<br>Faculty Liaison<br>Student Liaison | <u><b>Individuals:</b></u><br>Chair, HSAC<br>NASW Member(s)<br>SDHS County Rep.<br>Director, CDHS                                         |

Chart 2.4 depicts the specific analysis units associated with a county level network. Networks incorporated a local NASW unit, one or more social work programs, and members of one or more county human service advisory council(s).

| <b>CHART 2.4</b><br><b>Embedded Units of Analysis: Austin-Bedford</b><br><b>County Network</b> |                                                                                                                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <u>Overall:</u><br>Austin-Bedford<br>Unit, NASW/[XX]                                           | <u>Overall:</u><br>Altmeyer-Buell<br>University/BSW<br>Program                                                                            | <u>Overall:</u><br>Austin County HSAC<br>Bedford County<br>HSAC                                                                                                                                         |
| <u>Subunits:</u><br>Unit Steering<br>Committee<br>"ELANers"<br>General Membership              | <u>Subunits:</u><br>Faculty<br>Students<br>Field Agencies<br>Alumni                                                                       | <u>Subunits:</u><br>Social Work<br>Members:<br>Private Non-<br>Profit Agency<br>Reps.<br>Public Agency<br>Reps.<br>Consumer<br>Advocates<br>Non-Social Work<br>Members (same<br>categories as<br>above) |
| <u>Individuals:</u><br>Unit Chair<br>ELAN Coordinator<br>Program<br>Coordinator<br>"ELANer"    | <u>Individuals:</u><br>Chair, Social<br>Work<br>Department<br>Faculty Liaison<br>Student Liaison<br>Coordinator,<br>Internship<br>Program | <u>Individuals:</u><br>Chair, HSAC<br>Individual social<br>workers<br>CHSAC Staff<br>Persons<br>SDHS County Rep.<br>Director, CDHS                                                                      |

Chart 2.4 depicts the Austin-Bedford County network. The Chester and Dover County networks were similar in structure. The specific organizational subunits and individuals listed in Chart 2.4 are not meant to be exhaustive.

The methods used to collect data for each unit of analysis varied. The questions that focused the data collection process and the methods used to collect data will be discussed in the upcoming sections on reliability and validity.

#### Reliability and Validity

A final consideration in case study designs is to create designs that are reliable and valid. "An important innovation of [his] book," according to Yin, "is the identification of several tactics for dealing with. . . tests [of reliability and validity]." (1989, 41) Table 2.5 replicates Yin's list of the four tests, the case study tactics for dealing with them, and the phase of research in which each tactic occurs.

**TABLE 2.5**  
**CASE STUDY TACTICS FOR FOUR DESIGN TESTS**

| <b>Tests</b>              | <b>Case-Study Tactic</b>                       | <b>Phase of Research in Which Tactic Occurs</b> |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Construct validity</b> | use multiple sources of evidence               | data collection                                 |
|                           | establish chain of evidence                    | data collection                                 |
|                           | have key informants review                     | composition                                     |
|                           | draft case study report                        |                                                 |
| <b>Internal validity</b>  | do pattern matching                            | data analysis                                   |
|                           | do explanation-building                        | data analysis                                   |
|                           | do time-series analysis                        | data analysis                                   |
| <b>External validity</b>  | use replication logic in multiple-case studies | research design                                 |
|                           |                                                |                                                 |
| <b>Reliability</b>        | use case study protocol                        | data collection                                 |
|                           | develop case study data base                   | data collection                                 |

From Case Study Research, (p.41) by R. Y. Yin, 1989, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc. Table 2.1 reprinted by permission.

"An important revelation," according to Yin, "is that several tactics [listed in Table 2.5 above] should be applied throughout the subsequent conduct of the case study. . . . 'design work' actually continues beyond the initial design plans." (41)

Because these tactics are recently codified, there are few available resources indicating how to utilize them in

practice. The author has made an attempt to apply some of the suggested tactics in this study.

### Reliability

Reliability involves "demonstrating that the operations of a study--such as the data collection procedures--can be repeated, with the same results." (Kidder 1981 as cited in Yin 1989, 41) Yin discusses two case-study strategies for dealing with reliability issues: (a) use of a case study protocol and (b) development of a case study data base. A review of each of these strategies follows.

### Case study protocol

The protocol is a guide for the investigator (and any research assistants) to follow in carrying out the case study. Yin identifies five areas to include in the protocol. The following section describes Yin's elements and indicates which ones were utilized in this study. (The following information relies heavily on material presented by Yin 1989, 70-80.)

1. The overview of the case study project should cover the background information about the project, the substantive issues being investigated, and any relevant readings.

The author developed an overview that described the project's background, focus, design, and resources. This was used to acquaint interested parties with the project, to recruit potential participants, and to ensure that all project liaisons from participating



organizations had a similar understanding of what the project was trying to accomplish.

The overview did not include a list of relevant readings, as recommended by Yin. However, as the project proceeded, two bibliographies were developed and distributed to participating personnel as well as to those attending the various continuing education events.<sup>14</sup>

2. Field procedures that include information about credentials, access to study "sites," and procedural reminders for all researchers should be part of the protocol. Written field procedures were not necessary, as the author was the sole investigator. Information about credentials and access to study sites is included in a subsequent section on the researcher's role management.

3. A set of substantive case study questions are the "heart" of the protocol. These questions are posed to the researcher not to prospective respondents. The purpose of the questions is to remind the investigator of what data needs to be collected and why. Each question should be accompanied by a list of possible evidence sources, i.e., interviews, participant observation, documentation.

Yin states that these questions should reflect the full set of concerns from the initial design. However, he cautions that the protocol should only include

questions asked of the individual case. Questions asked of an entire study or normative questions about recommendations and conclusions do not belong in the protocol.

Because the author was using the "differential model" of program evaluation, she developed a set of questions with suggested data collection methods for each program stage at the beginning of the project. Developing these questions compelled the author to anticipate issues that might arise as the study proceeded. Yin indicates that they also keep the investigator focused.

4. To the extent possible, Yin recommends that a tentative outline of the case study report be included in the protocol. A written outline of the final report was not prepared; however, this investigator planned to organize the findings according to stages of program development. Each stage-related evaluation chapter would feature selected evaluation questions and their answers.

The project director considered the forty-one questions in the four tables while carrying out the project. However, including all of them in the report was not only unnecessary but would not accomplish the goal of presenting a reliable, readable account of the project's unfolding. Therefore, the author chose a limited number of exemplary questions and

answers for inclusion in this study. The following criteria were used to select questions:

1. they should illuminate the project's approach to accomplishing one or more of a stage's goals or tasks;
2. they should represent different units/levels of analysis; and
3. they should include a mix of the three evaluation objectives--program effort, program effectiveness, and program efficiency.

The first set of questions and suggested data collection methods for the Program Initiation Stage was presented in Table 2.1 above. Tables that include evaluative questions, research strategies, and data collection methods for the Program Contact, Program Implementation, and Program Stabilization Stages follow:

**Table 2.6**  
**EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND STRATEGIES**  
**PROGRAM CONTACT STAGE\***

| Evaluation Objectives/Questions                                                                                                                               | Evaluation Strategies/Methods** |                     |           |                       |        |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------|
|                                                                                                                                                               | Documen-<br>tation              | Archival<br>Records | Interview | Particl-<br>pant Obs. | Survey |
| <b>Effort</b>                                                                                                                                                 |                                 |                     |           |                       |        |
| 1. What amounts of time and program resources are devoted to making contacts with liaison persons from cooperating organizations? with intended participants? | X                               |                     |           | X                     |        |
| 2. What efforts are devoted to the compilation of data pertaining to program activity?                                                                        | X                               | X                   |           |                       |        |
| 3. What amounts of time and activity are devoted to finding key informants that could increase the number of contacts with target populations?                |                                 |                     | X         | X                     |        |

Continuation of Table 2.6

| Evaluation Objectives/Questions                                                                                            | Evaluation Strategies/Methods** |                     |           |                       |        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------|
|                                                                                                                            | Case Study Strategy             |                     |           |                       |        |
| Effort (con't)                                                                                                             | Documen-<br>tation              | Archival<br>Records | Interview | Partici-<br>pant Obs. | Survey |
| 4. To what extent are alternative strategies sought and used when efforts do not appear sufficient to reach target groups? | X                               |                     | X         | X                     |        |
| <b>Effectiveness</b>                                                                                                       |                                 |                     |           |                       |        |
| 5. To what extent are the intended target groups represented in each county's network?                                     | X                               |                     |           | X                     |        |
| 6. To what extent have contacts resulted in positive working relationships among target groups in each county?             |                                 |                     | X         | X                     |        |
| 7. What are the opinions of the intended beneficiaries regarding the reasons why contacts are or are not made?             |                                 |                     | X         |                       |        |

Continuation of Table 2.6

| Evaluation Objectives/Questions                                                                                                                                                                             |                    | Evaluation Strategies/Methods**<br>Case Study Strategy |           |                       |        |  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------|--|
| Efficiency                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Documen-<br>tation | Archival<br>Records                                    | Interview | Partici-<br>pant Obs. | Survey |  |
| 8. What are the relative results of using different means for contacting potential participants (letters, group meetings, liaison persons)?                                                                 | X                  |                                                        |           | X                     |        |  |
| 9. Are liaison functions and roles structured to maximize consistency in each county so project goals can be achieved?                                                                                      |                    |                                                        | X         |                       |        |  |
| 10. Are certain attributes of participants more related to successful project contacts than others, i.e., membership in NASW? membership in ELAN? holding multiple roles in network? other characteristics? | X                  | X                                                      |           | X                     | X      |  |

\*Based on format developed by Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978.

\*\* Methods are defined in Case Study Research Section of chapter. Note: An "X" indicates that the method in a particular column can be used to answer the evaluation question in the same row.

**EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND STRATEGIES**  
**PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION STAGE\***

| Evaluation Objectives/Questions |                                                                                                                                                          | Evaluation Strategies/Methods** |                     |           |                       |        |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------|
|                                 |                                                                                                                                                          | Documenta-<br>tion              | Archival<br>Records | Interview | Partici-<br>pant Obs. | Survey |
| <b>Effort</b>                   |                                                                                                                                                          |                                 |                     |           |                       |        |
| 1.                              | How much time and effort are devoted to a review of project's objectives and goals?                                                                      | X                               |                     |           |                       |        |
| 2.                              | What staff efforts are involved in the respecification of goals and in the location of additional resources judged necessary to achieve project results? | X                               |                     |           |                       |        |
| 3.                              | How much time and activity are devoted to procuring follow-up information from program participants?                                                     | X                               |                     |           |                       |        |

Continuation of Table 2.7

| Evaluation Objectives/Questions |                                                                                                                                                                                 | Evaluation Strategies/Methods**<br>Case Study Strategy |                     |           |                       |        |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------|
| Effectiveness                   |                                                                                                                                                                                 | Documenta-<br>tion                                     | Archival<br>Records | Interview | Partici-<br>pant Obs. | Survey |
| 4.                              | Has the program made a beginning place for itself -- in the two major social work organizations that participated in the block grant project? in the social services community? | X                                                      | X                   | X         | X                     |        |
| 5.                              | What benefits have accrued for individuals and institutions?                                                                                                                    |                                                        |                     |           |                       | X      |
| 6.                              | Are there any unplanned outcomes, either desirable or undesirable, that could be attributed to the project?                                                                     |                                                        |                     | X         | X                     |        |
| 7.                              | How effective is the collaborative model used to engage and educate members to influence SSBG policy implementation at the local level?                                         | X                                                      | X                   | X         | X                     | X      |



Continuation of Table 2.7

| Evaluation Objectives/Questions |                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Evaluation Strategies/Methods**<br>Case Study Strategy |                     |           |                       |        |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------|
| Effectiveness (Con't)           |                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Documenta-<br>tion                                     | Archival<br>Records | Interview | Particl-<br>pant Obs. | Survey |
| 8.                              | What results have been achieved that could be attributed to the project? Are there changes in the knowledge, attitudes and/or behavior on the part of project-related individuals or organization? |                                                        |                     | X         | X                     | X      |
| <b>Efficiency</b>               |                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                                                        |                     |           |                       |        |
| 9.                              | What are the relative results of different approaches used to achieve similar results?                                                                                                             | X                                                      |                     |           |                       |        |
| 10.                             | Could the same results be achieved with a reduction in the project director's efforts?                                                                                                             | X                                                      |                     | X         | X                     |        |

Continuation of Table 2.7

| Evaluation Objectives/Questions |                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Evaluation Strategies/Methods**<br>Case Study Strategy |                     |           |                       |        |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------|
| Efficiency (Con't)              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Documenta-<br>tion                                     | Archival<br>Records | Interview | Particl-<br>pant Obs. | Survey |
| 11.                             | How do the participating county networks compare on items such as level of participation, interest of participants in becoming involved in social action efforts, strength or relationships among groups in local network? | X                                                      |                     | X         | X                     | X      |

\*Based on format developed by Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978.

\*\* Methods are defined in Case Study Research Section of chapter. Note: An "X" indicates that the method in a particular column can be used to answer the evaluation question in the same row.

**Table 2.8**  
**EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND STRATEGIES**  
**PROGRAM STABILIZATION STAGE\***

| Evaluation Objectives/Questions                                                                                                                     | Evaluation Strategies/Methods** |                  |           |                  |        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------|------------------|--------|
|                                                                                                                                                     | Documentation                   | Archival Records | Interview | Participant Obs. | Survey |
| <b>Effort</b>                                                                                                                                       |                                 |                  |           |                  |        |
| 1. What is the extent and type of activities devoted to developing alternative sources of needed inputs?                                            | X                               |                  |           | X                |        |
| 2. What efforts are devoted to keeping volunteer leadership and staff current with changes in state and county block grant policies and procedures? | X                               | X                |           | X                |        |
| 3. What is the extent and type of activity designed to involve members in influencing governmental block grant implementation processes?            | X                               |                  |           | X                |        |

Continuation of Table 2.8

| Evaluation Objectives/Questions |                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Evaluation Strategies/Methods*<br>Case Study Strategy |                     |           |                       |        |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------|
| Effort (Con't)                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Documenta-<br>tion                                    | Archival<br>Records | Interview | Partici-<br>pant Obs. | Survey |
| 4.                              | What efforts are made by key members of the organization to communicate and convey the organization's official positions on block grant issues to staff, committees, sections, task forces and units? | X                                                     |                     |           | X                     |        |
| <b>Effectiveness</b>            |                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                       |                     |           |                       |        |
| 5.                              | To what extent has the program developed diversified sources of key resources?                                                                                                                        | X                                                     |                     | X         | X                     |        |
| 6.                              | Has the program maintained a place for itself -- in the two major social work organizations that participated in the block grant project? in the social service community?                            | X                                                     |                     |           | X                     |        |

Continuation of Table 2.8

| Evaluation Objectives/Questions |                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Evaluation Strategies/Methods*<br>Case Study Strategy |                     |           |                       |        |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------|
| Effectiveness (con't)           |                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Documenta-<br>tion                                    | Archival<br>Records | Interview | Partici-<br>pant Obs. | Survey |
| 7.                              | Have adaptations been made in the original project objectives? If so, on what basis were these adaptations made? What results have been achieved that could be attributed to these adaptations? |                                                       |                     | X         | X                     |        |
| 8.                              | Are there any unplanned outcomes that could be attributed to the program (either desirable or undesirable)?                                                                                     |                                                       |                     |           | X                     |        |
| Efficiency                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                       |                     |           |                       |        |
| 9.                              | What are the relative results of using a different approach to achieve similar results?                                                                                                         | X                                                     |                     |           | X                     |        |

\* Based on format developed by Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978.

\* Methods are defined in Case Study Research Section of chapter. Note: An "X" indicates that the method in a particular column can be used to answer the evaluation question in the same row.

A copy of the case study protocol is included in Appendix A. It includes the Project Overview; Major Programmatic Tasks; and Tables 2.1, 2.6, 2.7, and 2.8.

The tables presented above indicate the particular configuration of data collection methods used for each of the questions in the protocol. These sources of evidence are described in the following section. The descriptions include pertinent comments from Yin and examples of the forms of information used in this case study.

#### Sources of evidence

Yin indicates that "Six sources of evidence can be the focus of data collection for case studies: documentation, archival records, interviews, direct observations, participant-observation, and physical artifacts." (1989, 85) This study used four of these sources--documentation, archival records, interviews, and participant observation--plus a survey.

Archival records. "Archival records can be used in conjunction with other sources of information. . . .When archival evidence has been deemed relevant, an investigator must be careful to ascertain the conditions under which it was produced as well as the accuracy of the archival evidence." (88)

Some examples of the archival records utilized in this study include Chapter records that pre-dated the project such as ELAN rosters and Board minutes, census records, and SDHS Title XX plans.

Documentation. Yin notes that "documentary information is likely to be relevant to every case study topic. . . . [and] can take many forms."

The usefulness of. . . documents is not based on their necessary accuracy or lack of bias. In fact, documents must be carefully used and should not be accepted as literal recordings of events that have taken place.

For case studies, the most important use of documents is to corroborate and augment evidence from other sources. First, documents are helpful in verifying the correct spellings and titles of names of organizations that might have been mentioned in an interview. Second, documents can provide other specific details to corroborate information from other sources; if the documentary evidence is contradictory rather than corroboratory, the case study investigator has specific reason to inquire further into the topic. Third, inferences can be made from documents. . . . these inferences should be treated only as clues worthy of further investigation rather than as definitive findings. . . (1989, 85-86)

Study documents included a variety of items:

1. correspondence with participating organizations, key informants, and continuing education speakers and panel members;
2. meeting announcements, agendas, and minutes;
3. administrative documents such as the PAF guidelines, proposal, and progress reports;
4. SDHS SSBG 1984 and 1985 pre-expenditure reports and instructions for establishing CHSACs;
5. [State] Association of Counties' report on the initial implementation of SSBG processes and procedures;

6. articles published in the NASW National and Chapter newsletters;
7. Chapter documents such as minutes of board meetings, committee reports, membership lists, and ELAN rosters;
8. CHSACs' membership lists and descriptions of organizational structure;
9. Schools' lists of students, faculty, and field agencies (including names of field instructors);
10. membership lists of groups such as United Way administrators; and
11. county network meeting sign-in sheets and the Spring Forum registration list.

Participant-observation. Yin (1989) described participant - observation as follows:

Participant-observation is a special mode of observation in which the investigator is not merely a passive observer. Instead, the investigator may take a variety of roles. . .and may actually participate in the events being studied. . . .

Participant-observation provides certain unusual opportunities for collecting. . .data, but it also involves major problems. The most distinctive opportunity is related to the investigator's ability to gain access to events or groups. . . . Another distinctive opportunity is the ability to perceive reality from the viewpoint of someone "inside" the case study rather than external to it. Finally, other opportunities arise because of the investigator's ability to manipulate events or situations. . . .

The major problems related to participant-observation have to do with the potential biases produced. . . (92-93)

The author assumed a variety of roles in connection with the project: grantsperson, employee of the State



Chapter, project director, faculty liaison from one of the participating schools, and officer of one of the participating local units of the Chapter. Although she would have preferred to carry fewer roles, one of the characteristics of the participating organizations was their small work groups. These multiple roles did allow her to gather information and recruit needed resources with some ease. They also facilitated her ability to add the additional role of participant-observer.

At the same time, the author had to be particularly careful to maintain an objective stance toward the project. The case study protocol helped to build in procedures to guard against contaminating the findings with personal biases.

Interviews. Yin describes three types of interviews associated with case studies: open-ended, focused, and structured. He notes that well-informed respondents and key informants "can provide important insights into a situation. . . [and] shortcuts to the prior history of the situation. . . ." He cautions that these "verbal reports" can be "subject to bias, poor recall, and poor or inaccurate articulation" and should be corroborated with data from other sources. (88-91)

This investigator conducted open-ended and focused interviews with key informants and with potential participants. For example, when one of the project's principal target populations did not attend the first

continuing education event, the author interviewed potential participants as well as key informants such as the director of the state university's social action center.

Surveys. Participants at network-sponsored continuing education events were asked to complete evaluation forms. Two forms were used--one for the county network meetings and one for the state network meeting. The evaluation forms are included in Appendix B.<sup>15</sup> These surveys provided information on the characteristics of the participants and their assessment of the quality of the presentations.

In addition to discussing each of the potential data sources, Yin also presents three principles of data collection: creating a case study data base, using multiple sources of evidence, and maintaining a chain of evidence. The first of these principles is discussed below; the second and third will be addressed in the section on validity.

#### Case study data base

Yin indicates that "the lack of a formal case study data base for most case study efforts is a major shortcoming of case study research and needs to be corrected in the future." (1989, 99) He notes that "the distinction between a separate data base and the case study report has not become an accepted practice" as it is with other research strategies. (emphasis in original, 1989, 98) He suggests four components that might be included in a data base: case study notes, an annotated bibliography of documents, any tabular materials, and narratives written by the

investigator, i.e., open-ended answers to questions in the protocol.

Case study notes, a chronological collection of documents, bibliographies developed for the project, and surveys completed by participants at three of the project's continuing education events are available. These data sources are in the author's possession.

The next section briefly describes Yin's procedures for increasing an investigation's validity and how they were applied in this study.

### Validity

According to Weller and Romney

The aim of research is to produce results that are valid and robust. . . .[this means] that the results reflect the meanings intended by the researcher and that they would stand up under a variety of circumstances. In order to validate findings it is usually necessary to look beyond the results of a single study and to compare the results from the single study to additional studies and criteria. (1988, 78-79)

As indicated in Table 2.5 above, Yin has proposed several recently conceptualized case study tactics for addressing issues of validity.

This investigator used three of the suggested tactics: a variation of having key informants review the study, the use of multiple sources of evidence, and the maintenance of a chain of evidence.

### Review of case study report

The chair and members of the doctoral committee were chosen because of their knowledge of the substantive issue,

the study's methodology, and/or the record of the profession's involvement in political and social action. The chair and/or the members approved the initial proposal, provided feedback during various stages of the research process, and critiqued drafts of the dissertation.

#### Multiple sources of evidence

The use of multiple sources of evidence. . .allows an investigator to address a broader range of historical, attitudinal, and behavioral issues. However, the most important advantage. . .is the development of converging lines of inquiry. . .any finding or conclusion in a case study is likely to be much more convincing and accurate if it is based on several different sources of information, following a corroboratory mode. (Yin 1989, 97)

An example of how multiple evidence sources can substantiate conclusions follows. Because SSBG decision making was being delegated to the counties, the State Chapter's local units were strategically important. Units were the key organizations at the local level--they not only sponsored the continuing education meetings but were also designated as political action coordinators. The unit's capacity to take on these additional responsibilities was critical to the success of the project. Findings related to the unit's ability to perform critical tasks emanated from several sources of evidence such as the following:

1. observations of several meetings of unit steering committees and membership meetings;<sup>16</sup>
2. documents such as the Ad Hoc Committee on Unit Strengthening's Report<sup>17</sup> Program Committee Reports<sup>18</sup>,

the Executive Director's Report<sup>19</sup>; and statements of Chapter objectives<sup>20</sup>;

3. attendance at SSBG Unit meetings (see Chapter VI); and

4. questionnaires completed by those who attended the continuing education events. (see Chapters VI and VII).

#### Maintaining a chain of evidence

[Maintaining a chain of evidence allows]. . .the reader of the case study. . .to follow the derivation of any evidence from initial research questions to ultimate case study conclusions. . . .[the reader] should be able to trace the steps in either direction (from conclusions back to initial research questions or from questions to conclusions). (102)

This process includes following a "paper trail" (in either direction) that includes the initial study questions, the case study protocol, the data base, and finally the report itself. (102-103) An example of this process follows.

One of the study's main research questions asked how effective the SSBG Demonstration Project was in helping social workers understand and influence block grant implementation policies and procedures on the state level and in four selected counties.

The "heart" of the case study protocol, the 41 stage-related evaluative questions and the data collection methods used to find answers to these questions, were presented in Tables 2.1, 2.6, 2.7, and 2.8 above. Question 8 in Table 2.7, Evaluation Questions and Strategies Program Implemen-

tation Stage, asks, "What results have been achieved that could be attributed to the project? Are there changes in the knowledge, attitudes and/or behavior on the part of project-related individuals or organizations?"

Participants at three of the project-sponsored continuing education events assessed the quality and the usefulness of the information they received. A summary of how they rated the presentations is described in Chapter VII, Evaluation of Program Implementation Stage. The case study data base includes meeting agendas and action minutes (see Chapter IV) as well as the questionnaires completed by the participants.

#### Summary: Reliability and Validity

According to Gilgun, reliability and validity are increased when the author provides a "thick description" of "processes, contexts, implementers, and subjects. . . ." (1994, 375) In this section on research design and in subsequent chapters, the author has strived to maintain a balance between "sufficient detail" and excessive minutia.

The next section describes the plan for analyzing the data that was collected.

#### Plan for Data Analysis

#### Stage-Related Findings

The evaluative questions concerning program effort, effectiveness, and efficiency for each stage of program development that guided the data collection process also provide the structure for analyzing the evidence. Fourteen

of the 42 questions were selected according to the criteria described above to evaluate the information that was collected. (See Appendix G for a review of the 14 selected questions.)

### Analytic Generalization

"In analytic generalization, findings extracted from a single case are tested for their fit with other cases and with patterns predicted by theory or with previous research and theory." (Gilgun 1994, 372)

In this study, the stage-related findings are compared to previous knowledge in the following areas:

1. the extent of social workers' individual and/or collective involvement in social action on behalf of people who are poor and/or disadvantaged;
2. circumstances under which social workers are most likely to engage in social action;
3. the professional association's involvement in political and social action at the national and state levels;
4. efforts made by State Chapters of NASW to involve their constituents in social action; and
5. the impact of decentralization on social action/advocacy efforts.

Empirical studies and selected works that address these five areas are examined in Chapter III, Review of the Related Literature: Social Action.

Finally, this chapter ends with a discussion of how the investigator handled role management issues.

### Researcher's Role Management

#### Entry/Access

When the project began this investigator was a tenured faculty member in the undergraduate social work department at Altmeyer-Buell University (ABU). Over a nine-year period she had taught in the child welfare, social welfare policy, and research areas; directed the professional internship program; secured and managed several federally-funded child welfare training grants; conducted several grant-related program evaluations; and developed continuing professional education activities for human service personnel. She was a member and former chairperson of the [State] Association of Baccalaureate Social Work Educators.

During the same period, she was an active member of the NASW State Chapter at both the state and unit levels, e.g., chaired the Educational Legislative Action Network (ELAN) for the Austin-Bedford Unit, represented the Chapter at the 1981 Delegate Assembly, served on the advisory committee to the Chapter's previous PAF-funded project, and represented baccalaureate educators on the Chapter's Continuing Education Committee.

The author was active in many community service activities involving agency boards, governmental bodies, and social service organizations. One particularly pertinent experience involved serving on a County Title XX Coalition,



a forerunner of the study state's SSBG county human service advisory councils. As director of the professional internship program, she had developed relationships with a wide range of agencies in the study counties.

All of these experiences gave her access to and credibility in the academic and practice arenas when she began working on the Block Grant Project.

#### Informed Consent and Confidentiality

The genesis of this doctoral project is described in detail in Chapter V and summarized here. The author responded to the State Chapter's solicitation of 1983-84 Program Advancement Fund proposals from members and/or doctoral students with projects related to the NASW's national program goals.<sup>21</sup>

The author's inquiry prompted a series of discussions that resulted in an agreement to submit a proposal related to increasing the Chapter's ability to influence state and county block grant implementation processes.

The essence of the block grant PAF proposal was approved by the Board of Directors on February 10, 1983. Chairpersons of the local units and the state committees that would subsequently be selected to participate in the project participated in the board's decision. The minutes indicated that "a candidate in the Doctoral Program. . .will be engaged" to direct the project should it be funded.<sup>22</sup>

When selected schools were asked to participate in the PAF project, their department heads and/or deans were also

informed that the study would be used as the basis for the author's dissertation.

The Executive Director, the president-elect, and the author collaborated in writing the proposal and soliciting support from organizations critical to the implementation of the project. The proposal was signed by the Executive Director and the Board President and submitted to the PAF Subcommittee on February 18, 1983.<sup>23</sup>

The proposal stated that "[The author] will be responsible for designing, implementing and evaluating the project. She will report to the chapter executive."<sup>24</sup>

The Chapter was informed of the PAF award in April, 1983. The award notice indicated that "funding was contingent upon" completion of the PAF "Agreement for Contributors of Works Made for Hire." Upon the advice of the executive director, the author added a notation to the Agreement indicating that the "research will also be used as the basis for [the author's] dissertation." The notated Agreement was returned to the national office.<sup>25</sup> The Chapter received full funding.

The PAF project's interim and final reports were endorsed by the executive director and the board president.<sup>26</sup>

As described above, key people in the participating and sponsoring organizations were informed of the project's dual purposes--to carry out two of the State Chapter's program goals and to provide the basis for the author's doctoral

dissertation. However, approximately 350 people participated in the project and information about the combined objectives did not reach all of them. To protect their right to confidentiality, the names of the study state, the counties in the demonstration area, the participating organizations, and key individuals have been disguised as follows:

- \* The study state is identified as (a) one located east of the Mississippi and (b) one of at least 14 where block grant planning and allocation responsibilities were being partially or fully transferred to counties.
- \* The State Chapter of the professional association is identified as one of ten that fit NASW's "large chapter" classification--membership over 2,000.
- \* The participating schools have been "rechristened" with names of social work pioneers whose biographies are included in the Encyclopedia of Social Work (1987)--Arthur Altmeyer, Bradley Buell, Grace Coyle, Arthur Dunham, and Martha Eliot.
- \* County names were chosen from listings of cities and counties in the Rand McNally Contemporary World Atlas (1986). The place names selected were ones that could be found in many states, i.e., "Dover" is located in Delaware, Florida, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee.

\* Titles rather than names were used to distinguish among individuals.

This schema is also utilized in the case study data base section of the reference list. Although this is somewhat unusual, the author felt it was better to err on the side of protecting participants' privacy. Researchers who need access to a particular reference can contact the author.

While these changes did not alter the study's findings, they did restrict the author's ability to describe some unique characteristics of the study state, participating organizations, and individuals that hindered or facilitated the accomplishment of project objectives.

## Chapter Endnotes

1. Richan (1981) defines strategic intelligence as "knowledge of the decision-making process, key actors, and patterns of influence. . ." (7)
2. Material in this section draws heavily on Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978; and Bielawski and Epstein 1984.
3. The terms "program director," "program manager," and "administrator" are being used interchangeably.
4. NASW/XX Leadership Handbook, 1985-1986.
5. ELAN [State] Roster, May, 1982.
6. For example, although the Dover County Unit encompassed parts of six state legislative districts, the unit's ELAN coordinator was only responsible for four of them. The fifth district, as well as portions of other legislative districts, was assigned to the Austin-Bedford ELAN Coordinator.
7. ELAN Roles, May, 1982.
8. NASW/XX Policy Review Process, May, 1982.
9. Range of Possible Action Strategies, May, 1982.
10. Range of Possible Action Strategies, May, 1982.

The Chapter developed five action levels:

- Level I -- No Action (NASW has no interest in issue.)
- Level II -- Limited Actions (NASW is interested but issue isn't significant.)
- Level III -- Significant Issue (NASW has high level of interest.)
- Level IV -- Important Issue (broad concern to profession)
- Level V -- Crucial Issue (vital to the profession)

A Level III action response, for example, calls for (a) observation of legislative committee meetings; (b) presentation of testimony at public hearings; (c) mobilization of "ELANers" to call or write legislative committee members; (d) development of a position paper; and (e) publication of a review of the issue in the newsletter.

A Level IV response incorporates Level III activities and adds (a) "ELANers" visiting legislators, (b) using position paper and other propaganda with selected publics, and (c) urging members to write.

A Level V designation initiates a "no holds barred, everything committed to issue" response.

11. The term network is widely used in the behavioral and social sciences. For example, see Sarason et al. 1977; Laumann, Marsden and Prensky 1983; Maguire 1983; and Scott 1991.

12. Information from Schreiber and Botsko's study (1983) could be compared to the project's findings as one test of validity.

13. The study examined "the curricular content of social work educational programs at the baccalaureate and master's level in order to find out how such programs define the base. . .and the specialized content, what content is included in each component and how articulation between undergraduate and graduate levels is arranged." (Dinerman 1981, 1)

14. NASW/[State] Block Grant Demonstration Project, Selected Bibliography, September 30, 1983. Spring Forum on "Human Services Planning Issues Confronting Local Decision-Makers," Selected Bibliography, June 6, 1984.

15. Both forms asked questions in the following areas: participant's satisfaction with the content, speakers, and meeting arrangements; participant's assessment of the "usefulness" of the presentation in helping them understand the issues; participant's suggestions for improving the continuing education program; and information about the participant's role(s) in the social service system and the reason he/she attended the meeting.

The county meeting forms also asked (a) if the participant felt the session was useful in helping him/her become a more effective advocate, (b) how frequently he/she attended unit meetings, and (c) whether he/she was interested in becoming involved in social action activities.

The forum evaluation form did not ask the questions listed above. Instead participants were asked (a) how they planned to apply the information presented at the conference, (b) if they wanted to be notified of Administration Section activities, (c) what activities would be most interesting to them, and (c) if they wanted to be notified of other meetings on the county level block grant implementation process.

The last page of both forms, where participants gave their names if they wanted more information or to be involved in social action activities, could be detached and turned in separately.

It would have been preferable if both forms were identical. The difference is explained by the fact that the forum had an active planning committee whose members wanted to take on responsibility for various tasks such as constructing the evaluation form.

The county networks depended on the project director to handle this sort of work.

16. In addition to having numerous discussions with individual unit officers and overseeing each of the Unit-sponsored continuing education events, the author also attended a number of unit meetings such as Austin-Bedford Unit Steering Committee Meetings on November 28, 1983 and June 21, 1984; the Chester Unit Steering Committee meeting and membership meeting on October 26, 1983; and the Dover Unit Meeting on October 20, 1983.

17. Chair, Ad Hoc Unit Study Committee. Memorandum to Board President, November 2, 1983.

18. Chair. Program Committee Minutes, February 28, 1983.

19. Executive Director. 1983 Year End Operating Report, January 6, 1984.

20. NASW/[State] Action Plan for PFY [Program Fiscal Year] '84, May, 1983. NASW/[State] Action Plan for PFY [Program Fiscal Year] '85, December, 1983.

21. Chapter Executive Director and Chair of Program Committee. Memo to Leadership of all volunteer structures, December 28, 1982.

22. Secretary of the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Board of Directors, February 10, 1982, 2.

23. Chapter PAF Proposal, Developing a Practice/Education Network to Increase Social Action on the Local Level Regarding Block Grants, February 18, 1983.

24. Chapter PAF Proposal, 1983, 14.

25. Chair, Program Advancement Fund Subcommittee. Letter to President of the Chapter, April 5, 1983.

26. Program Advancement Fund Project FY1983-84, Progress Report, NASW [State] Chapter, February 1, 1984. Program Advancement Fund Project FY1983-84, Final Report, NASW [State] Chapter, August 22, 1984.

### CHAPTER III

#### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE: SOCIAL ACTION

##### Introduction

Chapter III reviews a small body of empirical studies as well as selected other works related to social workers' individual and collective involvement in political and social action efforts aimed at bettering the condition of disadvantaged persons. Social workers engage in a variety of political and social action activities to influence policy development in their roles as members of the professional association, as agency employees, as members of political parties, as elected officials, and as participants in broad-based social action groups. (Haynes and Mickelson 1991) Since the present study focuses on a project funded by the professional association's Program Advancement Fund and carried out under the auspices of a State Chapter of NASW, the literature review emphasizes studies of "social action by social workers acting through their professional association." (Thursz 1966, 120)

##### Definition of Social Action Behavior

This study uses definitions of social action behavior developed by Epstein (1969 and Reeser (1990). When Epstein conducted a survey of the social action attitudes and behaviors of members of the New York City Chapter of NASW, he developed two original indices of social action behavior. The index of institutionalized social action behavior was based on respondents' indications that they had engaged in



specific social actions, taken through institutionalized channels (e.g., visited a public official, gave public testimony, participated in an agency social action committee, etc.) The index of noninstitutionalized social action behavior was based on respondents' saying that they had engaged in a protest action (e.g. joined a protest demonstration, engaged in civil disobedience, etc.). (Reeser and Epstein 1990, 20)

In 1984, Reeser replicated Epstein's study and developed "two additional measures--an index of electoral social action behavior and an index of professional social action behavior." The first of these indices asked respondents if they had engaged in activities such as contributing money to a candidate or party, attended public rallies. The second, explored respondents' involvement in activities specifically related to social work professionalization, e.g., licensing, social work lobbying. (Reeser and Epstein 1990, 20)

The professional association tends to involve its members in institutionalized social action behaviors such as testifying before public bodies, giving service to an NASW Committee involved in social action, participating in social work lobbying for legislation, etc.

The rest of this chapter has been organized under seven headings, as follows: (a) the history of the social work profession with respect to social and political action; (b) the social action behaviors of individual social workers;

(c) the involvement of the professional association in social action at the national and state levels; (d) initiatives taken by State Chapters of the NASW to involve their constituents in social action; (e) circumstances under which social workers are most likely to engage in social action; (f) factors predicting the effectiveness of the social action efforts of the profession; and (g) the impact of decentralization on social action efforts.

Profession's History with Respect to  
Social and Political Action

Patti (1983a) succinctly reviewed the evolution of the profession's involvement with political and social action as a prelude to discussing the importance of social workers' involvement in opposing the Reagan administration's attempt to dismantle the government's commitment to social welfare. He described the history in the following way.

Since social work began to emerge as a self-conscious occupational group at the turn of the century, the profession has generally embraced the idea that individual and collective action to reform social and economic institutions or to change harmful environmental conditions is a part of its domain. To be sure, there have been internal divisions on ideology and substantive policy issues and sharp differences about the relative emphasis social work education and practice should give to political action as opposed to the provision of direct services. Nevertheless, a persistent normative theme in the professional subculture has continued to define political action as a core responsibility. (97)

Patti (1983a) noted that social workers were important participants in such events as the First White House Conference on Children in 1909, the enactment of child labor

legislation, the creation of the juvenile court system, and reform efforts aimed at improving the housing and educational services available to inner city poor. In 1912, Jane Addams and Paul Kellogg helped to write the platform of Theodore Roosevelt's Progressive Party. Over the period from 1915 through 1960, the social work profession became more concerned with the provision of direct practice interventions, and less concerned with the goal of bringing about social change. However, in the 1960's, the profession once again demonstrated its interest in social action.

According to Patti (1983a), this trend was the result of two major social developments. The first of these developments was the emergence of social movements that sought to empower segments of society that had little previous influence in the political process. These groups included racial and ethnic minorities, students, the poor, the aged, and those opposed to the Vietnam War. Patti suggested that many social workers who participated in these movements developed a heightened awareness of the need for institutional change and an increased ability to work for political change. At the same time, the Great Society legislation created a large number of programs that were aimed at redressing the problems of poverty and racism in our society. These programs were founded on the principle that social problems were the result of environmental deficits rather than individual pathology. These programs required social workers to focus their professional efforts

on such activities as community organization and advocacy, as opposed to individual treatment.

Concomitant with the changes described above, NASW became more committed to the goal of promoting social action. This commitment was manifested in the establishment in 1971 of the Educational Legislative Action Network (ELAN), a national network that facilitates information exchange between NASW State Chapters and coordinates action on state and federal legislation. In 1975 the NASW created the Political Action for Candidate Election (PACE) committee to raise funds for political contributions to candidates that support the professional association's legislative agenda.

Over the period since the creation of these institutions, approval for social action within the social work profession has increased. For example, Reeser and Epstein (1990) reported that between 1968 and 1984, the proportion of NASW members who approved of social workers' engaging in political campaigning rose from 68 per cent to 78 per cent, and the proportion of members who approved of social workers' organizing protest groups rose from 28 per cent to 41 per cent. (19) Ezell (1993) reported a "significant growth in the political involvement of social workers over the Reagan years in office." (81)

Weismiller and Rome (1995) maintained that "In the 1990's major institutions representing social work education and practice are seeking to formalize and advance the role

of social workers in politics." (2035) They pointed out that the 1992 revision of the Council on Social Work Education Curriculum Policy Statement indicated that one of the four purposes of the social work profession is "the pursuit of policies, services, resources, and programs through organizational or administrative advocacy and social or political action, so as to empower groups at risk and promote social and economic justice." (CSWE 1992, 3)

#### Social Action Behaviors of Individual Social Workers

Although there is no national data available indicating the extent to which social workers are involved in political and social action (Patti 1983a), there are some empirical studies that describe the actual political behavior of rank and file social workers. (Epstein 1969; Ezell 1993; Pawlak and Flynn 1990; Reeser and Epstein 1987, 1990; Wolk 1981)

Epstein (1969) has had a long-standing interest in social workers' involvement in social action on behalf of low-income clients and in the relationship between professionalization and social activism. His 1969 study surveyed "the social characteristics, professional commitments, and social action attitudes and behaviors of 899 profession social workers [members of the New York City Chapter of NASW]." (Abstract) He was interested in determining the social bases of social work activism.

attitudes and behaviors of professional social workers in 1969. He found that

. . .organizational career factors and external status characteristics [sex, age, socio-religious group identification, political affiliation] are most predictive of commitment to activist goals and strategies of change for the profession and of participation in institutionalized and non-institutionalized social-action behavior.  
(Epstein 1969, Abstract)

When Epstein compared the social action attitudes and behaviors of caseworkers, groups workers, and community organizers, he found that "social caseworkers are the least likely to endorse activist goals for the profession, approve conflict strategies in welfare and housing reform, and participate in social action, institutionalized as well as non-institutionalized." (1969, 82)

Wolk (1981) surveyed 289 social workers in Michigan. Respondents received two questionnaires. One requested demographic information. The second was a modified version of the Political Activity Index developed by Woodward and Roper. (1950) Wolk's modified version contained seven questions with a total possible point score of 8. (1981, 284) The average score of the respondents was 3.7 which placed them in the low end of the "active" category. (285) Wolk reported that two-thirds of the responding social workers had participated in three or more of the following political activities: (a) engaging in political discussions; (b) making financial contributions to political groups; (c) attending political meetings; (d) being a member of a political organization; (e) participating in a political

campaign; (f) communicating with elected officials; and (g) testifying before legislative committees. He noted that "Although social workers from all facets of the profession tend toward political involvement, social workers in macro-level positions (for example, administration) are most active." Wolk attributed this to the demands of the job and stated that "political involvement is often a necessary activity of social workers in administration or community organization." (287)

Pawlak and Flynn (1990) interviewed 57 executive directors in four cities in Western Michigan to ascertain their perspectives on and experiences with 19 political activities. "One-third of the respondents had a master of social work degree (half in treatment and half in administration)." (307)

The researchers were interested in the subjects' "on-the-job" and "off-the job" political activities. The percentage of executive directors that participated in on-the-job political activities ranged from 95 percent who wrote letters to 25 percent who participated in marches or attended rallies. (308) "State government was the most frequent object of the directors' political activities, and the federal government was the least frequent object." (308)

Over half of the directors served on task forces and committees. Pawlak and Flynn noted that

Many considered themselves "political players": they purposely established political ties and credibility and positioned themselves "to be asked to serve." Most of these directors were sought by appointed officials

from government agencies, but several were asked to serve by prominent elected official from the executive and legislative branches of state or federal government. The task forces or committees focused on professional issues, for example, Medicaid or Alzheimer's disease, rather than on specific agency matters. (308)

The directors also participated in off-the-job political activities. However, most of the issues they were involved in were related to their roles as private citizens or taxpayers. (308)

Reeser and Epstein (1990) compared "the findings of two large, public opinion surveys of rank-and-file social workers conducted in 1968 and 1984." (3) Their study covered a number of topics. The two that were most related to this study include:

1. a comparison of the respondents' social action behaviors during the two time periods; and
2. the extent to which different practice groups (caseworkers, group workers, and community organizers) had differential commitments to activism.

With regard to number one, the authors report that

84 percent of the social workers in 1984 scored high on such institutionalized social action behaviors as visiting a public official. . .as contrasted with only 47 percent in 1968. Alternatively, the proportion of social workers engaged in noninstitutionalized forms of social action behavior such as protest demonstrations declined from 29 percent in 1968 to only 17 percent in 1984. . .while socially approved forms of political behavior nearly doubled, socially disapproved forms dropped by nearly one-half. (21)

Of the social workers surveyed in 1984, 80 percent were actively involved in electoral social action behavior; and 44 percent were actively involved in "forms of behavior



intended to augment the power and influence of social work, e.g., licensing, social work lobbying. . ." (21)

With regard to the impact of specialization on social action, in 1968 and 1984, caseworkers were least likely to participate in both institutionalized and noninstitutionalized social action behaviors. Community organizers were most likely to take part in social action behaviors during both time periods. However, group workers were most likely to engage in noninstitutionalized social action behavior in 1968 and least likely to do so in 1984. (25) These findings support "the use of a 'process' approach<sup>1</sup> to the prediction of differences in the social activism of social workers. . ." (30)

Ezell (1993) conducted a study "to learn which social workers are most politically active and what changes may have occurred in social workers' political participation during the Reagan years." (82) Ezell surveyed 311 randomly selected members of the Washington State Chapter of NASW and 42 randomly selected graduates (BSW, MSW, and Ph.D) of the University of Washington School of Social Work who were not members of NASW.

The survey had a section that included the same questions relating to political participation that Wolk (1981) had used. He found that there was significant growth in the political involvement of social workers over the Reagan years in office. In Wolk's 1981 study, the Average Political Activity Index Score was 3.7; whereas in 1989 the

Average Political Activity Index Score was 4.6--the high end of the "active" category. The change represented a statistically significant difference. The big differences in the political behavior of social workers over the Reagan years was their greater tendency to write or talk to public officials and attend meetings at which political speeches were made. Ezell found that "social workers are politically active largely by writing letters to public officials but also by discussing political issues with friends, by belonging to politically active organizations and by attending political meetings." (92)

Among social workers, those with the highest educational degrees, those who are NASW members, those who are in macro type jobs, and black social workers tend to be more active than their colleagues. The data also suggested that one of the primary reasons social workers are politically active is to advocate for clients.

Thus it is clear that social workers as a group are active politically, as one would expect based on the more recent actions and policies of NASW.

Social Action Involvement of the  
Professional Association at  
State and National Levels

State Level

Five studies of the political activity among NASW State Chapters have been conducted between 1979 and 1992.

(National Center for Social Policy and Practice 1988, 1989;

Lause 1979; Salcido and Seck 1992, Smith 1991) The investigators were interested in, among other topics, the extent to which Chapters' political activity has focused on the status of the social work profession or on the goal of securing social and economic justice for the disenfranchised.

Lause (1979) conducted an exploratory survey of 50 NASW chapters during the 1974-77 period. He found that legislative activity nearly doubled in the three-year period. Lause noted that "State Chapter legislative activity was characterized by a concentration on issues which were directly related to the concerns of professional status." Social work licensure and third-party payments advocacy activities accounted for 57 percent of the first priorities in 1974, and 67 percent in 1975. "While acknowledging that licensure and third-party payments may be related to service quality and consumer freedom of choice, he believed this to be a tenuous relationship." (Lause 1979 as cited in Smith 1991, 24)

"Lause (1979) believed that social work's ability to contribute to the development of a more just and humanistic society was inhibited by a state-level preoccupation with status problems and dwarfed by the pursuit of social work licensing and vendorship and that NASW legislative agendas have only a minimal focus on social problem concerns. He added that available evidence, moreover, does not suggest that the legislative focus of State Chapters become more

social problem focused following the attainment of legal regulation of social work." (Lause 1979 as cited in Smith, 1991, 25)

The NASW-affiliated National Center for Social Policy and Practice (1988, 1989) conducted two surveys to ascertain the Chapters' legislative agendas. The staff were interested in information about the process used by Chapters in setting legislative agendas as well as in the content of the agendas. Questionnaires were mailed to the Executive Directors of all NASW Chapters informing them that they would be contacted by telephone. The telephone interviews were conducted during the summer of 1987.

Thirty-two of the Chapters reported that they had an established process to develop a state legislative agenda; eight had no process, and thirteen had "partial" structures to develop agendas. Chapters in the latter group often noted that they "work with coalitions when issues arise." (1988, 2) Local area units submitted issues to the Chapter level in seven of the Chapters, and five Chapters reported that they polled their membership to identify issues. (3)

Each of the chapters reported the issues that were priorities for 1986, 1987, and 1988. The priority issues that were mentioned most frequently during the three year period included:

1. Professional issues (licensing, vendorship, mandatory mental health benefits)--mentioned 80 times
2. State budget issues--mentioned 27 times

3. Children's issues--mentioned 51 times
4. Welfare reform--mentioned 23 times
5. Aging issues--mentioned 14 times
6. AIDS--mentioned 14 times

The survey indicated "a broad spectrum of interests across the country and among chapters. The most frequently identified priority issues are licensing and vendorship. Obviously, the issues identified as priority by some of the chapters are already resolved in other states and would not be identified." (1988, 5)

The Center conducted a follow-up survey in 1989. When chapters identified their top three priorities for the upcoming legislative sessions, 16 named both policy and professional issues, 21 named policy issues only, and 8 named professional issues only. Nine respondents had not yet decided on their priorities. (6) "While the 1988 report indicated that chapters placed a strong focus on professional issues, [the 1989] summary reveals a move toward dealing with both professional and social policy issues." (7)

Smith (1991) surveyed NASW chapters in the United States "to collect data relating to the extent and nature of political/legislative activities of NASW chapters. (55) Forty-two of the 52 chapter responded. Smith reported the following findings:

1. in contrast to suspicions voiced by earlier writers, social workers in NASW are focusing their efforts in the legislative arena on social service issues and professional issues.

2. the level of participation of chapter's legislative political activities is related to the size of the chapter. It should be noted that the size of the chapter reflects the amount of financial resources available to chapters for funding such programs. . . .

3. there is a greater growth in legislative programs than in political programs over ten years. Nevertheless, there is growth in both programs. The difference in rate of growth between the two programs may be attributed to a number of factors, including the earlier implementation of ELAN and the greater acceptance of the type of activities pursued in the legislative programming of NASW. . . .(76-77)

Smith (1991) felt that her findings lent support to those issued by the National Center for Social Policy and Practice.

During the same time period Salcido and Seck (1992) also surveyed 52 NASW Chapters. The authors were interested in "the level of political participation among NASW chapters" and in ascertaining which social action activities were perceived as being the most influential. (563)

Responses to the survey were obtained from Chapter executive directors, Chapter presidents, legislative advocates, and Chapter legislative coordinators. More than half of the respondents indicated that they were "very active" in three types of political activities: writing letters to politicians (56 percent); telephone calls to officials (52 percent); and lobbying legislators (52 percent). However, Salcido and Seck concluded that "chapters seemed to act on behalf of goals related to promoting the profession and to a lesser extent on those promoting social services legislation. This may mean that

professional commitment to advocacy for disenfranchised groups is not a high priority." (564)

It may be that the NASW State Chapters are more concerned with professional issues than is the national office, since state laws regulate the professions. However, it is curious that the State Chapters are not more involved in social action initiatives, along with their role in professional advocacy. Salcido and Seck suggested that more research is required to understand the Chapters' "noninvolvement in these issues." (564) The authors suggested that it was especially ironic that the Chapters surveyed reported very little involvement in protest activities and voter registration efforts, since these activities can be used to empower the poor, minorities, and social service clients. They concluded that, through the Chapters, the social work profession must "aggressively organize for social justice, continue to pursue legislation beneficial to the disadvantaged, and seek to directly mobilize social workers and disenfranchised groups toward these goals." (564)

#### National Level

During the Reagan and Bush administrations, when the responsibility for meeting people's needs was substantially decentralized, the NASW national office expanded its government relations office from a single professional to six full-time lobbyists and support staff. In 1994, over 1300 social workers were participating actively in the

association's lobbying efforts. (Weismiller and Rome 1995)  
Over one-third of NASW State Chapters employed staff members or consultants to influence policies that affect social workers and their clients.

Consistent with the goal of empowering at risk groups and promoting social and economic justice, NASW has launched a number of recent policy initiatives at the national level, and many of these efforts have met with considerable success. Weismiller and Rome (1995) noted the following legislative victories achieved at least in part due to the efforts of the professional association on the national level:

1. the passage of the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 to combat discrimination in the workplace;
2. the enactment of the Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvements Amendments of 1988, which provided for the inclusion of school social workers and other pupil support personnel in programs for disadvantaged and handicapped students;
3. an increase in funding for the Title XX Social Services Block Grant under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989;
4. the provision in the Higher Education Amendments of 1992 of loan forgiveness under the federal Perkins Program for social workers and others working with high-risk children and families in low-income communities or with disabled infants or toddlers; and



5. the creation of a new entitlement to fund family preservation services under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993.

Several authors have noted that NASW increased its level of political and social action activity in the mid 1980s in response to the policies of the Reagan administration. (Ezell 1993, Haynes and Mickelson 1991, Reeser and Epstein 1990, Weismiller and Rome 1995)

Initiatives Taken by State Chapters of NASW  
to Involve their Constituents  
in Social Action

In spite of the general conclusion that NASW Chapters have been more focused on professional recognition than on social action, there are some notable exceptions. For example, Abrams and Goldstein (1982) described the political advocacy efforts of the Florida Chapter. They noted that the State Chapter had "developed a comprehensive, five-part program to strengthen its efforts to obtain effective social policy legislation." (243) The five components of the program were as follows:

1. The Chapter's Board develops a set of legislative goals each year.
2. The Chapter lobbies to achieve these legislative goals.
3. The Chapter has a political action committee (PACE) that helps to elect lawmakers who are favorable to NASW policy goals.

4. The Chapter has a well-organized education program designed to motivate members in local units to support the Chapter's lobbying and political action committee.

5. The professional association monitors the implementation of laws that have been enacted with the support of the Chapter.

Abrams and Goldstein (1982) suggested that these efforts had resulted in a number of successful social action initiatives, including increased funding of AFDC grants, legislation to improve housing and health care for migrant workers, state subsidies for the adoption of hard-to-place children, a new system to keep track of children placed in foster care, the revision of archaic adoption laws, the creation and funding of community care programs for the elderly, the enactment of a bill of rights for persons who are retarded, the passage of legislation extending due process to mentally ill patients who are held involuntarily, the approval of Medicaid payments for abortions, the defeat of a bill calling for a national constitutional convention aimed at banning abortions, the institution of statewide school breakfast programs, and the adoption of legislation establishing services for victims of domestic violence. Abrams and Goldstein also noted that the Florida Chapter had acted to achieve social work licensure, but it is clear that the mix of social action and professional development issues is more heavily weighted in the direction of social action.

A key element in the Florida Chapter's social action program is the education of members, Abrams and Goldstein noted that "An educated, organized, and motivated membership is necessary to provide the resources and strength for the system to influence policy." (1982, 245-246) The significant involvement of members is required in at least five specific areas: (a) the contribution of funds to the political action committee; (b) volunteer work for the political action committee and the candidates endorsed by the Chapter; (c) seminars that inform members of NASW's policy positions and prepare them for communicating with legislators; (d) calling on legislators personally to argue in favor of NASW positions and initiatives; and (e) responding to NASW requests to telephone or send letters to legislators and members of the press in support of NASW positions on particular issues.

Abrams and Goldstein suggested that the task of raising the political consciousness of Chapter members is a difficult one, since the Chapter must "compete with the members' interests in courses to advance their therapy-related skills, with social workers' traditional reticence to become involved in politics, and with the limited hours and funds most social workers have to devote to activities outside their agencies." (246) In order to accomplish the objective of motivating members, the Chapter holds an annual educational meeting for the membership in the months before the start of the legislative process. In these meetings,

the state legislative chairperson explains policy priorities to the members, describes specific legislative initiatives, and attempts to recruit members to call on local legislators and engage in telephone and letter-writing campaigns. In addition, the state legislative chairperson meets with the legislative committee of each local unit and assists them in developing their skills in lobbying and organizing letter-writing efforts. The Chapter also holds seminars to train members in campaign skills, so that they are better prepared to work for candidates endorsed by the political action committee. Abrams and Goldstein pointed out that Chapter members who work in political campaigns often meet officials in contexts that promote warmth and friendship. This, in turn, makes it easier for those members to approach these officials at a later time to call their attention to NASW legislative priorities.

In 1992 Schachter conducted a research project that described the New York City Chapter's efforts to involve its membership in political action over a 15 year period. Schachter (1992) presented an historical study of the involvement of the New York City Chapter in three legislative areas in the 1960s: obtaining New York State certification for social workers, pursuing federal civil rights legislation, and developing public welfare policy. This report makes it clear that the New York City Chapter was quite active in the areas of civil rights and public welfare policy during the decade of the 1960s.

Schacter stressed the important role in these efforts of State Chapter position statements and members' testimony before legislative committees. This observation supports the contention of several experts on social action within the profession that the provision of information to legislators is crucial to the accomplishment of social work policy objectives. (Albert 1983, Haynes and Mickelson 1986, Mahaffey 1972, Patti and Dear 1975, Richan 1981)

Schacter also stressed the importance of informal social connections between Chapter members and individuals with access to legislators. He stated that, "Personal connections, either through family members of social workers, or through connections to social workers in influential policy positions, worked to advance the social work position. Such connections were at times the difference between a successful outcome and one that would have been quite different." (221) This observation supports the argument of Abrams and Goldstein (1982) that participation by social workers in political campaigns is important, because such participation can be expected to lead to the establishment of close personal connections.

Schacter attributed the success of the New York City Chapter in the areas of civil rights and welfare policy to the efforts of NASW leaders as well as the efforts of "a number of active members in each issue area." (1992, 223) He noted that these efforts were supported by "some amount of staff assistance, including limited utilization of a

professional lobbyist," but he also stressed that the "contribution of volunteers was a resource that was relied extensively upon." (223) Schacter indicated that there were times when large scale activities were undertaken that involved the general membership, i.e., letter-writing or collection of petitions. However, he also noted that "there were numerous instances in this study in which the general membership did not play a role in the political activities of the organization. In fact, the study suggests that the inclusion of members in such activities was likely to have been the exception, and not the rule." (223) This conclusion supports the contention of Olson (1965) that most members do not join organizations in order to achieve collective action, but rather for the material benefits that they receive as a result of their membership.

#### Predictors of Social Workers' Involvement in Social Action Activities

Richan (1981) pointed out a number of factors that tend to inhibit social workers from participating actively in politics. He referred to Ribicoff's (1962) assertion that many social workers view politics as an "undignified business," but Richan rejected this assertion on the basis that social workers have not hesitated to become politically active in pursuit of professional recognition. Richan suggested that a more important factor in limiting the political participation of social workers may be the notion advanced by Brager (1968) that social workers as a group

tend to believe that manipulative political tactics violate ethical principles.

Richan argued that "Social workers appear to become most active when they perceive that both the public interest and their own interest are at stake." (1981, 239) He noted that social workers are constantly admonished to care for others. The selection process in schools of social work, the ethical prescripts of the profession, and the social work literature all reinforce the social worker's role as a "professional altruist." Richan argued that social workers may feel defensive about this altruism in a society that puts down "do-gooders" and "bleeding hearts," but he asserted that among colleagues, social workers do in fact subscribe to the value of altruism.

For this reason, Richan suggested that an issue which is seen as primarily serving the self-interest of the profession is likely to be met with ambivalence. On the other hand, he also argued that if social workers see an issue as contributing to the public good, but not to their own vital interests, they tend to be apathetic. Therefore, Richan contended, that in order for social workers to be inspired to become involved in political activities, they must perceive themselves as pursuing a "mixed agenda." By this term, Richan is referring to an issue that can be seen as affecting both the public interest and the interest of the profession.

As an example of such an issue, Richan referred to the "harsh and repressive nature of the regulations promulgated by HEW in early 1973," which "embodies a direct threat to everything for which social workers stood--both in terms of the deprived populations, which would suffer severely, and the social workers' own interests." (1981, 242) Richan noted that this issue mobilized disparate elements within the social work profession and led many workers to become more active politically than they ever had before.

Factors Predicting the Effectiveness  
of the Social Action Efforts  
of the Social Work Profession

Having considered the question of what types of issues are most likely to inspire social workers to become politically active, the next logical question concerns the factors that determine how effective their political actions may be. Wolk (1981) stated that "despite the apparent numbers of professional social workers engaged in political activism, the profession plays a minimal role in shaping policies and decisions at the local, state, and national levels." (288)

Mathews (1982) suggested that, in general, social workers are not particularly effective in their social action activities. He surveyed 24 state and federal legislators residing in southwestern Michigan. The survey solicited the perceptions of these legislators regarding social workers and the social work profession, the extent to



which they perceived social workers as having political influence, and their opinions regarding the ways in which social workers could increase their political influence.

Mathews reported that the great majority of the responding legislators did not provide an accurate description of the training and experience necessary to become a social worker. Only three of the 24 legislators made any reference to the academic training required to become a social worker. With respect to the legislators' perceptions of the extent to which social workers were politically active, the greatest number of respondents reported that in the last year they had received no letters from social workers, that they had received no telephone calls from social workers, and that they had not had any face-to-face meetings with social workers. In short, the legislators tended to perceive social workers as uninvolved in the political process.

In order to determine how much political influence the legislators felt that social workers have, the respondents were asked to rate each of six professional organizations in terms of their relative political influence. These organizations were the United Auto Workers Union, the Chamber of Commerce, the Michigan Education Association, the Michigan Bar Association, the American Medical Association, and the National Association of Social Workers. In making these ratings, the responding legislators were asked to use a ten-point scale where one indicated that they viewed the

organization as the least influential of the group. The mean ratings of the six organizations indicated that the NASW was last, with a mean rating of only 2.45 on the ten-point scale. Five of the respondents indicated that they had never received a communication from the NASW, and the same five legislators indicated spontaneously that in fact they had never heard of the organization. Clearly, the social work profession does not appear to have any measure of political influence among this group of public officials.

The responding legislators were also asked to indicate the actions that an organization could take to increase its level of political influence. The respondents provided a number of specific recommendations. The most frequently mentioned action was to "develop personal relationships." This response was offered by ten of the 24 respondents. This finding supports the conclusions of Schacter (1992) regarding the importance of personal connections in political lobbying activities, as well as the contention of Abrams and Goldstein (1982) that participation in political campaigns should be encouraged to develop cordial and personal relationships between social workers and politicians. Some of the other factors mentioned by the legislators have also been noted earlier in this review. These included writing letters (mentioned by 8 respondents), providing knowledgeable input (6 respondents), making financial contributions (4 respondents), participating in election campaigns (3 respondents), meeting with legislators

face-to-face (2 respondents), being involved actively in a political party (2 respondents), making telephone calls (2 respondents), and bringing petitions to legislators (2 respondents).

Mathews (1982) recommended that when social workers do become politically active, they should make it a point to identify themselves as social workers. He stressed the importance of developing personal relationships with elected officials and initiating frequent contact with them. Mathews also stressed that social workers have tended to align themselves almost exclusively with liberal, Democratic, and urban politicians. He suggested that legislators are often influenced by the most active groups within their constituencies, regardless of the ideological "fit." He therefore argued that social workers should not restrict their lobbying activities or their networking solely to Democratic politicians. Mathews suggested that the most important factor in determining the degree of political influence that a professional group can exert is the degree to which that group can provide legislators with technical and political information. He quoted one of his respondents as suggesting that ". . .we [legislators] recognize that the touchstone of good lobbying and bad lobbying is not whether the objectives of persuasion are selfish or altruistic, liberal or conservative, pro-labor or pro-business, but solely and simply whether the message

conveyed is intelligible, accurate, and informative, or cryptic, deceptive, and obscure." (1982, 625)

Richan (1981) also noted a number of factors that he perceived as affecting a professional group's ability to influence political policy decisions. These included money, large blocs of voters, formal authority, control over information, personal relationships, participation in coalitions, and the degree of investment in an issue. Richan argued that the social work profession has little money and does not comprise a large voting bloc. He also suggested that social workers' "access to positions of formal authority is largely fortuitous and dependent on the decisions of others." (233) He therefore recommended that the most powerful tools of the profession are information and the development of personal ties. He also suggested the utility of participating in coalitions with other groups having mutual interests.

Richan stated that the social work profession can have political influence, provided that social workers have sufficient investment in the issue. He suggested that "To the degree that a constituency makes an intense and sustained commitment of its resources to a cause, it will be able to actualize its potential influence." (236) Richan also pointed out that one of social work's prime virtues, its concern for the full range of human problems, may present a problem from the point of view of achieving effective political action. If the profession allows itself

to pursue too broad a range of policy objectives, it will run the risk of diluting its scarce resources to the point that no progress is made on any particular issue. In short, it is necessary to target specific issues and to focus political efforts on those specific targets. The interests of the disadvantaged groups in our society are best served when the social work profession proceeds in an incrementalist manner, achieving one goal after another, rather than attempting to do everything at one time.

O'Connor (1983) pointed out several aspects of the historical development of the social work field that have had a profound influence over the degree to which the profession can achieve political influence. He noted that the field of social work originally recognized the importance of both the individual and the environment in which the individual functions, and that social workers originally gave as much attention to actions designed to change the environment as they did to actions designed to change individual clients. However, as the struggle for professional recognition unfolded, it became necessary to identify the unique body of expertise that provided social work with its distinctive body of expertise that provided social work with its unique identity and legitimized its claim to the status of a profession. As noted by Lubove (1972), "The core of any profession is a special skill applied to a special function." (22)

The social work profession adopted the principle and processes of social casework as this special core of expertise. Thus the focus of the profession narrowed, emphasizing individual change rather than action to change the environment. This trend was accelerated with the incorporation into the social casework model of Freudian psychology and psychoanalytic practice. O'Connor argued that "Rhetorically, social work continues to proclaim a person-environment orientation but in actuality environmental intervention remains the underdeveloped part of its technological base." (8)

O'Connor suggested that the over-reliance of the field on clinically-oriented casework as the principal method has profound consequences for social work. Specifically, it contributes to social workers "being locked into the lower strata of social welfare organizations." (1983, 9) This is because casework skills allow social workers to provide direct services to clients on a one-to-one basis, focusing on the personal and interpersonal aspects of the client's problems. But direct services are provided by personnel at the ground level of social agencies. Organizational, interorganizational, and community interventions and policy planning are tasks reserved for those at the higher levels. Thus, social workers tend to be uninvolved with the types of activities that would lead naturally to political involvement.

O'Connor presented a four-tier organizational model comprising direct service, supervision, management, and executive levels. He argued that each of these levels is marked by a different technological base: the direct service level by casework; the supervisory level by teaching and training; management by program design and administration; and the executive level by policy analysis and planning and by political activity. Thus, social workers must master new technologies if they are to rise within the organizational structure to reach the highest level, where political action takes place.

Moreover, the focus on casework at the entry level of the social work profession tends to exclude many individuals who have broader perspectives and concerns, some of whom may be presumed to have the capability to approach social welfare issues through legal, political, and economic activities. In short, "social work has gained a quasi-professional status but at a rather high price. . . . Social work is locked into the lower levels of large bureaucratic structures because of its reliance upon casework as its principal intervention method, and. . . the profession has distanced and insulated itself from individuals who actually exercise influence in the social welfare arena." (1983, 12)

O'Connor concluded that social work must become more adaptive. In order to achieve this end, the profession must:

1. develop social workers who possess the technological expertise necessary to assume positions at higher levels in the institutional structure of the social welfare system;
2. develop social workers with the specialized expertise required to assume policy-making positions in the various fields of practice; and
3. link social workers with individuals and groups who exert political clout with respect to social welfare policy issues.

O'Connor also suggested that social workers must be willing to break away from the traditional role of neutral enabler that is inherent in the Freudian model of direct practice. They must instead assume an activist position. They must learn to act in a planned, responsible way to induce change in personality and in social systems. They must re-commit to the social work heritage of social reform and social activism.

#### The Impact of Decentralization on Social Action and Advocacy Efforts

Zinn and Rivard (1983) pointed out that the establishment of social service block grants by the Reagan administration had important consequences with respect to the locus of decision-making activities that affect the



planning and implementation of social service delivery. Funding that had come from Title XX of the Social Security Act is now funneled to the states at a reduced level, and it has been subject to fewer federal regulations and greater discretion on the part of the states. This means that efforts on the part of the social work profession to influence the implementation of the Social Service Block Grants will require the use of new strategies and approaches.

According to Zinn and Rivard, "the first step toward being able to understand and influence the implementation of SSBG is to identify the primary individuals, groups, and organizations that have historically controlled and presently control decisions concerning social service funding." (1983, 35) They argued further that once these groups have been identified, it may be possible to determine what their agendas have been and how successful they have been in attaining their goals. They noted that under Title XX, each state's governor designated a single stage agency, such as the welfare department or the department of social services, to be responsible for the implementation of all Title XX programs. This designated agency thereby "gained power over the state's social service system by controlling the flow of funds to other public and private agencies." (1983, 36) Under the Reagan administration's block grant system, the state governor is not required to appoint a single agency to administer block grant funds, but most

states have left responsibility for the administration of the SSBG in the hands of the agency originally responsible for Title XX. Thus, Zinn and Rivard recommend that efforts to influence the utilization of block grant funds at the state level should begin by gaining familiarity with that agency's personnel, decision-making procedures, and past funding patterns.

They noted that the allocation of SSBG money typically takes place through two channels. First, funds are spent for services provided directly by the local offices of the agency that administers the SSBG. Second, money is channeled to other agencies with purchase-of-service contracts. Obviously, the allocation of funds among public and private agencies for purchase-of-service contracts is a political process.

Sosin (1990) suggested that the decentralization of policy decisions has both advantages and disadvantages. He stated that decentralization

allegedly enables local areas to plan and deliver services without the encumbrance of detailed and stifling centralized regulations. When combined with the increased emphasis on delivery of services by counties and private agencies, it is also said to encourage accountability to the local community. Accordingly, although some problems and substantial interstate variation are acknowledged, observers generally conclude that local governments are likely to tailor their services and eligibility requirement to local needs. (1990, 618)

However, these benefits are not without costs. Sosin noted that "Local advocacy groups and agencies that receive funds may find it necessary to devote their energies to

competing for government revenues rather than pursuing comprehensive long-term social aims." (1990, 618) Sosin also reported the possibility that decentralization may encourage substitution. That is, private resources which had been used by agencies may be replaced with government funding, such that the total expenditure for delivery of services is reduced. Furthermore, it is possible under decentralization that no agency will assume responsibility for particular client groups. Sosin noted that in Chicago decentralization resulted in a situation in which "no agency or specialized wing of the service system clearly has the responsibility (or ability) to provide case management of advocacy services for homeless individuals who are not chronically mentally ill or otherwise disabled." (1990, 629)

These considerations indicate clearly that decentralization places a premium on the political skills of those administering social welfare agencies. They must be good politicians simply to ensure that their agencies will continue to be funded. One hopes that preoccupation with the politics of securing adequate funding will not distract administrators entirely from their role as proactive agents of social change. Nevertheless, based on Sosin's analysis, the potential that they will be distracted does appear to be very real.

Patti (1983a) argued that

The moves toward block grants, deregulation, local discretion, and local financing and the concomitant shift of responsibility to states are placing many policy decisions closer to home. Among other things,

these developments make it increasingly important that social workers become involved in political action at state and local levels to protect existing programs and to advocate for groups like the unemployed, women heads of households, and minorities, whose situation grow steadily worse. (98)

### Chapter Endnotes

1. Bucher and Strauss' (1961) "process model" of professions suggests that rather than regarding professions as single, homogeneous communities it is more accurate to view them as "loose amalgamations of segments, pursuing different objectives in different manners and more or less deliberately held together under a common name at a particular time in history." (Bucher and Strauss 1961, 325 cited in Reeser and Epstein 1990, 23)

## CHAPTER IV

### INTRODUCTION TO EVALUATION OF PROGRAM STAGES

#### Introduction

The lead question asked in this study is, "How effective was the SSBG Demonstration Project in helping social workers understand and influence social service block grant implementation policies and procedures on the state level and in four selected counties?" The extended "differential evaluation" model of social program evaluation, described in Chapter II, provides the framework for answering this question.

The essence of the "differential evaluation" approach is the matching of research strategies and data collection methods to evaluation objectives at different stages of program development. The program developmental cycle is made up of four sequential and interrelated stages: initiation, participant/client contact, implementation, and stabilization. Each of these phases has distinctive developmental goals, administrative tasks, and informational requirements. (Bielawski and Epstein 1984; Patti 1983b; Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978) The length of time that a program stays in each stage can vary and programs can recycle through earlier stages if new circumstances require that prior tasks such as resource acquisition or staff development need to receive attention again.

The developmental cycle began in January, 1983; and, as depicted in Figure 2.1 above, the project moved through the four stages in a sequential pattern. The monitoring of the stabilization phase ended in June, 1985. The beginning date was more unequivocal than the ending date. The author ended her part-time employment as project director in June, 1984 and arbitrarily selected June, 1985 as a cut-off date for systematic observation of how well the project's objectives were included in on-going Chapter affairs.

Among its other features, the "differential evaluation" model requires the selection of an appropriate research strategy(ies). As described in Chapter II, an embedded single-case study research design was deemed most appropriate for this investigation. (Yin 1989) Therefore, when evaluating the block grant project's effectiveness, the whole project along with its "logical subunits" is examined. These subunits include:

1. three types of participating organizations, their subdivisions, and selected individual members;
2. state and county level networks organized under the project's aegis; and
3. selected "episodes" (Lofland and Lofland 1984, ch.6) or activities, i.e., continuing education events not connected with network activities and participation in the Human SERVE voter registration drive.

A second, ancillary study question involves assessing the efficacy of the evaluation paradigm for helping

administrators make decisions more effectively. An appraisal of the evaluation model's usefulness is presented in Chapter IX.

The third study question asks, "What does the experience of the SSBG Demonstration Program have to say about the capability of two of the profession's predominant organizations--the professional association and the educational institution--to cooperate in involving their constituents in county-based political action on behalf of low-income and disadvantaged persons?" This question is addressed in Chapter IX.

Chapters V - VIII evaluate how well the project accomplished the tasks identified with each of the project's four developmental stages. These evaluations follow the model outlined below.

#### Stage-Related Evaluations

The evaluation of each stage includes the following elements:

1. an abbreviated description of the stage that consists of (a) a definition, (b) the length of time the program remained in the stage, (c) pertinent developmental goals, and (c) principal administrative and programmatic tasks;<sup>1</sup>
2. one or more narratives describing representative events;



3. answers to exemplary evaluation questions selected from the four tables presented in Chapter II:<sup>2</sup>

a. Table 2.1 Evaluation Questions and Strategies, Program Initiation Stage,

b. Table 2.6 Evaluation Questions and Strategies, Program Contact Stage,

c. Table 2.7 Evaluation Questions and Strategies, Program Implementation Stage, and

d. Table 2.8 Evaluation Questions and Strategies, Program Stabilization Stage.

5. project modifications; and

6. an assessment of how well the project accomplished its stage-related tasks--both administrative and programmatic.

Although these elements generally follow the order in which they are presented above, on occasion, section #6 precedes section #5. When modifications were implemented during a specific stage, they precede the "assessment" section; those that occurred at the end of the stage follow the "assessment" section.

In addition to evaluating the project's effectiveness in the stabilization stage, Chapter VIII also includes an epilogue describing pertinent vignettes related to the study that occurred post-June, 1985.<sup>3</sup>

The tables listed under element 3 above specify the data collection methods used to gather pertinent information for each discussion question. For example, Program Contact

Stage Question #4 asks "To what extent are alternative strategies sought and used when efforts do not appear sufficient to reach and/or engage target groups?"

Documentation, interviews and participant observation were the selected methods for gathering information related to this question. The various data collection methods are defined in Chapter II, Methodology.

Chapter endnotes cite references to materials in the case study data base.

Because the project's Continuing Education Program (CEP) will be referred to frequently in the upcoming chapters, overviews of the project's six major continuing education events are included in this chapter. Readers can refer to these summaries as they peruse Chapters V - VIII.

### Overview of Continuing Education Programs

The project design indicated that informal practice/education networks would be established in selected geographic areas. These networks would (a) sponsor educational activities related to evolving state and county social service block grant implementation policies and procedures and (b) mobilize participants to become advocates for an equitable allocation of SSBG funds and for regulations that would replace procedural safeguards for clients that were lost in the federal government's deregulation process.

Chart 4.1 lists the continuing education events designed to inform NASW members and other human service personnel of changes in the social welfare system. It includes the six project-sponsored meetings as well as four programs organized by other groups that included information about the block grant project as part of their agendas. The chart is followed by program overviews that conclude this chapter.

**CHART 4.1**

**BLOCK GRANT DEMONSTRATION PROJECT  
CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAM (CEP)**

| <b>Program/Date*</b>                                                                              |                                                  | <b>Host School/<br/>Co-Sponsor</b>                                                                                                             | <b>Target<br/>Population</b>                                                                                |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>State Chapter 29th<br/>Annual Meeting:</b>                                                     |                                                  | <b>NA</b>                                                                                                                                      | <b>Chapter<br/>members</b>                                                                                  |
| <b>1.</b>                                                                                         | <b>PAF Grant<br/>Presentation</b>                |                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                             |
| <b>2.</b>                                                                                         | <b>Political Skills<br/>Workshop<br/>9/11/83</b> |                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                             |
| <b>Elliot Graduate School<br/>of Social Work/<br/>Professions Weekend</b>                         |                                                  | <b>NA</b>                                                                                                                                      | <b>Graduate<br/>Students</b>                                                                                |
| <b>1.</b>                                                                                         | <b>PAF Grant<br/>Presentation</b>                |                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                             |
| <b>2.</b>                                                                                         | <b>Political Skills<br/>Workshop<br/>9/24/83</b> |                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                             |
| <b>Austin-Bedford Pilot<br/>Program, Unit's Social<br/>Action Agenda<br/>10/5/83*</b>             |                                                  | <b>Altmeyer-Buell<br/>University (ABU),<br/>Social Work Dept.</b>                                                                              | <b>ELAN members<br/>in Austin-<br/>Bedford Unit;<br/>ABU social<br/>work students<br/>and faculty</b>       |
| <b>Austin County's Kick-<br/>Off Meeting for the<br/>Human SERVE Voter<br/>Registration Drive</b> |                                                  | <b>Organized by<br/>social work<br/>interns, Follett<br/>College; hosted<br/>by Altmeyer-Buell<br/>University (ABU),<br/>Social Work Dept.</b> | <b>Follett<br/>College and<br/>ABU social<br/>work faculty,<br/>students, and<br/>field<br/>instructors</b> |

Continuation of Chart 4.1

| Program/Date                                                                                             | Host School/<br>Co-Sponsor                             | Target<br>Population                                                                                                                |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Update on Social Services Block Grant/Human Services Planning in Chester County<br>1/26/84*              | Coyle College, Department of Sociology and Social Work | NASW members in Chester County; Coyle College social work faculty, students, field instructors; Chester County HSAC members         |
| [State] Association of Baccalaureate Social Work Educators<br>2/3/84                                     | NA                                                     | Faculty representatives from state's baccalaureate programs                                                                         |
| Update on Social Services Block Grant/Human Services Planning in Dover County<br>2/23/84*                | Dunham Falls University (DFU), Social Work Department  | NASW members in Dover County; DFU social work faculty, students, field instructors; Dover County HSAC members                       |
| Social Workers' Day Conference: "Muddling Through" or Rational Planning" Workshop<br>March 9, 1984*      | NA                                                     | Chapter members                                                                                                                     |
| Update on Social Services Block Grant/Human Services Planning in Austin and Bedford Counties<br>4/25/84* | Altmeyer-Buell University (ABU), Social Work Dept.     | NASW members in Austin and Bedford Counties, ABU social work faculty, students, field instructors; Austin and Bedford counties HSAC |

Continuation of Chart 4.1

| Program/Date*                                                                                        | Host School/<br>Co-Sponsor                                                                                                                    | Target<br>Population                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Spring Forum, "Human<br>Services Planning<br>Issues Confronting Local<br>Decision Makers"<br>6/8/84* | Administration<br>Section/State<br>Chapter (with<br>support from<br>Eliot Graduate<br>School of Social<br>Work,<br>Administration<br>Sequence | Social service<br>administrators<br>and planners;<br>members of<br>various county<br>planning<br>groups,<br>government<br>officials;<br>Eliot<br>University<br>faculty and<br>students;<br>participants<br>at previous<br>meetings. |

\* Indicates a project-sponsored continuing education event.

## **Austin-Bedford Unit Pilot Meeting for "ELANers"**

**Date:** October 5, 1983  
**Host School:** Social Work Dept., Altmeyer-Buell University  
**Topic:** ELAN Alert including an Update on Social Services Block Grant Planning in Austin and Bedford Counties

### **Program**

#### **Welcome:**

- \* Chair and "ELANer," Austin-Bedford Unit

#### **Panel Members:**

- \* Member, Austin County HSAC (NASW member, "ELANer," administrator of private non-profit agency)
- \* Member, Bedford County HSAC (NASW member, "ELANer," administrator of public agency)

#### **Moderator:**

- \* SSBG Project Director (also Unit's ELAN chair)

### **Agenda**

1. Information on PACE's endorsement of the challenger for the senate seat in the XXth legislative district
2. Information on the state's Human SERVE Voter Registration Drive
3. Update on social service block grant funding and human service advisory councils in Austin and Bedford Counties.

### **Highlights<sup>4</sup>**

Because there was a small audience, an informal group meeting was held. The project director presented information on the first two agenda items. Then the speakers discussed the work of the CHSAC.

Both speakers served on the Planning Committees of their respective CHSAC. They were involved in carrying out three of the state-mandated functions--developing a social service resource inventory, conducting a needs assessment, and designing a comprehensive county human services plan.

The Bedford CHSAC's Planning Committee spent considerable time reviewing and critiquing the state's guidelines for comprehensive human service plans. They forwarded their assessment to the state with specific recommendations regarding the standardized planning format, the service classification system, and the resource inventory.

The speakers said the meeting was helpful to them because they seldom had an opportunity to discuss CHSAC issues with their counterparts. They supported the project's efforts to form a "block grant technical advisory committee" as one vehicle for sharing ideas.

There was some discussion of the political climate in each county. It was felt that Bedford County legislators were more likely to overturn or ignore CHSAC decisions than were Austin County legislators. However, those familiar with Austin County felt that the CHSAC staff worked "behind the scenes" with county legislators and administrators and only presented decisions that had been "pre-approved."



### Chester Network Meeting

**Date:** January 26, 1984

**Host School:** Department of Sociology and Social Work,  
Coyle College

**Topic:** Update on Social Services Block Grant/Human  
Services Planning in Union County

#### Program

##### Registration and Distribution of Materials:

- \* Student Liaison

##### Welcome:

- \* Chair, Department of Sociology and Social Work
- \* Chair, Chester Unit

##### Moderator:

- \* Faculty Liaison

##### Panel:

- \* Chester County Department of Human Services'  
Senior Planner and staff person to the CHSAC
- \* Member of CHSAC's Delegate Committee (district  
office administrator of the public child  
welfare agency)
- \* SDHS's representative to Chester County

#### Agenda

1. Role of the CHSAC in local planning efforts

#### Highlights<sup>5</sup>

##### Senior Planner's comments:

Chester County initiated a year-long process to determine the size and structure of its HSAC. The county department of human services developed a unique model based on information gathered from a variety of sources. The HSAC has a three-tiered structure with approximately 180 members.

The service system tier covers providers, consumers, and advocates from 19 areas, i.e., income maintenance, legal services, children's services, home health care. Public meetings were held where interested parties could self-select the group they wanted to identify with. Once each group was formed, meetings were scheduled so each group could elect a representative to serve on the delegate committee, the second tier of the system.

The delegate committee is responsible for three of the four state-mandated functions--needs assessment, resource inventory, and county human services plan.

The third tier, the process committee, consists of people who have an impact on the social service delivery system: educators, business leaders, United Way staff, mayors, etc. This group is assigned the resource allocation function in an effort to insulate allocation decisions from service providers. The county DHS solicited nominations for this committee from the public and from the service system groups. Staff then screened the nominations, and submitted 15 names to the county legislature for approval. These nominations were endorsed by the county legislators.

The county received \$300 million in SSBG funds.

To date, neither the county legislators or the SDHS have overridden the CHSAC's decisions.

CHSAC member's comments:

The CHSAC member joined the child welfare service system group and was elected to represent that group on the

delegate committee. The county's already existing child protection council formed the nucleus of this committee. As a member of the delegate committee, she is responsible for communication between the two groups. In addition, the delegate committee is responsible for three of the council's state-mandated functions--the needs assessment, the resource inventory, and the county human services plan. The CHSAC also has taken on a service coordination task. For example, it intends to bring all the agencies that deliver services to the homeless together to maximize the funding coming into the county and to avoid duplication of services.

SDHS representative's comments:

The SDHS representative considers herself a social worker and a community organizer. Decentralization requires that groups work together. Her role is to keep communication lines open between state and county, between other planning groups in the county and the CHSAC, and among the SDHS's divisions. She functions as a liaison to county government, provides technical assistance to various county groups, and monitors the work of the CHSAC. The CHSAC performs two major roles: comprehensive planning within the guidelines set by the SDHS and providing advice to the state.

Comments from moderator:

The state's block grant funds go to the Governor's office and then to the Commissioners of the various departments. There is a lack of accountability on the part

of the Commissioners. State legislators are interested in states where the money becomes part of the general budget.

Since the Reagan administration, the study state has received \$2.1 million less in federal funds than it did under previous federal programs.

With nine block grants there is chaos. "Nine people not talking to each other." Some people are suggesting that the state merge all funding streams and departments that deal with a specific population.

The key question is whether or not the client is any better off under the block grant system.

Comments from audience:

1. "Three quarters of SSBG monies are allotted to child day care."
2. "Block grants have been cut over a period of time. Cut on state level, then on county level, and then within the county."
3. "Advisory council is a buffer: county legislators don't have to say no, they can blame cuts on the HSAC."
4. "Will the county be allowed to contract with providers for SSBG funds or will the state continue to be the responsible party? Who has the most expertise in this area?"
5. "Should have had a consumer or "consumer advocate" from the CHSAC on the panel."
6. "[When will HSAC] "specify the Purchase-of-Service Contracting (POSC) rules and regulations agencies must follow, and provide information on results of needs assessment?"

### Key Points from the Presentations

1. There appears to be a cooperative relationship between the county department of human services and the CHSAC.

2. The issue of which level of government administers SSBG contracts with private, non-profit providers is a controversial one. The state currently has more expertise and more resources; however, some counties are pressing for reimbursement for added workload and full responsibility for SSBG funds, including contracting with providers.

3. The SDHS's divisions are attempting to reduce conflicts and facilitate the coordination of services in Chester County. Although many human service providers want the divisional coordination to start at the state level, the CHSAC is not waiting for that to happen.

4. The last audience comment seemed to reflect the "uncertainty" agencies were feeling due to the changes.

5. The CHSAC acts as a "buffer" for county legislators. (On a different occasion, an official of the state department of human services stated that the SDHS was willing to share allocation responsibilities with the counties and the CHSACs because of anticipated cuts in funding. The CHSAC also plays a "buffer role" for the state.)

6. Although the creation of the process committee may "insulate allocation decisions from service providers," committee members such as mayors or business leaders have their own political agenda.

### **Dover Network Meeting**

**Date:** February 23, 1984

**Host School:** Social Work Department, Dunham Falls University

**Topic:** Update on Social Services Block Grant/Human  
Services Planning in Dover County

#### **Program**

##### **Registration and Distribution of Materials:**

- \* Student Liaison**

##### **Welcome and Recognition of Social Worker of the Year:**

- \* Chair, Social Work Department**
- \* Chair, Dover Unit**

##### **Moderator:**

- \* Faculty Liaison**

##### **Panel Members:**

- \* Director, Dover County Department of Citizens Services (ex officio member of CHSAC)**
- \* Member of CHSAC; Director, Dover County Division of Welfare; NASW member; and President, State Public Welfare Directors Association**
- \* SDHS's representative to Dover County**

#### **Agenda**

- 1. Recognition of Dover County administrator who was selected as the Chapter's Social Worker of the Year.**
- 2. Role of the CHSAC in local planning efforts**
- 3. Major restructuring in the Dover County Department of Citizens Services**
- 4. Information on Dover/Chester Information Service<sup>6</sup>**

### Highlights<sup>7</sup>

#### Director, Department of Citizens Services' comments:

Dover County changed to the county executive form of government in 1978. Citizens wanted a more efficient, more responsive form of government. Over 60 departments/divisions were coordinated into 6 operating departments.

An umbrella Department of Citizens Services was created. The new county social service agency subsumed five previous departments into major divisions--welfare, aging, community action, consumer services, and youth services.

The Department developed a decentralized planning and service delivery system in 1983. Following the United Way's model, the county was divided into 13 service areas. Each area service council was charged with identifying service issues and needs in its respective area. The next step in the process is to establish 13 Citizens Services offices that will serve as the central point for most county-sponsored social services.

When the CHSAC was formed, it was able to use the information from the area councils as part of its human services plan. The planning work of the council is done by the Department of Citizen Services; the CHSAC is an approving and recommending body. Its recommendations go to the county executive and ultimately to the SDHS. At the time of the meeting, the CHSAC had two additional responsibilities: allocating \$994,000 in Emergency Jobs Bill funds and allocating accumulated child care excess



fees. Both sources of funds were earmarked for child care services. Ninety percent of these funds went into county's purchase-of-service system. The department has developed a uniform purchase-of-service system for its five divisions.

SDHS representative's comments:

The CHSACs were created as a partial response to increasing client demands, inflation, and decreasing finances. They provided an opportunity to look at local service delivery systems, to enhance the state/county relationship, and to involve consumers in decisions. The idea was to "bring folks together and allow them to participate in the process." CHSACs need to establish an annual human services plan that is ultimately approved by the county and by the SDHS. They also are required to conduct a needs assessment as a basis for determining the county's target populations.

In Dover the CHSAC was able to update existing data from the United Way's recent needs assessment and from the Department of Citizens Services' resource inventory. The next step for the council is to establish service priorities that can be funded when new unrestricted monies become available. The councils will also have a role in coordinating agencies and their services.

CHSAC member's comments:

1. There was a 25% cut in funds in 1982.
2. Council has never dealt with the full block grant allotment--just new funds. The bulk of SSBG dollars still

go through the old state allocation system. The council wants to allocate all of the SSBG money.

3. The Department of Citizens Services is a county agency that supplies data and staff to the council and makes recommendations. The council receives the input and makes its own recommendations and they may differ from the Department's.

4. There is a myth about waste and the funds that will become available once the new system is in place. Public seems to think that a lot more will be done with the same amount of money.

Comments from audience:

1. "Will councils be advocates for more money?"
2. "How long will competent people stay involved in planning and recommending without the dollars to follow through with these plans?"
3. "NASW should be active in showing the many needs and showing that waste is negligible."
4. "There is a need for day care services to free young mothers for education."
5. "Federal dollars are constant, costs are up, county is putting in more money for social services. People in Dover are upset because of increase in property tax to pay for social services. The state should put in more money."
6. "Panel should have provided more information on the council's service priorities and selection criteria."
7. "Panel should have a fourth member--someone from a private non-profit agency that's funded by SSBG."

Social Action Issues

Hearings on the county's human services budget and the state's homeless budget were being held in the upcoming

weeks. Participants were told how and when they could present testimony.

Key Points from Presentations

1. There were differences in how speakers described the relationship between the CHSAC and county Department of Citizens Services.

2. If CHSACs were authorized to allocate all SSBG funds based on results of needs assessment, this could result in a major "shakeup" of the service delivery system.

3. Whether CHSACs should assume an advocacy role was being debated at state and county levels.

4. There was a suggestion of the type of issue that the NASW Chapter should become involved in--documenting need and showing that "waste" is negligible.

5. The last two audience comments listed above could be indications that agencies were concerned with how changes in county and state roles would impact on the system that was in place.

### Austin-Bedford Network Meeting

**Date:** April 25, 1984 (deleted from CEP schedule)

**Host School:** Center for Social Work, Altmeyer-Buell University

**Topic:** Update on Social Services Block Grant/Human Services Planning in Austin and Bedford Counties.

### Planned Program

#### Registration and Distribution of Materials:

Student Liaison

#### Welcome:

- \* Chair, Austin-Bedford Unit (representing Austin County)
- \* Vice Chair, Austin-Bedford Unit (representing Bedford County)

#### Moderator:

Faculty Liaison, Unit's ELAN chair, and project director

#### Proposed Panel:

- \* SDHS's representative to Austin County
- \* SDHS's representative to Bedford County
- \* Chair of the Austin County HSAC (consumer advocate)
- \* Chair of the Bedford County HSAC (agency administrator, NASW member)

### Highlights

The continuing education protocol included a second meeting in the Austin-Bedford area for members from the four participating organizations in the two-county area (two CHSACs, one school and one NASW unit). However, this meeting was cancelled because of impending changes that

preoccupied the leadership in the two key organizations. Consideration was being given to dissolving the two-county Austin-Bedford unit and allowing interested members to reform as single-county entities. The university announced plans to "phase out" the social work program as part of an overall strategy to solve ABU's serious fiscal and enrollment problems.

### State Network Meeting

**Date:** June 8, 1984, 12:00 noon to 6:00 p.m.

**Co-sponsors:** Block Grant Project and Administration  
Section with assistance from Eliot University  
Graduate School of Social Work's Administration  
Sequence

**Topic:** Human Services Planning Issues Confronting  
**Local** Decision-Makers

**Program<sup>8</sup>**

Pre-meeting Luncheon for speakers and NASW/[XX] staff

Registration and Distribution of Materials:

Student Liaisons from participating schools

Welcome:

- \* Chapter Executive Director

Moderator:

- \* Project Director

Keynote Address:

- \* Director, State and Local Government Research  
Project, Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.

Respondents:

- \* Executive Director, Ewell County Department of  
Human Services
- \* Lancaster County Legislator; Chair, Human  
Services Committee, [State] Association of  
Counties
- \* Chair, Administration Sequence, Eliot University  
Graduate School of Social Work
- \* Director, SDHS Office of Human Services Planning  
--agency responsible for development of the  
CHSACs and a coordinating state human services  
advisory council (SHSAC)

### Workshop Leaders:

#### 1. Purchase-of-Service vs. Public Agency Developing Capacity to Deliver Services

\* Special Assistant to Executive Director, Council on Social Work Education; author of several articles on purchased services

\* Analyst, Office of Contract Administration, SDHS Division of Mental Retardation; Chair, Chapter's Administration Section

#### 2. Expanding Local Planning Capacity: How and with What Resources?

\* Executive Director, Ewell County Department of Human Services; NASW member

\* Director, State and Local Government Research Project, Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.

#### 3. Service Coordination vs. Service Integration at Local Level

\* Chief, Community Services Unit, SDHS Division of Alcoholism; Chair, Chapter Committee on Alcoholism

\* Chair, Administration Sequence, Eliot University Graduate School of Social Work

### Workshop Recorders:

Members of the Administration Section and representatives of target populations--United Way staff person, administrator of private non-profit agency, and administrator of public agency providing direct services.

Reception, Complimentary Cocktail, and Hors d'oeuvres

### Highlights<sup>9</sup>

The keynote speaker's presentation centered on the relationship between needs assessment procedures and evaluation strategies in the resource allocation process. He discussed several data collection methods to assist planners in documenting the extent and variety of needs in their locality. He particularly recommended systematic

surveys of citizens asking them about their own problems as an effective technique. Linking the needs assessment process to evaluation efforts was stressed as a way to help funding sources judge how effectively services are being delivered to clients to meet identified needs. Process and outcome evaluation designs were discussed. Recognizing all the problems connected with outcome evaluations, the keynoter still urged agencies and funding sources to consider them.

The respondents commented on the evolutionary process that has characterized the development of planning efforts on the local level and on the impact of political factors on the "rational" planning process. It was pointed out that "planning requires making choices (rational activity) based on constraints (political environment, civil service requirements, etc.) to determine future events."

Workshops on three critical issues related to local planning efforts followed the main address.

Service coordination and/or service integration at the local level. A variety of concrete examples describing how agencies can exchange services and coordinate efforts at the local level were presented. Although coordination and/or integration can be very complex at the state level, among departments and block grant funding streams, a variety of informal exchanges can be initiated at the local level.

Purchase-of-service vs. public agency developing the capacity to deliver service. A sampling of pertinent issues



discussed at this workshop included: defining the "public responsibility," developing a rationale for selecting services to be contracted, developing accountability systems, re-defining public sector staff roles, and evaluating contractor performance and compliance. Participants at this workshop felt the issues were so extensive that a follow-up forum on this topic should be scheduled.

Expanding local planning capacity: how and with what resources. The workshop leaders stressed the importance of "process management" at the local level where diverse interest groups compete for resources and decision-making has political as well as rational aspects. A number of planning groups at the local level were identified, including a family court planning group, county alcoholism coordinators, mental health boards, area offices on aging, and the human service advisory councils. Whether or not the human service advisory councils should or could emerge as the focal group for planning at the county level was vigorously debated.

The forum ended with an informal discussion and cocktail hour where participants met with their counterparts from other counties and/or followed up issues raised in the presentations. Some participants suggested that this forum be considered the first in a series of annual "Social Worker as Administrator" institutes.

## Chapter's Annual Social Workers' Day Conference

Date: March 9, 1984

Theme: Toward Social Justice

### Program

#### Registration

#### Morning Workshops:

1. The Elderly Alcoholic: Twice Discriminated Against
2. Making Continuity of Health Care a Reality
3. Changing Our Image: The Social Workers' Connection
4. "Muddling Through" or Rational Planning
5. Standing Up for Your Clients' Rights: SSI
6. Confidentiality and Social Work Practice

#### Lunch

Keynote Presentation--Dr. Nancy Humphreys

Social Worker of the Year Award--to the administrator of a large sectarian agency who was an advocate for low income and disabled persons

#### Afternoon Workshops:

1. Practicing in the Workplace: Conflicts and Considerations
2. AIDS: How the Social Work Profession Responds
3. Practical Strategies for Peace: Alternatives and the Enhancement of Human Services
4. Adult Protective Services: Have We Progressed Since the Boarding Home Scandal?
5. Licensure: Towards Social Justice. How Licensure Serves to Protect Clients
6. Stress Management for Those Seeking Social Justice

Reception, Cash Bar, and Hors d'oeuvres

PACE Auction

### Project-Sponsored Workshop

Topic: "Muddling Through" or Rational Planning

Description: The state's decentralized block grant implementation processes have introduced a rational social planning model that conflicts with interest group politics at the county level. The workshop is designed to describe how the SSBG and the Community

Services block grant processes work and how local politics impact on services to clients and jobs for social workers.

**Panel members:**

- \* Chair of the State Block Grant Coalition
- \* Director of the SDHS Office of Human Services Planning--agency responsible for development of the CHSACs and a coordinating state human services advisory council (SHSAC)
- \* Supervisor of the State Department of Community Affairs, Office of Community Services--agency responsible for implementation of the Community Services block grant
- \* Assemblywoman and Vice Chair of the state legislature's Joint Appropriations Committee

**Moderators:**

- \* Project Director
- \* Faculty Liaison/Coyle College

**Highlights**

A heavy snowstorm caused the Chapter leadership to cancel the conference early on the morning of the 9th. Efforts to reschedule were partially successful--a dinner honoring the social worker of the year was held but the workshops could not be rescheduled.

### Events Sponsored by Other Groups/Organizations

The project director participated in four additional continuing education events:

1. Eliot University's Profession's Weekend for graduate social work students,
2. NASW [State] Chapter's 29th Annual Meeting,
3. Austin County's Kick-Off Meeting for the Human SERVE Voter Registration Drive, and
4. [State] Association of Baccalaureate Social Work Educators meeting.

### Materials Distributed At Continuing Education Events

The following materials were distributed at the various continuing education events.

1. Bibliography for County Network Meetings<sup>10</sup>
2. Bibliography for State Network Meeting (Spring Forum)<sup>11</sup>
3. Block Grant Descriptions, Responsible State Department and Key Contact People<sup>12</sup>
4. Block Grants in the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981<sup>13</sup>
5. Information on how to order two publications:
  - a. [State] League of Women Voters 1984 Citizen's Handbook and Calendar<sup>14</sup>
  - b. Block Grants and You: A Citizen's Handbook<sup>15</sup>

6. Information on Reorganization of Dover County Department of Citizens Services<sup>16</sup> (distributed at Dover meeting only)

7. Spring Forum workshop handouts:

a. Workshop on "Service Coordination vs. Service Integration at Local Level"

i. Services Integration and Services Coordination:  
Some Innovative Models Handout

ii. Interorganizational Relations<sup>17</sup>

b. Workshop on "Purchase-of-Service vs. Public Agency Developing Capacity to Deliver Services"

i. Purchase of Service Decision-Making: Identifying Issues and Criteria Handout

ii. Alternative Service Delivery Strategies: Factors in States' Decision Making<sup>18</sup>

#### Conclusion

This summary of the project-sponsored continuing education events provides the reader with a resource to use in conjunction with the next four chapters that evaluate how well the project accomplished its stage-related objectives.

## Chapter Endnotes

1. The stage-related administrative tasks are based on the following sources: Patti, 1983b; Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein, 1978; and Bielawski and Epstein, 1984. In Patti's model of program development, "...assessment is a continuing managerial responsibility throughout the program development cycle, [but] takes on special significance during the stabilization stage. . ." (1983, 174) The "differential evaluation" model considers evaluation a key task for each developmental stage. This study uses the latter approach.
2. Criteria for selecting questions included: (a) illuminating the project's approach to accomplishing one or more of a stage's main tasks, (b) representing different units/levels of analysis, and (c) including a mix of the three evaluation objectives--program effort, program effectiveness, and program efficiency. See Appendix G for a listing of the selected questions.
3. The author remained active in Chapter and unit activities, requested and was appointed to a "consumer-advocate" position on a CHSAC, subsequently joined the staff of a county human services department with responsibility for developing its contract administration unit, and (d) was appointed to several state committees related to the CHSACs.
4. Action minutes, Austin-Bedford Pilot Meeting, October 5, 1983.
5. Action minutes, Chester Network Meeting, January 26, 1984.
6. A local foundation was awarded a \$100,000 grant from the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services to design and disseminate a comprehensive human service information system in the pilot area of Dover and Chester Counties.
7. Action minutes, Dover Network Meeting, February 23, 1984.
8. Except for the main speaker and the county legislator, presenters were NASW members. The legislator had to cancel his appearance at the last minute.
9. "Forum Serves to Initiate Annual Institute." NASW. . .News, July/August, 1984.
10. NASW/[State] Project Block Grant Selected Bibliography, September 30, 1983.
11. Spring Forum, "Human Services Planning Issues Confronting Local Decision-Makers," Selected Bibliography, June 6, 1984.
12. Fair Budget [Action Campaign] and [State] Block Grant Coalition. Block Grant Descriptions, Responsible [State] Department, and Key Contact Persons. n.d.

13. [State] Department of Human Services, Office of Intergovernmental Relations. Block Grants in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, [State's] Federal Allotment, FFY82. n.d.
14. League of Women Voters of [State]. 1984. 1984 [State] Citizen's Handbook. [Capital City, XX]: Author.
15. Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas Advisory Committees to the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. 1983. Block Grants and You: A Citizen's Handbook. Washington, DC: U. S. Commission on Civil Rights.
16. Newsletter of [Dover] County Government. Winter, 1984. Focus on [Dover].
17. Neugeboren, Bernard. 1985. Organization, Policy, and Practice in the Human Services. NY: Longman, Inc.
18. Demone, H. and Gibelman, M. Alternative Service Delivery Strategies: Factors in States' Decision Making. Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare (forthcoming)

## CHAPTER V

### EVALUATION OF PROGRAM INITIATION STAGE

#### Introduction

Chapter V is the first of four chapters that utilizes the "differential evaluation" model to assess the effectiveness of the SSBG Demonstration Project. This chapter focuses on the first stage of program development--program initiation. The project's intervention strategy, objectives, and major programmatic tasks are presented in this chapter because they were formulated during the initial developmental phase.

The organization of the material in this chapter follows the outline presented in Chapter IV.

#### Description of the Stage

##### Definition

"Program initiation refers to that stage in which the ideas for a program are translated into a plan of action and in which necessary resources are secured." (Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978, 7)

##### Time Frame

The SSBG Demonstration Project's initiation stage began in January, 1983, when the author responded to a memorandum from the Chapter executive director and the chair of the program committee soliciting NASW Special Project Program Advancement Fund (PAF) proposals from membership leaders.<sup>1</sup> Receipt of the award announcement from the national office in April, 1983, marked the end of the initiation stage's



dominant position.<sup>2</sup> Contact stage requirements moved into the forefront in May, 1983. However, unfinished initiation tasks (described below) occupied a subordinate position through September, 1983.

### Goals

Patti (1983b) identifies two developmental goals pertinent to the first stage of program development.<sup>3</sup>

They are:

(1) to establish credibility with major constituencies, both within and without the organization, and thereby develop the support and resources necessary for survival and program integrity; and (2) to establish a capability that shows promise of realizing the intent (purpose) set forth in the [organization's] authorizing policy. (68)

### Tasks

#### Stage-Related Administrative Tasks

Resource acquisition and program planning are the two administrative tasks most prominently identified with this initial stage. (Patti 1983b)

#### Resource acquisition task

Programs need a variety of resources throughout the entire developmental cycle. During the first phase of the cycle, the block grant project attempted to acquire the following critical resources: (a) sanction of the parent institution (national office), (b) funds, (c) support from community organizations whose participation was essential to carrying out the program, (d) qualified staff, (e) physical facilities, (f) social legitimation within the parent organization (State Chapter) and within the human services

community, and (g) "strategic and tactical" information<sup>4</sup> related to block grant issues and processes.

#### Program planning task

"Program plans vary considerably in specific detail," according to Patti, "but they are generally comprised of four generic, interrelated elements: needs assessments, objectives, intervention strategies, and resources" (1983b, 71)

Requests for proposals (RFP) from funding sources such as the NASW Special Project Program Advancement Fund often dictate the elements of the plan and how they should be presented. PAF proposal guidelines were disseminated in December, 1982,<sup>5</sup> and prescribed the content and format for the project plan.

#### Stage-Related Programmatic Tasks

The project's programmatic tasks are presented in Project's Operating Plan, Initiation Question 7, below.

The following narrative describes the project's inception.

### Narrative

On December 28, 1982, the Chapter executive director and the Chapter president-elect sent a memo to the "leadership of all volunteer structures" announcing the deadline for submitting 1983-84 Program Advancement Fund proposals to the national office. The Chapter's program committee, chaired by the president-elect, was coordinating the submission of proposals. Doctoral students with projects related to the professional association's national program goals as developed by the Delegate Assembly were invited to route their applications through this committee.<sup>6</sup>

The Program Committee was exploring ways to encourage the submission of a proposal related to the new federal and state block grant policies and their impact on clients and services. The committee wanted to involve members in various social action activities to influence the block grant implementation process in the state. The committee's interests coincided with Delegate Assembly Priority SP1 ("Advocate for adequate allocation of. . . financing for health and human services and income maintenance. . .") and SP9 ("Develop and mobilize the political potential of the membership. . .").

The chair of the program committee and president-elect of the Chapter was a professor of social policy at the state university's graduate school of social work. She had served on the program committee for the Seventh NASW Professional Symposium that took place in November, 1981. It was at this symposium that the professional association was confronted with the reality of "New Federalism" and its potential impact on the funding and delivery of human service programs.  
(Dinerman 1983)

The chair of the program committee contacted the staff of the national office's PROJECT BLOCK GRANT and learned that a grant to a State Chapter might be considered if: "1.) it built on the results of PROJECT BLOCK GRANT's two-year nine state effort to monitor the federal to state transfer of responsibilities for the block grants; 2.) it examined block grant implementation at the county level of government which the national project was unable to do. . ."<sup>7</sup>

Simultaneously, the author (an assistant professor of social work in an accredited undergraduate program) was in the early stages of developing a doctoral project in the area of continuing professional social work education -- Delegate Assembly Priority PA2 ("Improve social work practice through direct provision of continuing education programs. . .and support. . . standards for the provision of continuing education.").

The Chapter president had previously appointed the author to the Continuing Education Committee as a representative of the state's baccalaureate social work educators.<sup>8</sup> The foundation for the committee's work was the professional association's policy statement #10, NASW Standards for Continuing Professional Education. (1982) The statement provided guidelines for individual practitioners as well as for providers of continuing education. The standards defined continuing education as "a self-directed process which requires social workers to assume responsibility for their own professional development." (NASW 1982, 3)

The author was considering a doctoral project that would help her school's alumni and other practitioners evaluate their on-going learning needs, identify areas and resources for continued learning, and ultimately become more sophisticated consumers of the growing plethora of continuing education offerings. The intent was to help practitioners use continuing education in a purposeful manner to meet their own career goals as well as their obligations to clients and to society. The author contacted the executive director and the chair of the program committee to discuss a PAF proposal related to her proposed project.

The author's inquiry prompted a series of discussions resulting in a merging of ideas. The Chapter leadership recognized that a continuing education component (gathering information and disseminating it to members) was an essential first step in mounting social action efforts related to influencing state and county block grant implementation processes; and the author was enthusiastic about modifying her doctoral project idea by uniting continuing education and social action in a distinctive manner. She taught in the social policy area and had a long-standing interest in increasing social workers' involvement in political and social action.

The president-elect, the first vice president (also on the faculty at the state university's graduate school of social work) and this investigator held a brain-storming session early in February to discuss potential project designs given the national office's interests and the resource constraints.<sup>9</sup> Special project PAF grants usually were awarded for a one-year period and had a ceiling of \$20,000. Most awards were in the \$3,500 to \$10,000 range.

A skeletal plan was agreed on: the Chapter would act as a catalyst to form collaborative practice/education networks in selected areas of the state. Members would be invited to attend "block grant" continuing education programs and then recruited to join ELAN teams advocating for an equitable allocation of block grant funds and replacement of procedural safeguards for clients. With less than two weeks left to prepare a proposal and to secure the endorsement of local units, designated Chapter committees such as ELAN and PACE, selected educational programs, and the Board of Directors; the work was spread among the executive director, the president-elect, and this investigator.

The essence of the block grant PAF proposal was approved by the Board of Directors on February 10, 1983. The minutes indicated that "a candidate in the Doctoral Program at Hunter [College] School of Social Work will be engaged" to direct the project should it be funded.<sup>10</sup> A completed proposal with endorsements from all but one of the potential organizational participants was signed by the Executive Director and the Board President and submitted on February 18, 1983.<sup>11</sup>

At the same board meeting where the PAF proposal was approved, the following Chapter goals for the 1983-84 program year were ratified: (a) to secure legal regulation of social workers through licensure; (b) to promote adequate and equitable support and funding for health, income maintenance, and human services; (c) to strengthen the Chapter; and (d) to promote the end of discrimination against minorities and other disadvantaged groups within the state.<sup>12</sup>

Early in April the PAF Subcommittee awards were announced. The Chapter was awarded \$14,555 thereby securing the funds needed to initiate the project. The award letter stated that the

committee had received 31 proposals from Chapters and funded 12 of them.<sup>13</sup>

This narrative provides a backdrop for presenting evaluation questions and answers for the Program Initiation Stage.

Selected Evaluation Questions/Answers--Table 2.1<sup>14</sup>

Four of the eleven questions in Table 2.1 Evaluation Questions and Strategies, Program Initiation Stage are answered below. Table 2.1 indicates the primary data collection methods used to collect pertinent information for each discussion question. For example, the first question listed below focuses on the existence of a program plan and the primary data collection method is documentation.

The questions and their answers are not presented in numerical order; the sequence follows an organic progression of project events--specification of a program plan, efforts to learn about the project's substantive area, the extent to which organizational representatives' perceptions of project objectives were in agreement, and the project's ability to develop networks that included the three target organizations in the demonstration areas.

Project's Operating Plan, Initiation Question 7

Question 7 under effectiveness asks, "To what extent is a program plan specified? This question is directed to the main unit of analysis--the total project. It highlights the stage's planning task. The primary source of data is documentation.

## Introduction

The block grant demonstration project's program plan was shaped by the PAF proposal guidelines. The Special Project Application provided detailed instructions for developing a proposal along with the criteria that would be used to assess its merit.

A critical component of the plan involved relating the project's objectives to one or more of the Delegate Assembly Maximum Priorities for 1982-84 and to one or more of the Board's "four areas of programmatic concentration for the 1983-84 program year as implementation strategies to achieve the [Delegate Assembly] priorities."<sup>15</sup> (See Appendices C and D.)

In addition to identifying the relationship between the proposed project and the Delegate Assembly Priorities and the Board of Directors' Areas of Concentration, the proposal required the following information: (a) a rationale or needs assessment, (b) the intervention strategy and anticipated outcomes, (c) project objectives, (d) major tasks, (e) the number and types of beneficiaries, (f) an evaluation plan, (g) a management plan, (h) a budget that included financial and/or "in kind" support from the Chapter and a request for less than \$20,000 in PAF funds, and (i) letters of support from cooperating organizations stating their willingness to have their members take part in its activities.<sup>16</sup>

As indicated in the above narrative, the rudimentary plan outlined at the February 9th brainstorming session was approved by the Board of Directors on February 10, 1983. Because the proposal had to be submitted to the national office by February 21, 1983, the Chapter executive director, the president-elect, and the author collaborated on putting the proposal together.

### Rationale

Based on what she had learned in her conversations with national staff, the president-elect wrote the rationale explicating how the project related to Delegate Assembly priorities, the national board's areas of programmatic concentration, and the concerns of PROJECT BLOCK GRANT staff. Portions of the rationale follow:

This proposal seeks 1) to forward the attainment of a number of national and chapter goals, [and] 2) to capitalize upon the investment already made by PAF in PROJECT BLOCK GRANT. . .The specific national program goals which are addressed are those having to do with advocacy for adequate funding for income maintenance, health and human services (SP1), with developing and mobilizing the political potential of the membership (SP9), and to a lesser degree with the continuing education of members in need of techniques for specific social policy change (PA2). This proposal also addresses two areas of concentration set by the National Board: legislative and political action especially with regard to the support for health and human services, and actions which seek to build the influence of NASW and gain public recognition of it. . .as an advocate for a more humane society.

. . .The targets for action will be many of those suggested by the national PROJECT BLOCK GRANT. Some of the particular techniques and strategies already learned will be used, such as those developed in Illinois and Mississippi. These will be modified for local use.



. . .Other by-products expected from this proposal include: 1) more effective recruitment of students, faculty and agency personnel to NASW membership, 2) more effective involvement of existing membership in local unit and ELAN activities, 3) strengthening the local units, and 4) an opportunity for social work students to experience social policy and social change as professional participatory activities and not just as required classroom subject matter. . . .It is hoped that the joint school-agency efforts in this area will help to build a partnership between groups that have not always seen the vital nature of their connection and cooperation for the profession. . . .<sup>17</sup>

The author was responsible for (a) formulating the intervention strategy and anticipated outcomes, (b) specifying project objectives, (c) delineating the major tasks that would be undertaken to accomplish these objectives, (d) identifying project beneficiaries, and (e) designing the evaluation plan. The following sections from the proposal include (a) the intervention strategy, (b) objectives and (c) major tasks. Information about project beneficiaries is presented in Chapter VI, Evaluation of Program Contact Stage.

#### Intervention Strategy<sup>18</sup>

. . .The proposal describes a collaborative approach to continuing education and social action. Approximately four key social work [educational] programs and three local chapter units will participate in the project.<sup>19</sup>

. . .Additionally, county human service coalitions will be invited to join the networks when the project is funded. . . .

The schools of social work each have a group of agencies that serve as field placement sites for students. Faculty, students and staff from these agencies comprise a sizeable group in each county. Chapter members in the three local units also include significant numbers of social workers

[1700]. Some may be serving as field instructors for the schools. Human service advocates from the county coalitions will expand this "natural" network. [Members of these three organizations form] a nucleus in each county for organizing educational and political activities.

Volunteers from the groups mentioned above. . . will be recruited to serve as speakers and workshop leaders for the continuing education series. A nationally prominent keynote speaker will "kick off" the continuing education/social action activities  
 . . .<sup>20</sup>

### Project Objectives

1. To establish a network among key schools of social work, local chapter units, and county human service coalitions in the northern region of the state. The purpose for establishing these networks is to sponsor educational activities related to changes in federal and state policies that impact on the delivery of social services to clients in the respective counties. Particular attention will be given to the block grant program. Emphasis will be on concrete action steps which can be taken to achieve greater financial support for human services. . .
2. To mobilize participants at the continuing education activities to join NASW, to become more active NASW members, to join local PACE/ELAN teams, and/or to join local coalitions advocating for an equitable allocation of human service funds in the particular county and against deregulation that weakens protection for clients.
3. To provide students from involved schools of social work with a participatory educational experience that will augment content covered in social policy courses.
4. To strengthen local units and their ELAN teams by providing ongoing consultation and training for newly recruited or reactivated members and by sponsoring programs in conjunction with local units.
5. To publicize the social work profession's commitment to support the development and implementation of block grant regulations and allocation procedures that will be equitable and will protect clients' rights.

## Major Tasks

1. Building a network of relationships at the county level. . . . One of the first project tasks is to build a network of relationships among the three previously mentioned organizations in four demonstration counties. This major task can be divided into the following sub-tasks:

(a) appointing a planning committee composed of representatives from the three organizations mentioned above;

(b) identifying liaison people from the student bodies and faculty of the participating schools, from state and local chapter units and from existing coalitions and agencies; and

(c) assessing the concerns and perspectives of the various constituencies in the network regarding topics related to the use of block grants in the counties.

2. Reviewing relevant literature and programs. This task includes reviewing information from other block grant projects to build on what has been accomplished in this area already. Particular attention will be given to the national office's PROJECT BLOCK GRANT. Also, literature related to the project's intervention plan and [evaluation] methodology will be reviewed.

3. Designing continuing education program. A continuing education program for chapter members; county human service advisory council members; students, field instructors and other agency personnel, and faculty at the participating schools will be developed. The program will keep participants abreast of changing policies and regulations related to block grant implementation in the state.

This task has several sub-tasks:

(a) selecting a nationally prominent keynote speaker for the opening session of the continuing education series;

(b) selecting workshop topics from lists generated by constituents;

(c) identifying and recruiting individuals with expertise from the membership of the participating organizations to volunteer to conduct workshops;

(d) selecting locations and formats for workshops and forums;

(e) selecting and/or developing training materials to distribute at workshops; and

(f) developing promotional materials targeted to potential participants as well as the general public.

4. Conducting continuing education program. The program will be conducted in accordance with the protocol developed as part of task 3 above beginning in late October [1983] and ending in February [1984]. The program will be timed to coincide with the legislative process so that newly recruited and continuing members of ELAN teams can contact state legislators on the Appropriations Committee who will be holding hearings during the early part of 1984 for the SFY85 budget.

5. Assisting ELAN unit coordinators in recruiting and training volunteers for ELAN teams. In addition to informing participants at the continuing education events about the current situation in regard to block grants, the program will also attempt to recruit participants for ELAN teams in the local units.

6. Providing ongoing consultation and assistance to ELAN coordinators. . . . After the continuing education series ends, the project director will continue to provide assistance to ELAN coordinators to help train volunteers and to maximize the impact of social action efforts [such as lobbying, preparing testimony, attending hearings] on county and state legislative bodies.

7. Building a structure that will continue once the project ends. To sustain the work of the project, the director will [attempt to form] a permanent planning committee with leadership people identified and in place. The association will need to (a) continue to influence county and state governmental bodies as new block grant directives and regulations take shape and (b) press for adequate funding of human services. County networks will need to monitor the

implementation of block grant policies at the local level. . .

**8. Evaluating the effectiveness of the model.**

The model used to organize social workers and other human service staff at the county level is a collaborative one bringing together practitioners and educators. The effectiveness of this model will be assessed. Additionally, the discrete continuing education activities will be evaluated.<sup>21</sup>

**Budget**

The executive director and the author prepared the budget. The Chapter requested \$14,555 in PAF funds and was prepared to contribute \$4,350 in "in-kind" contributions. The PAF funds covered salaries for part-time staff, travel expenses, stipends for student liaisons, and costs associated with the proposed continuing education programs and the opening conference, i.e., honoraria, refreshments, conference rental space.

**Chapter's Capability**

The executive director was responsible for writing the section related to the Chapter's ability to undertake this project. Some excerpts from the sections on the Chapter's readiness to undertake this project follow.

. . .For [the chapter] this project represents a continuing part of its efforts to affect human services in this state.<sup>22</sup>

. . .the chapter has a long-standing position among social and human service agencies. . .as an advocate for equitable distribution of human service dollars. In the Title XX process the chapter was among the first to urge formation of county coalitions. For ten years the chapter has participated in the shape, form and amount of the state's human services budget. It has expressed concern about human service block grants through letters, coalitions, and meetings with key state

leaders. Based on past positions, experience and standing, the chapter is ideally suited to help guide and shape an effort for equitable distribution of block grants by local government. As a provider of continuing education it is well respected. It has a large and active ELAN. Local units are well established.<sup>23</sup>

. . . Without PAF funds the project will not operate. The chapter has identified a necessary step, but is hampered by financial considerations.  
 . . .<sup>24</sup>

. . . The Project Director. . . is currently a faculty member at [Altmeyer-Buell University] and has been an active member of chapter. She arranged a reduced workload at the university for the 1983-84 academic year (3/4 time) so she can devote 1/4 time to this project. A summary describing her pertinent qualifications is attached. . . [She] will be responsible for designing, implementing and evaluating the project. She will report to the chapter executive director. Other project staff will include a part-time secretary. . .<sup>25</sup>

. . . Stipends for student liaisons from participating schools are included in the budget. Liaison responsibilities will include keeping fellow students informed of [project activities], recruiting students to participate in continuing education activities. . . and involving students in . . . social action activities. This final responsibility will be shared with faculty members at each school and with the project director.<sup>26</sup>

The executive director obtained letters of support from the chair of the PACE Committee and from the chairs of the three local units in the four demonstration counties. Unfortunately, the chair of the state ELAN Committee had recently resigned and a replacement had not been appointed.

The president-elect secured a letter of support from the dean of the graduate school of social work; and the author acquired statements of support from two of the three undergraduate programs in the demonstration counties.<sup>27</sup>

The proposal package was put together in eight hectic days and was submitted to the PAF Committee on February 18, 1983.

As indicated in the narrative, the Chapter received a PAF award of \$14,555. This award also represented the parent organization's sanction to explore the feasibility of expanding the professional association's social action domain to the county level of government.

In order to do this, the project director needed to acquire another kind of resource--information. The next question addresses this topic.

Resource Acquisition: "Strategic and Tactical"

Information, Initiation Question 3

Question 3 under effort asks, "What efforts are focused on learning about the content of the proposed continuing education program (social service block grant implementation policies and procedures at the state and county levels of government)? This question pertains to the main unit of analysis and to the stage's second essential task--resource acquisition.

Two methods were used to collect data applicable to this question: (a) documentation, i.e., conference reports, agendas, correspondence, project calendar and log and (b) participant observation.

### Introduction

Richan (1988) defines strategic information as "knowing where the key decisions are made and who has the power to

make them and who or what will influence those decisions" and tactical information as substantive knowledge of social welfare policy and its impact on clients. (202) Acquiring strategic and tactical information about the state and county block grant implementation processes and procedures was essential to the success of the project. Question 3 assesses the efforts made to collect these kinds of information from three sources: conferences and workshops, interviews and correspondence with key informants, and a selective review of literature addressing the change in the federal government's relationship to the states and localities.

#### Conferences and Workshops

The project director attended six conferences/workshops between March 22 and November 22, 1983. The meetings--briefly described below--immersed the author in both the substantive content of the proposal and the emerging "block grant information network" in NASW and in the study state.

##### 1. Human Needs in [State]: Action for the 1980's March 22, 1983

The Fair Budget [Action Campaign] coordinated a broad-based conference for "human needs advocates." Over 300 individuals representing more than 150 constituencies and organizations attended the one-day conference which was co-sponsored by 37 state and local organizations (including the state's NASW Chapter). Nancy Amidei, Director of the Food Research and Action Center in Washington, D.C., presented the keynote address documenting the deleterious effects of federal cutbacks on children, families, and the elderly. There were several pertinent workshops on block grants; income maintenance/social services/community services; human service



advisory councils; coalition building; and lobbying.<sup>28</sup>

2. Outlook '84, Guide for Citizen Participation,  
Northern Regional Meeting of the State  
Department of Human Services  
April 5, 1983.

The Commissioner of the State Department of Human Services (SDHS) and his staff presented information about the department's proposed programs for state fiscal year 1984. The meeting covered the following topics: (a) an update on federal and state funding, (b) information on SDHS-administered block grants (SSBG; Low Income Energy Assistance; and the Mental Health portion of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Block Grant); and (c) presentations by county representatives on local priorities. Two study counties were located in the northern region, but only one of them made a presentation.<sup>29</sup>

The author brought students from her social policy class to the meeting in an effort to involve students in extra-curricular social policy experiences--one of the grant's ancillary goals.

3. NASW PROJECT BLOCK GRANT Skills-Building  
Workshop  
May 14 and 15, 1983  
Chicago, IL

National office project staff and representatives from the nine state Chapters that participated in the two-year effort to understand the federal to state transfer of block grant responsibilities presented the results of their experiences and shared a variety of materials that they had developed or collected.<sup>30</sup>

4. Austin County Child Protection Coalition's  
Annual Legislative Breakfast Meeting  
June 17, 1983

One of the state's congressional representatives was the keynote speaker. The author was the ELAN liaison to the Congressman. He presented his rationale for opposing block grants: (a) a concern that weaker, less visible or popular groups would have their funding cut, (b) a philosophical belief in the federal government's responsibility to set national standards, and (c) the fact that block grants had two purposes--to transfer responsibility from the federal to the

state level of government and to cut funding. He said that the state would lose \$230 million.<sup>31</sup>

The author and the grant's graduate student liaison discussed the Chapter's project with the congressman's aide.

5. Block Grants and County Human/Community Services: A Challenge for Innovation and Service  
September 22, 1983.

The [State] Association of Counties commissioned a research study exploring "the phenomenon of federal block grants" with particular emphasis on the SSBG and the Community Services Block Grant. The intent was to gather information early in the process that would help prepare state and county officials for their expanded roles in planning for human and community services. The study findings clustered in four areas: (a) county and state human services and community services planning; (b) human service advisory councils; (c) changing roles, relationships and responsibilities in the delivery system; and (d) the voluntary, non-profit and the private, for-profit sectors. The principal investigator was the faculty liaison from one of the project's participating schools.<sup>32</sup>

6. 1983 NASW Professional Symposium "Celebrating the Future"  
November 19-22, 1983  
Washington, D. C.

The president of NASW described the symposium as "one of the largest and most important meetings of our nation's social workers. . .designed to advance the practice of social work. . . .Of equal importance is the symbolic significance of this gathering. Our profession faces difficult challenges. But we have collective power as a profession. . . .We are gathered to "celebrate the future," in the confidence of our ability to meet today's challenges."<sup>33</sup> The author attended sessions on block grants, coalitions, networking, policy, and politics and social work. There were many opportunities to meet with national staff and representatives from state Chapters involved in PROJECT BLOCK GRANT.

### Contacts with Key Informants

As a follow-up to these meetings, the author arranged several interviews and/or corresponded with key informants to continue gathering information. A sampling of these informants included: the coordinator of Fair Budget; the chair of the state's block grant coalition; the social policy director of the League of Women Voters; the acting director of the SDHS's Office of Policy, Planning and Advocacy (an NASW member); staff of the SDHS's Intergovernmental Relations Department; and the chairperson of the Governor of Illinois' Block Grant Implementation Task Force.<sup>34</sup>

Another important source of information was social workers serving on newly-formed county human service advisory councils, working in government agencies with responsibility for administering block grants, or monitoring block grant processes for advocacy groups. In an effort to reach them, an article was published in the State Chapter's September, 1983, newsletter asking them to contact the author and become part of "a technical advisory network" to the project.<sup>35</sup> Close to 4000 social workers were on the mailing list. One person responded. She was a member of an advisory council in the southern part of the state. Although no social workers from government agencies or advocacy groups responded, an examination of the conference materials mentioned above provided the needed contacts.

A different approach to identifying social workers serving on county HSAC's was devised. Unit chairs and/or the project director contacted chairpersons of the CHSACs in several counties and requested copies of the councils' membership lists. When the lists were received, the unit chairs identified people they knew to be social workers. These names were forwarded to the Chapter office to be matched against the membership list. This approach yielded 73 names of social workers in eight counties; 30 were identified as NASW members. In the four demonstration counties, of the 56 council members identified as social workers, 22 (39 per cent) were NASW members. Additionally, two NASW members staffed the council in one of the study counties.

Many of the social workers serving on the councils were agency administrators. In accordance with state guidelines, council members were appointed to represent the various client groups served with SSBG funds (elderly, children, victims of domestic violence, veterans, etc.) The author's efforts to contact NASW members that were serving on councils is described in Chapter VI.

### Literature Review

The third potential source of information was written materials. An extensive literature review related to the impact of changes in federal and state block grant policies was undertaken. National conference proceedings were perused for sessions related to the study topic and letters

sent to presenters requesting copies of their papers. Bibliographies tailored to different audiences were prepared, i.e., students and county continuing education participants and state-wide conference attendees.<sup>36</sup>

PROJECT BLOCK GRANT and the national Coalition for Block Grants and Human Needs developed "key actors" and "key documents" checklists to assist their members in acquiring needed information. These checklists helped focus the search for knowledgeable people and pertinent materials. The "key actors" charts were also used to keep track of the growing number of people located in county and state block grant information networks.

#### Summary

To sum up, the author, assisted by a quarter-time secretary and the graduate student liaison to the project, expended considerable effort to become immersed in block grant issues and to begin collecting and codifying strategic and tactical information.

The project's initial experience with trying to locate knowledgeable NASW members had a disquieting outcome. Many social workers serving on county CHSACs were not members of NASW and even those that were did not come forward. One possible explanation for this behavior is that most social work members of the CHSACs were administrators who may have felt that NASW did not meet their needs. It was also possible that, as administrators, they were concerned about their agency's survival and maintaining services for their

client populations. They may not have supported the project advocating for an equitable distribution of funds if it meant less money for their programs. During an interview about involving student interns in council activities, one very vocal, well-respected agency administrator expressed the opinion that NASW, or any other professional associations, should not be involved with council business.<sup>37</sup>

#### Congruence of Organizational Representatives'

##### Perceptions of Project Objectives,

##### Initiation Question 11

Question 11 under efficiency asks, "To what extent do liaison persons/organizations perceive project objectives as similar or dissimilar; to what extent do they have competing objectives that are at cross purposes with the project?"

The unit of analysis is participating organizations and their subdivisions. As indicated in Table 2.1 (Chapter II), interviews and participant observation were used to gather information related to this question.

#### Introduction

Since the project's organizational supporters were contacted by different people and only had brief verbal descriptions of the project, the author sent each of the schools and subdivisions of the Chapter that endorsed the project copies of the completed grant proposal. The accompanying letter thanked them for their support, solicited their reactions to or comments about the proposal, and expressed the author's interest in working with them on

the grant's educational and social action activities.<sup>38</sup> This was done in an effort to begin building a commitment to the project's objectives and to ensure that the organizations would be ready to participate in the project should it be funded.

No comments or suggestions were forthcoming. The author did not interpret this to mean that the potential participants agreed with everything in the proposal. What seemed more likely was that they were all busy people who would not delve into the specifics until they knew whether or not the project was funded.

#### Formation of Planning Committee

The initial organizational meeting was held on June 15 at Dunham Falls University in Dover County. The author consciously decided to have the initial project meeting at a "neutral" site to avoid the appearance of favoring her school. Thirteen representatives from the participating organizations were invited and seven of them attended.

Two schools did not send faculty representatives. The director of one of the social work programs never responded to the invitation. The faculty liaison from the branch campus of the graduate school couldn't attend, but he called to contribute several suggestions about possible formats and speakers for the opening conference. He felt that the target population should be agency directors rather than the NASW general membership.<sup>39</sup>

Eight additional people affiliated with the Chapter and interested in the project were invited: the executive director, the president-elect, the former chair of ELAN, two members of the public relations committee, the graduate and undergraduate student representatives to the board of directors, and a member of the continuing education committee. Four were able to attend.<sup>40</sup>

The agenda for the meeting included the following topics:

1. Introduction of members
2. Chapter's Social Action Project
  - a. Description of grant and its relationship to chapter and national goals
  - b. Discussion of roles and activities for participants in the "practice/education" networks
  - c. Review of project timetable
3. Next steps

Attendees received the project overview and list of major tasks from the case study protocol (see Appendix A) along with the "Key Actors" and "Key Documents" charts developed by PROJECT BLOCK GRANT.

Unit chairs were asked to begin filling in charts for their respective counties and to identify members with expertise who might be willing to join a block grant technical advisory committee to the project. School representatives were asked to complete the process of appointing faculty and/or student liaisons to the project



and to arrange a time early in the Fall semester for the project director to meet with field instructors, faculty, and students.

The meeting ended with a brainstorming session about possible dates and a keynote speaker for the opening session of the continuing education series on block grants. Several members expressed confusion about the changes in federal and state categorical and block grant policies and concern about the scattered way that block grant information was emerging from the assorted state departments responsible for the eight block grants. The organizational representatives voiced reservations about their constituents' readiness to attend a large "kick-off" conference on block grants early in the Fall.

In addition, the unit chairs felt that many Chapter members were employed in agencies that were feeling the pressure of increasing demands for service, decreasing resources, and confusion about the new SSBG needs assessment process being instituted by the state and administered by the county HSACs. Those familiar with their CHSACs reported that the councils seemed overwhelmed by their responsibilities.

During the meeting some other issues related to the project itself were raised directly or came up in informal discussions over refreshments. An officer of one of the units insistently questioned the executive director and the author about the "real" amount of the grant funds and how

they were being used. Despite the fact that information about the grant award and the budget was presented, there seemed to be an underlying feeling among some NASW members that information was being withheld or that the funds should be used differently.

One of the representatives from an undergraduate program "jokingly" commented that the project director would have an opportunity to "pry" as she visited and talked with each school's various constituents.

Comments like these seemed to reflect organizational stress. Schools were more competitive due to declining enrollments and concerns about faculty cutbacks.<sup>41</sup> Just as there was often tension and mistrust between the national office and the State Chapters, similar feelings sometimes existed between Chapters and their local units. An Ad Hoc Committee on Unit Strengthening was in the process of surveying unit operations as part of an effort to revitalize inactive units and support those unit officers that felt overburdened and unrecognized.<sup>42</sup> The unit's purpose in the organizational structure was being reexamined. Unit chairs serving on the board of directors had participated in recent discussions about the "costs and benefits" of different suggestions for using \$4,000 in unallocated Chapter funds.<sup>43</sup> Some board members felt that the funds should be used to "strengthen" units, some wanted to invest in a computer, and others wanted to hire a Special Projects part-time staff person.

The session ended with an agreement to hold a follow-up meeting during the summer. Attempts to schedule the second meeting were unsuccessful. Most faculty and student liaisons were not available. Vacation schedules presented conflicts for other members. The second meeting was finally scheduled to coincide with the Chapter's annual meeting.

The 29th annual meeting was held on Sunday, September 11, 1983 in "Resort City." The organizers thought participants and their "significant others" would combine the meeting with a weekend visit to this resort area in the southern part of the state.

Workshop topics included (a) developing political skills, (b) improving relations with the media, (c) licensing update, (d) influencing agency policies from within, (e) recruiting and engaging new members, and (f) deciding how much personal energy to invest in professional organizations.<sup>44</sup> The second meeting of the Planning Committee was one of the events scheduled for the annual meeting.

Only 60 of the Chapter's 4000 members attended. Some felt that the attendance was low because the agenda was not "practice oriented." None of the planning committee members affiliated with participating schools or branch units planned to attend. They didn't want to spend the weekend in "Resort City," and they didn't want to make a lengthy trip from a distant part of the state for a two-hour committee meeting.

The author presented information on the PAF grant to the 60 attendees and also co-lead a workshop on "Political Skills" with the chair of PACE.

The June meeting and follow-up conversations and correspondence with organizational representatives (liaison persons, faculty, administrators) did not lead the author to believe that there was a pattern of different perceptions of project objectives between or within groups. There was a sense of confusion about the policy changes taking place and a primary concern with the needs of their respective organizations and how the project might help them in exchange for their support. The project's objectives would be competing for time and attention with the participating organization's own objectives; but the author did not sense that the participants felt that the project's and their organizations' objectives were at cross purposes.

#### Assessment of "Fit" Between Project Objectives and Unit's Organizational Function

Although no one expressed this concern, this investigator recognized that the project created a dilemma for the Chapter and the local units. Units, in collaboration with the schools, were being asked to take on additional responsibilities for overseeing local SSBG planning, allocation, and program monitoring decisions and to become involved in advocacy efforts to insure that resources were distributed equitably. This objective was at cross purposes with the unit's basic organizational function

and with the roles of other entities in the organization, i.e., state ELAN Committee, Income Maintenance and Social Services Task Force, Board of Directors, Policy Council. And it might well place some NASW members in conflict with the lobbying aims of their agency administrators some of whom served on the HSAC.

#### Network Formation, Initiation Question 9

Question 9 under effectiveness asks, "To what extent have beginning relationships been formed and/or strengthened among target groups in each county?" The focus of this question is on one of the project's subunits--county networks organized under the project's aegis. Interviews and participant observation were used to collect data.

The project's intervention plan, outlined in Question 7 above, was based on the assumption that organizational and/or individual actors in each demonstration area could be united to form loosely-connected networks interested in influencing the implementation of SSBG policies and procedures.

In attempting to forge stronger ties among the three target organizations in each demonstration county--local units of NASW, schools of social work, and county HSACs--several obstacles that affected this potential merger surfaced in the initiation stage. These impediments, discussed below, altered how and when proposed project tasks could be accomplished.

## Schools

Several factors associated with the schools/departments of social work participating in the project created obstacles that needed to be taken into consideration when planning project activities.

The academic calendar did not mesh well with the project timetable. For example, faculty members and students were not available during the summer, were occupied with beginning semester concerns through September, and had a long break between semesters.

Two faculty members who were identified as their schools' liaisons to the project when the grant proposal was submitted, were subsequently granted sabbatical leaves for the Fall 1983 semester. A faculty member from a third school was given a special assignment within the University and therefore was not available to participate in project activities. One school's endorsement of the project was perfunctory--its letter of support arrived too late to submit with the proposal and no representative attended the initial planning committee meeting. Support for the project from the state university's graduate school of social work came from the dean who is located on the main campus in Ewell County. However, the graduate school's participating unit was the Dover County branch campus; and there was a lag in communication between the two locations.

The new faculty liaisons had to be introduced to the project in the Fall. And the branch campus of the state

university's involvement in project activities had to be postponed until the Spring semester due to the undergraduate and graduate faculty liaisons' sabbatical leaves. There was a second participating undergraduate program in Dover County that was able to participate in the Fall semester.

The lengthy curriculum development and implementation process in some schools prevented the inclusion of new material on block grants into the Fall semester courses and, in some cases, limited inclusion in the Spring semester. Continuing education activities, therefore, took precedence over basic education for students as well as for other project participants.

There was a poor match between the field work and policy curriculum for undergraduate students in the Fall semester and the introduction of complex shifts in federal and state social welfare policy. Undergraduate seniors (and juniors in one of the schools) were preoccupied with adjusting to their field placement sites. The policy classes were presenting basic information about social welfare policies and services. Content on social action strategies varied and seemed to depend on the interests of individual faculty members.

To a lesser or greater extent, all of the undergraduate programs were concerned with declining enrollments. They all had a small faculty body (between 3 and 6 full-time members); and the project competed with many other issues for faculty attention.

Both graduate and undergraduate faculty were better connected to the NASW State Chapter than they were to the local units. Several faculty members served on state committees and/or task forces, i.e., an undergraduate faculty member from one of the cooperating schools chaired the Chapter's licensing committee.

All of the above resulted in the project director spending considerable time arranging to meet with the various subgroups related to the schools (faculty, students, field instructors) throughout the Fall semester to facilitate their involvement in county networks. Chapter VI, Evaluation of the Program Contact Stage, reports the outcome of these meetings.

#### Chapter Branch Units

There were considerable differences among the three NASW units participating in the project. Only one had a history of having an active steering committee that planned program activities several months in advance. Unfortunately this unit's work group diminished over the life of the project--the new ELAN coordinator resigned and the program chairperson became seriously ill. The other two units did not have this history and chairpersons had to assume heavy workloads.

Two of the three units had ELAN coordinators when the project began. The author was the coordinator for one of these units; in the second unit, the chairperson was also the ELAN coordinator.



The branch units were seen as one of the weaker components in the Chapter's organizational structure. The Program Committee was concerned that "units seemed to hold many meetings with tiny attendance. . .while the various interest-based [state] groups seemed to attract a much healthier attendance. . ."<sup>45</sup> The unit's purpose was being reexamined at the same time that the demonstration project was asking units to take on new responsibilities.

As mentioned above, the connections between the local units and the schools were weak.

#### County HSACs

The third organization on the county level to be incorporated into the local network was the human service advisory council. The CHSACs were not being asked to participate in project activities as entities. The four advisory councils in the demonstration area were part of county government. Securing county legislators' and administrators' approval of staff's recommended lists of council members typically involved a lengthy political process. Given the project's limited time period, obtaining each council's endorsement of the Chapter's block grant project was not politically or strategically feasible. Therefore, individual social workers associated with CHSACs as members or staff needed to be identified and drafted to serve as links to these nascent organizations. This was a second important reason to locate NASW members serving on councils.

The advisory councils in each of the demonstration counties were at different stages of development and the resources for sophisticated planning efforts varied. Chester County had a 170 member council with 21 subcommittees;<sup>46</sup> Dover had a "decentralized" council with 27 members.<sup>47</sup> In Bedford County 37 people served on the council.<sup>48</sup> And Austin County had a 35 member council.<sup>49</sup>

Councils were mandated by the SDHS to carry out SSBG planning, allocation, and program monitoring responsibilities. The state was not providing financial resources to help counties carry out their newly-mandated functions, although it did hire a consultant to design the needs assessment process and to help councils implement it. There was widespread discontent among the counties with the lack of state funding, with the consultant, and with the needs assessment process. (Schreiber and Botsko 1983)

The possible organizational structures, the composition, and the responsibilities of the councils were defined by the SDHS.<sup>50</sup> Council membership needed to reflect the demographic makeup of the county and the range of services funded by the SSBG. The following groups were to be represented on the councils: elected officials, public and private provider agencies, consumers and/or consumer advocates, appointees from the DHS's other divisions, "related service" representatives, and "other" representatives whom the county believed would provide a valuable contribution to human services planning. This

latter category could include faculty from social work and related disciplines or a representative from NASW. However, a study of the initial composition of the councils indicated that "individuals from academia" are rarely included as members of the council. (Schreiber and Botsko 1983, 5)

One of the project's first tasks was to identify NASW members serving on these councils to help the professional association become connected to sources of information about this evolving planning mechanism. As indicated in question 3 above, less than half of the social workers serving on councils in the demonstration counties were NASW members. And council appointees saw themselves as representing specific services or client groups.

#### Network Formation

The organizational components for a "network" existed in each county but none of them emerged as a potential catalyst for bringing the pieces together. The project director had to assume a more prominent linking role than was initially planned.

The councils were in their own initiation stage. The first group of councils were certified by the state in July 1983. They were about to embark on their first task--a needs assessment and a resource inventory--that would involve many agencies in the counties. Many of the social workers serving on the councils did not have strong links to the professional association. The strength of their connection to the schools was not known.

Pressures related to beginning the Fall semester, changes in faculty liaison persons, and enrollment concerns contributed to the project's "back burner" position with the three undergraduate programs. Involving the Dover County branch campus of the state university's graduate program in project activities was being delayed until the Spring semester.

NASW unit officers saw the project as related to their needs more than the schools did during this stage. At a minimum, chairs were interested in program development ideas and resources to increase attendance at monthly meetings.

Although they expressed interest in the project, the undergraduate social work programs and the local NASW units had over-extended work groups. The initial expectations that local units, with project support, could be catalysts for forming networks and that tasks could be assigned to liaison persons from the schools, units, and CHSACs was overly optimistic. More of the "nitty gritty" work to help the groups connect with each other needed to be done by the project director.

#### Initial Assessment of Networks' Ability to Engage in Social Action

The project had tacit approval from the national office and the Chapter leadership to explore how the professional association might become politically active on the county level. The author's initial assessment of the networks' ability to mount social action efforts was not optimistic.

Due to the decentralization of the federal social service program, there was a need for county-level social action endeavors. (Morell 1982, Patti 1983a, Magill 1986, Sosin 1990) However, there did not seem to be a good "fit" between the task and the participating organizations at the county level.

Units did not have the authority to make policy decisions for the association. Their mission according to the state by-laws was to "increase the opportunity for Association members to join together in strengthening their professional identity."<sup>51</sup> They were not set up to function as a political action network. (Dempsey 1982, 236; Gilman 1990)

Undergraduate social work curricula was not geared toward administration and planning; the inclusion of social action content was variable. Faculty tended to be more active on state committees than they were in the local units.

The CHSACs were charged with SSBG planning, allocation, and program monitoring responsibilities. Because the social service block grant is a revenue source that supports a wide range of social services to a diverse group of clients, developing a consensus on issues related to a "fair" allocation of funds was a formidable, if not impossible, task. The study state was one where the issue of a "fair" distribution of resources was particularly acute.

. . .the central concern was the formula for distributing state and federal service dollars to

the localities. [Certain] counties. . .felt strongly that they had not received adequate resources in the past. They argued for a revision in the formula that would provide them a "fairer" share of the total resources. Other counties, quite naturally, opposed this revision and proposed an alternative that would actually increase their share of the resources. The state department [of human services] eventually proposed a compromise that temporarily defused the issue. (Peterson, et al 1986, 57)<sup>52</sup>

This controversy was replicated within counties.

Social service providers held conflicting positions on how SSBG funds should be allocated. Data on the apportionment of SSBG funds among service categories presented at the SDHS's northern regional meeting described in Question 3 above elicited strong reactions about what was "fair." For example, in one study county 76 per cent of SSBG funds supported child day care programs while 1 per cent was allocated to transportation services.<sup>53</sup> Advocates for the elderly and for persons with disabilities that attended this meeting did not think this was a "fair" allocation of funds. Advocates for children's services felt that the providers serving the elderly or persons with disabilities had access to other funding streams.

Some of the forementioned obstacles to accomplishing project objectives could be alleviated by modifying the operating plan. However, the latter obstacle challenged the proposal's assertion that the professional association was "ideally suited to help guide and shape an effort for equitable distribution of block grants by local government." As the project progressed, the professional association's

role in spearheading effective advocacy efforts at the local level would continue to be examined.

Thus far, answers to selected evaluation questions particularly relevant to the major tasks of the program initiation stage have been presented. They provide the basis for assessing how well the administrative and programmatic tasks were realized.

### Assessment of How Well Project Accomplished

#### Initiation Stage Tasks

##### Administrative Tasks

In the program initiation stage, success is determined by the ability to secure those resources needed to launch the program described in the action plan.

#### Action Plan

As indicated above, an operating plan in the form of a PAF proposal was prepared, submitted to the national office, and funded. The award letter stated that the committee had received 31 proposals from Chapters and funded 12 of them.<sup>54</sup> According to the PAF chairman, "the selection was exceptionally difficult because of the generally excellent quality of the proposals." Seven of the 12 Chapter grants were for licensing and/or vendor-ship projects, three were related to practice concerns, and two to social action efforts other than securing licensure.<sup>55</sup>

Because the president-elect and chair of the program committee was active at the national level, she had developed personal relationships with national office staff.

As a professor of social policy, she also had an investment in the block grant issue. She contacted the director of PROJECT BLOCK GRANT to determine what next steps were needed to study and influence the intergovernmental transfer of responsibilities for social services. This information was incorporated into the grant proposal.

The Chapter executive director, with several years' experience in the position, had also developed productive working relationships with national staff and had overseen the successful implementation of a PAF Grant in 1978. The national office was impressed with the Chapter's Committee on Inquiry and had asked the Chapter to participate in a 1983-84 national PAF training grant for other Chapters.

Although the author did not have access to the PAF decision-making process, it seems reasonable to assume that the personal relationships, the credibility of the president-elect and the executive director, and the Chapter's readiness to invest time and resources in the block grant issue had some bearing on the PAF Committee's judgment.

### Resources

By the end of the initiation stage, the following resources were obtained:

1. sanction of the parent institution (national office);
2. approximately \$15,000 in PAF funds;



3. approximately \$5,000 in "in-kind" support from the Chapter;
4. a commitment to provide technical assistance from Chapter staff, i.e., bookkeeper, membership coordinator, and executive director;
5. endorsement from those external organizations and internal subdivisions whose participation was essential to implementing the project, i.e., four schools of social work and three branch units;
6. project staff, i.e., part-time director and part-time secretary;
7. physical facilities, i.e., the author's school agreed to serve as the "home base" for the project and, along with the other schools, agreed to donate space for the continuing education events; and
8. substantive information about block grants.

Three additional resources were partially secured:

1. social legitimation within Chapter;
2. social legitimation within the social services community; and
3. strategic information possessed by social workers involved in the block grant implementation process.

#### Legitimation within Chapter

There was initial support from the president-elect, the first vice president, and the executive director, followed by the board's endorsement. However, securing additional support from the volunteer leadership was more difficult to

obtain than originally anticipated. Some critical leadership positions were simply vacant such as the chair of the state ELAN Committee and the chair of the Income Maintenance and Social Services Task Force. There were ELAN vacancies at the unit level also. Carrying out collective political action efforts without this component would be difficult if not impossible.

It was also becoming evident that Chapter "norms" did not support the cross fertilization of ideas and the transfer of information among the various subunits. For example, the Administration Section was planning a program on block grants that the author discovered by chance, and the Continuing Education Committee learned about the project because this investigator happened to be a committee member.

#### Legitimation within the social services community

As discussed above, locating social workers involved in block grant implementation activities to form a technical advisory committee for the project was the most difficult resource to acquire. The project director felt that acquiring social legitimation within the social services community was closely connected to the willingness of knowledgeable social workers and their allies to contribute their expertise to the professional association's block grant project.

### Strategic information possessed by social workers

Gathering strategic information about the block grant process from social workers involved in the evolving process was critical to the success of the project. The professional association needed links to the CHSACs so it could educate its membership and begin to influence the SSBG implementation process in the demonstration counties.

Council members who were social workers did not seem to have strong connections with the Chapter. Many of the social workers serving on county HSAC's were not members of NASW. As indicated above, their lack of response could be attributed to the fact that most social workers on CHSACs were administrators, a segment of the profession that is not well connected to NASW. (Gibelman and Schervish 1993, 90)

However, even those social workers that were members did not come forward. Because the SSBG funds a range of social services it may create conflict among different segments within the social services. Administrators may be understandably protective of their agencies' services and clients during a period of cutbacks and unwilling to join an NASW effort to ensure an "equitable" allocation of funds.

When the project moved into the contact stage in May, 1983, the need to secure additional "strategic" information meant staff had to continue to devote time to this critical initiation stage task.

### **Programmatic Tasks**

The project's programmatic tasks were described in Question 7 above. Progress toward accomplishing the first three tasks was made during the initiation stage. A brief description of the headway made in these areas follows:

#### **Task 1. Building Networks**

A project planning committee was formed; several of the liaison persons from the student bodies and faculty of the participating schools and from statewide committees and local units of the Chapter were identified. A process using "key informants" to identify social workers serving on CHSACs was initiated. The planning committee meeting and follow-up interviews were used to assess the concerns of the project's diverse constituencies. This information resulted in revisions to the project plan that will be presented in the concluding section of this chapter.

#### **Task 2. Reviewing Related Programs and Literature**

The author participated in a meeting of PROJECT BLOCK GRANT representatives to learn from their experiences, attended the profession's national symposium, attended several forums in the state that discussed block grant issues, contacted key informants, and conducted an extensive literature review.

#### **Task 3. Designing Continuing Education Program**

The project plan called for a Continuing Education Program (CEP) for members of the participating organizations in the demonstration counties. The program would open with

a multi-county conference featuring a prominent guest speaker and workshops. The planning committee would be involved in selecting workshop topics. Knowledgeable individuals from the participating groups would be selected to conduct the workshops. This "kick off" event would be followed by a series of SSBG forums in the demonstration counties.

This plan was modified for several reasons: two statewide meetings on block grants (described above) had recently been presented, the planning committee had reservations about beginning with a large conference, and identifying potential workshop leaders was more difficult than originally anticipated. The revised plan is described in the following section on project modifications.

#### Project Modifications

The evaluation process provided information that prompted the project director to revise the project's operating plan in the following areas:

1. An umbrella planning committee composed of representatives from the two key organizations--the professional association and the schools--in all four demonstration counties was formed during the initial project period and two meetings were scheduled. Attendance at the first meeting was good; however, the second meeting was cancelled because the representatives from the schools and the CHSACs didn't attend.

After gathering more data on the various organizations, the author decided to disband the umbrella committee and focus on establishing working groups in each county. This organizational structure was more in line with the objective of building a network in each county that would continue beyond the life of the project.

2. The Chapter leadership responded to changing federal and state policies by attempting to secure outside funding to support a project that would involve rank and file members in influencing how state and county block grant policies would be implemented. At the first planning committee meeting, organizational representatives questioned their constituents' readiness to participate in a conference on this topic. The schools and units needed time to develop grassroots interest in the block grant issue.

Therefore, the Continuing Education Program (CEP) was modified. The original plan involved beginning with a multi-county or statewide conference featuring a nationally prominent keynote speaker. This event would be followed by a series of county forums. This plan was reversed. The CEP would end with a large conference and begin with local meetings in the demonstration units. These meetings were designed to be the vehicles for linking the target groups in each county network and for developing interest in the issues at the local level.

3. Due to the small work groups available in the local units and to the observation that faculty had stronger

connections to state-level Chapter groups than to the local units, the project director decided to explore the possibility of involving additional Chapter structures/groups in the project. Two prospects were the Administration Section and the Social Workers' Day Committee. The former group was devoting one of its upcoming meetings to the state's block grant implementation process.<sup>56</sup> The Social Worker's Day Committee was planning a March conference. This annual celebration of Social Work Month was usually well attended and often had a social action thrust.

4. As discussed above, the CHSACs were not asked to participate as entities due to county government's lengthy and often factional approval processes. Instead, efforts would focus on recruiting social workers serving on the councils to become project liaisons.

5. Due to some of the schools' curriculum development processes and to the baccalaureate programs' focus on basic information about social welfare policies and services, continuing education activities related to block grants took precedence over basic education for students as well as for practitioners.

6. The focus of social action efforts needed to be rethought. Councils were in their own initiation stage of development. And there were technical and political problems associated with deciding what would be an "equitable" allocation of SSBG funds in each county.

### Summary

The goals in the program initiation stage, according to Tripodi and associates, "are concentrated on securing the necessary resources and conditions for [participant] contact and program implementation." (1978, 46-47) By May, 1983, these goals were sufficiently achieved and the program moved into the contact stage.

Chapter VI, Evaluation of Program Contact Stage, assesses the accomplishments of the second phase of the project's developmental cycle.



## Chapter Endnotes

1. Chapter Executive Director and Chair of the Program Committee. Memo to Leadership of all volunteer structures, December 28, 1982.
2. Chair, NASW PAF Subcommittee. Letter to Chapter President, April 5, 1983.
3. The first developmental stage in Patti's formulation is called the design stage.
4. Richan (1988) defines strategic information as "knowing where the key decisions are made and who has the power to make them and who or what will influence those decisions" and tactical information as substantive knowledge of social welfare policy and its impact on clients. (202)
5. Chair, PAF Subcommittee. Memorandum to Chapter Presidents and Staff, National Unit Chairpersons, National Staff, December 14, 1982.
6. Chapter Executive Director and Chair of Program Committee. Memo to Leadership of all volunteer structures, December 28, 1982.
7. Program Committee Minutes, January, 1983.
8. Chapter President. Letter to author, January 30, 1981.
9. Meeting with Chapter President-Elect and Program Chair, Chapter First Vice President, and author at Eliot University Graduate School of Social Work, February 9, 1983.
10. Secretary of the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Board of Directors, February 10, 1982, 2.
11. Chapter PAF Proposal, Developing a Practice/Education Network to Increase Social Action on the Local Level Regarding Block Grants, February 18, 1983.
12. Chapter Action Plan for PFY [Program Fiscal Year] 84.
13. Chair PAF Subcommittee. Letter to Chapter President, April 5, 1983.
14. Table 2.1 Evaluation Questions and Strategies, Program Initiation Stage can be found in Chapter 2 and in Appendix A.4.a.
15. NASW Special Project Grant Application and Instructions, December, 1982, 7.
16. NASW Special Project Grant Application and Instructions, December, 1982.

17. Chapter PAF Proposal, 1983, 7

18. Patti (1983) notes that "intervention strategies can be variously conceptualized. . ." and uses the following taxonomy developed by Schoenberger and Williamson (1977) as an illustration:

1. Education
2. Prevention
3. Individual treatment
4. Rehabilitation
5. Regulation
6. Supporting or strengthening existing programs
7. Generating institutional change.

19. See Table 1. Project-Related Organizations in Chapter I.

20. Chapter PAF Proposal, 1983, 14-15.

21. Chapter PAF Proposal, 1983, 10-12.

22. Chapter PAF Proposal, 1983, 15.

23. Chapter PAF Proposal, 1983, 8.

24. Chapter PAF Proposal, 1983, 8.

25. Chapter PAF Proposal, 1983, 14.

26. Chapter PAF Proposal, 1983, 15.

27. The promised letter of support from the third school didn't arrive in time and the proposal was submitted without it.

28. Fair Budget Action Campaign, 1983. Report of a Conference: Human Needs in [State].

29. [State] Department of Human Services. 1983. Outlook '84, Guide for Citizen Participation. Capital City, XX: Author.

30. NASW PROJECT BLOCK GRANT Skills-Building Workshop. "Workshop Packet with Information from Nine Project States." May 14-15, 1983. Examples of materials that were presented include: Block Grant Advisory Task Force Draft Report to the Governor and the Legislature of the State of California, the Coalition on Block Grants and Human Needs 58-page memorandum of "specifications" for block grant legislation or administrative regulations, the Helping Handbook prepared by the League of Women Voters as part of a recruitment effort to interest low-income people in joining the Georgia Block Grant Coalition, the NASW/Mississippi Chapter's poignant audio-visual presentation of poverty statistics and how they affected the lives of ordinary citizens.

31. Case study notes, June 17, 1983.

32. Schreiber, Meyer, and Michael Botsko. 1983. Block Grants and Human/Community Services: A Challenge and Opportunity for Innovation and Service. Capital City, XX: [State] Association of Counties.
33. National Association of Social Workers. 1983 NASW Professional Symposium, Celebrating the Future, Final Program, November 19-22, 1983, p. 3.
34. Case study notes and correspondence.
35. "Block Grants--Identifying the Players," NASW. . .NEWS, September, 1983, 3.
36. Project Block Grant Selected Bibliography (2 pp.) and Spring Forum on "Human Services Planning Issues Confronting Local Decision-Makers" Selected Bibliography (5 pp.)
37. Case study notes, June 17, 1983.
38. For example: Author. Letter to Director, Social Work Program, Dunham Falls University, February 25, 1983.
39. Case study notes. Telephone conversation between faculty liaison from graduate school's Dover County branch campus and project director, June 22, 1983.
40. Action minutes. Project Planning Committee, June 15, 1983.
41. One of the participating schools had recently lost a social policy teaching slot due to university retrenchment.
42. Secretary of the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Board of Directors, February 10, 1983.
43. Secretary of the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Board of Directors, April 7, 1983.
44. Board of Directors. 29th Annual Meeting Brochure. "Exercise Your Power: Participation Makes it Happen: Sharpen Your Skills," September 11, 1983.
45. Chair, Program Committee Minutes, February 28, 1983.
46. Chester County Human Service Planning Advisory Council: Narrative Description and Membership List, no date.
47. Dover County Human Services Advisory Council, Proposed Membership, May, 1983.
48. Bedford County Human Services Advisory Council Membership List--1983-84, no date.

49. Austin County Human Services Planning Council: Narrative Description and Membership List, March 7, 1984.

50. State Department of Human Services. 1982. County Human Service Advisory Councils: Background, Purpose, Activities, and Composition. [Capital City, XX]: Author.

51. Chapter By-Laws. 1979. . . . State Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers. Article X, B.1

52. Beginning with the fiscal year 1984, the state DHS created a formula to distribute new and future SSBG and related funds on a county basis. The formula utilized, as factors, the numbers of Medicaid eligible persons residing in a given county and also the number of persons whose family income was below 80% of the state's median income adjusted for family size. (SDHS 1983)

53. State Department of Human Services. 1983. Outlook '84, Guide for Citizen Participation. [Capital City, XX]: Author.

54. Chair PAF Subcommittee. Letter to Chapter President, April 5, 1983.

55. "PAF Subcommittee Sets Special Projects," NASW. . . News, May, 1983, p.12.

56. Bulletin Board Announcement of Administration Section's October 19th meeting on "Human Services Planning on the County Level: Impact on Social Work Administrators." NASW. . . NEWS, October, 1983.

## CHAPTER VI

### EVALUATION OF PROGRAM CONTACT STAGE

#### Introduction

The contact stage of the "differential evaluation" model of program development assesses the effectiveness and efficiency of efforts made to reach and engage a project's designated beneficiaries. (Tripodi et al 1978)

According to the PAF proposal, approximately 500 participants would attend one or more of the continuing education events. The project plan called for a minimum of one multi-county and three county-level programs. A smaller, unspecified number of program attendees were expected to become involved in the project's social action endeavors.<sup>1</sup>

The potential participants would be recruited from the following organizations in the demonstration counties: four schools of social work, three of the Chapter's branch units, and four county human service advisory councils (CHSACs).

Table 6.1 below summarizes information from the proposal related to gauging the number and type of anticipated direct and indirect project beneficiaries.

| <b>TABLE 6.1</b><br><b>Estimated Number of Direct and Indirect</b><br><b>Project Beneficiaries*</b> |                |                                                              |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Beneficiaries</b>                                                                                | <b>Number*</b> | <b>Basis for Estimate</b>                                    |
| <b>Direct Beneficiaries/Schools</b>                                                                 |                |                                                              |
| Students                                                                                            | 80             | 20 students x 4 social work programs                         |
| Faculty                                                                                             | 12             | 3 faculty x 4 social work programs                           |
| Staff from field placement agencies                                                                 | 300            | 5 staff x 15 agencies x 4 social work programs               |
| <b>Direct Beneficiaries/Chapter Units</b>                                                           |                |                                                              |
| Officers from local units                                                                           | 9              | ELAN coordinator and 2 other officers x 3 units (4 counties) |
| General unit membership (including "ELANers")                                                       | 60             | 20 members x 3 units (4 counties)                            |
| <b>Direct Beneficiaries/CHSAC's</b>                                                                 |                |                                                              |
| Members from CHSACs                                                                                 | 40             | 10 members x 4 county coalitions                             |
| <b>Total Direct Beneficiaries</b>                                                                   | <b>501*</b>    | <b>NA</b>                                                    |

Continuation of Table 6.1

| Beneficiaries                      | Number* | Basis for Estimate                                                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Indirect Beneficiaries</b>      |         |                                                                                                                                            |
| Chapter members                    | 3700    | Mailing list for monthly newsletter                                                                                                        |
| Clients of social service agencies | unknown | (Assumes that political efforts result in increased support for social services and/or new state regulations safeguarding clients' rights) |
| Total Known Indirect Beneficiaries | 3700    | NA                                                                                                                                         |

\* This is not an unduplicated count as the same participant could attend more than one event.

As indicated in Table 6.1, the goal was to engage approximately 500 participants in project activities: 78 percent from the four participating schools, 14 percent from the three branch units; and the remaining 8 percent from the four newly-formed CHSACs.

Given the project's premise that "natural networks" existed in the demonstration counties, the groups were not intended to be mutually exclusive. Quite the contrary. It was expected that people would occupy multiple roles in the county human services network, i.e., be both a field instructor and an NASW member.

Although this condition was recognized, the proposal didn't specifically address how participants with multiple

roles would be placed in the discrete categories described in Table 6.1. The author's solution is to report both the actual number of participants at each event and, when known, the number of "categorical positions" filled by the attendees.

This chapter utilizes the framework described in Chapter IV to evaluate the SSBG Demonstration Project's ability to reach and engage the participants identified in Table 6.1. This assessment begins with a brief description of the characteristics of the contact stage.

#### Description of the Stage

##### Definition

"Program contact is that stage in which a program has achieved its objectives of initiation and is devoting its efforts to the active engagement of a target population." (Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978, 7)

##### Time Frame

The SSBG Demonstration Project's contact stage began in January, 1983 and continued through June, 1984, (see Figure 4.1, Chapter IV). During the first four months--January through April, 1983--the project was primarily concerned with initiation stage tasks. Organizational support was secured and some of the liaison people were selected by administrators. Potential groups of participants were identified; however, it was too soon to begin contacting them.



In May, 1983 the primary and secondary foci switched--reaching target populations was of main concern and continuing the search for other resources, i.e., block grant strategic information, lessened in significance. From October, 1983 through June, 1984 the project was simultaneously involved with contact stage and implementation stage tasks. Additional groups of potential participants emerged as the project developed, and specific individuals that belonged to these groups needed to be identified and contacted.

#### Goals

Tripodi and associates (1978) succinctly describe the goals of the contact stage as "being concerned with the bringing together of program content and clientele." (50)

#### Tasks

##### Stage-Related Administrative Tasks

Resource acquisition is the administrative task most prominently identified with the contact stage. (Patti 1983b)<sup>2</sup>

During this phase of the developmental cycle, program participants are the targeted resource. "The failure to attract and engage a clientele calls into question the very reason for a program's existence and often severely weakens its claim to [other] resources." (Patti 1983b, 114)

According to Patti, three elements are vital to the task of acquiring a clientele: "informing the [target] population regarding the availability of the program

services. . .; developing mechanisms and processes that will minimize obstacles or facilitate access to the service; and creating conditions and processes that will promote trust between the agency and its clientele." (1983b, 114)

Although the reference is to programs that provide social services to clients, the elements described by Patti (with some changes in terminology) are equally applicable to programs that recruit participants to influence the implementation of public policies.

In a more recent article on social action organizations, Mondros and Wilson (1993) assert that "Involving, engaging, and sustaining a large and strongly identified group of participants is important to achieving organizational [social action] goals." (69-70) They present ideas for designing "high access" organizational structures that facilitate the recruitment, engagement, and continued involvement of participants. (76-83) The authors define "high access" organizations as those that "actively build bridges to reach people, assiduously avoid barriers which impede involvement, and make judicious use of gates to open opportunities for leadership to as many people as possible." (83)<sup>3</sup>

There are similarities between Patti's "elements" and Mondros and Wilson's "structural strategies." Reference will be made to both of these works throughout this assessment of project efforts to acquire program participants.

The project proposal's list of major programmatic tasks included activities related to contacting and engaging participants. These tasks/activities are described in the following section.

#### Stage-Related Programmatic Tasks

The demonstration project's nine programmatic tasks were presented in Chapter V. Three of these tasks--building a network of relationships, task 1; designing a continuing education program, task 3; and recruiting participants for local ELAN teams, task 5--were associated with the contact stage goal of reaching and engaging social workers and other human services personnel in project activities.

Task 1 activities included identifying and meeting with liaison people from the participating organizations to assess the concerns and interests of their respective constituencies.

Task 3 involved identifying those people in the four-county demonstration area that the project wanted to reach. Sub-tasks included developing promotional materials to use in attracting the identified populations to the project's events and selecting accessible locations for workshops/forums.

Task 5 focused on enlarging and strengthening the ELAN teams in the demonstration units. Recruiting and/or reactivating ELAN members was seen as an integral part of the project's continuing education process. The project

director planned to assist ELAN unit coordinators in training newly recruited members to strengthen their commitment to the association and to the social action network.

ELAN Members: Key Target Population

The PAF proposal stated that the Chapter had a "large and active ELAN."<sup>4</sup> Accomplishing the project's social action objectives was heavily dependent upon "ELANers'" interest in and readiness to participate in influencing the implementation of SSBG policies and procedures in the demonstration counties and in the state.

The following narrative describes the executive director's efforts to mobilize the Chapter's ELAN component in the spring of 1982--six months prior to the inception of the SSBG Demonstration Project. The narration ends with a description of the project's first attempt to bring "program content and clientele" together in October, 1983--an Austin-Bedford Unit meeting for "ELANers," faculty, and students hosted by Altmeyer-Buell University's undergraduate social work department.

### Narrative

The opening statement of the May 19, 1982, ELAN ALERT that was sent to members of the reorganized network announced, "Congratulations! You have survived the first shake down of [the] ELAN. . . list in ten years."<sup>5</sup> The ALERT requested that "ELANers" begin meeting with their assigned legislators.

The vehicle for beginning or renewing the relationship was updating the information in the Chapter's biographical profile of each legislator and identifying his/her key aides. With that as an opening, "ELANers" were then asked to advocate for the licensure of social workers (Senate Bill S-00). The alert stressed that "NO LEGISLATOR SHOULD BE MISSED IN THIS EFFORT." They were also advised to discuss the Chapter's statement on the state budget for FY '83 and to leave a copy with the legislator. The instructions further suggested that the "ELANer" urge the legislator to vote for increased funding for human services, "tell stories about what is happening in your agency or practice. . . [and] stress that state dollars must replace diminished federal dollars."

Following contact with the assigned legislator, each "ELANer" was directed to advise the Unit Coordinator of the outcome. "This allows the ELAN network to focus on any trouble spots which you have identified."<sup>6</sup>

A special Alert was issued on the same day to network members assigned to senators serving on the Senate's Labor, Industry and Professions Committee. The five legislators serving on this committee determined when the social work licensure bill would reach the Senate floor. This Alert stated that, "There are few occasions [when] you will have such a key role to play." Each "ELANer" in the targeted districts was urged to organize a visit to his or her senator and to bring "an agency director, a school social worker, a health care provider, and any [social worker] who knows this legislator personally."

As a follow-up to the interview, network members were instructed to let the staff know what happened. The Alert stated that "It is important for us to have a reading on the committee. Preliminary intelligence suggests that the committee is highly in favor of the proposal. If you hear anything negative, or more likely, if any

questions are raised, please advise [the office] so that a response can be prepared."

Over the next several months, the executive director issued periodic ELAN Alerts. They focused on licensing, 1982 PACE endorsements, the state's human services budget, and support for a bill establishing an Alcohol Rehabilitation Fund supported by increased taxes on the sale of alcoholic beverages.

One Alert asked network members to write to designated federal officials and legislators protesting certain U. S. Department of Human Services' regulations that are "of grave concern to us all."<sup>8</sup> The correspondence acknowledged that this was an unusual request as "ELANers" were not normally asked to respond to federal issues. However, the "far-ranging" impact of the proposals necessitated mobilizing a "large" response.<sup>9</sup>

Each Alert instructed the "ELANer" to advise his or her local Unit ELAN coordinator of the results of calls, letters, and/or visits. An insert was enclosed listing the local coordinator's name, address and telephone number. The importance of this final step in the ELAN process was stressed in each mailing.

Correspondence with coordinators during this same period advised them "to have patience" with "ELANers" that were not providing feedback on their contacts with legislators. One such memo explained, "This year we are trying to tighten up the ELAN system, and those who have been active for years are not in the habit of communicating. We need to build that expectation together. Each general ELAN Alert will remind them to reach you by phone or post card."<sup>10</sup>

In April, 1983, an Alert was issued that instructed network members to contact state legislators and urge them to adopt the recommendations contained in the Chapter's testimony before the Joint Appropriations Committee on the SFY84 human services budget. It also included information on upcoming events such as a special election that would affect the composition of the Senate's Labor, Industry and Professions Committee and assisting the PACE Committee in endorsing and electing pro-human service candidates. The notice also mentioned that the Chapter "has some PAF money with which . . . [the Austin-Bedford ELAN] Unit Coordinator,

will be developing a model to influence Block Grant allocations on the local level."<sup>11</sup>

The 28 Austin-Bedford Unit "ELANers" were invited to attend the project's first block grant continuing education event scheduled for October 5, 1983, at Altmeyer-Buell University (ABU).<sup>12</sup> Students in the social work program at ABU received special invitations from the Unit chairperson and the Unit ELAN coordinator (who was also the project director and a member of the ABU faculty).<sup>13</sup>

The executive director sent a notice to all members in Austin County informing them of the meeting on October 5th. It highlighted the senate race in the [XX]th district. The incumbent who sat on the Senate's Labor, Industry and Professions Committee was opposed to licensing social workers and "almost single handedly worked to hold [the licensing bill] in committee." PACE was endorsing the challenger and the Chapter was urging members in Austin County to work for his election.<sup>14</sup>

The agenda for the October 5th meeting included: information on PACE's endorsement of the challenger for the senate seat in the [XX]th legislative district, information on the Human SERVE Voter Registration Drive, and an update on the social service block grant funding and human service advisory councils in Austin and Bedford Counties. The program was designed to appeal to different constituencies--those primarily interested in social action targeted to licensure and those whose main interest was in influencing social welfare policy. The two guest speakers were members of their respective county HSACs. In addition, they were NASW members, "ELANers," and well-known agency administrators. The unit chairperson was also an "ELANer."

The project's first effort to bring "program content and clientele" together not only marked the beginning of the program implementation stage. It also tested the effectiveness of contact stage efforts to reach one of the key target populations--"ELANers."

Although the executive director's effort to update and strengthen the Chapter's social action network occurred prior to the initiation of the demonstration project, it was

a necessary base for launching the project's social action component.

Answers to contact stage evaluation questions, presented below, focus on the effectiveness of project efforts to contact and engage "ELANers," the other categories of potential participants listed in Table 6.1 above, and new groups of participants that emerged as the project progressed.

Selected Evaluative Questions/Answers--Table 2.6<sup>15</sup>

Introduction

Table 2.6, Evaluation Questions and Strategies, Program Contact Stage, includes ten evaluation questions that directed the assessment of the second stage of program development. For each question the table indicates the combination of data collection methods that were used to compile information on the three criteria of program evaluation: effort, effectiveness, and efficiency.

Four of the ten questions, selected in accordance with the principles described in Chapter II, are answered below. Two questions focus on recruitment and engagement efforts; one addresses the extent to which relationships were maintained; and the final question looks at attributes of participants that facilitated participation in project activities. Taken together they provide a picture of how well the tasks of the program contact stage were managed.

A brief recap of contact stage endeavors that took place while the project's main concern was carrying out



initiation stage tasks provides a context for discussion of the four questions referenced above.

#### Contact Stage Activities Described in Chapter V

##### Recruiting Liaisons

Chapter V reported on the initial organization meeting and subsequent contacts with representatives from the participating schools and the Chapter's local units that took place during the summer of 1983.

Concurrent efforts to identify NASW members serving on the county HSACs were also recounted. Identifying these HSAC members met the task requirements of two different project stages:

1. gathering strategic information on SSBG procedures  
--an initiation stage task and
2. acquiring links to these newly-formed organizations  
--a contact stage task.

##### Project Modifications

Project modifications that resulted from these contacts included: (a) disbanding the umbrella committee in favor of establishing working groups of liaisons in the three demonstration areas, (b) changing the continuing education protocol to begin the series with county forums rather than with a large multi-county conference, and (c) exploring the possibility of working with other Chapter components in addition to branch units. These modifications influenced the focus and timing of efforts to recruit, engage, and

maintain project beneficiaries. These changes in the project plan are referred to in the following questions.

### Resource Acquisition: Recruiting Target

#### Populations, Contact Question 1

Question 1, effort, asks, "What amounts of time and program resources are devoted to making contact with liaison persons from cooperating organizations? with intended participants?"

This question involves the project as a whole as well the following subunits of analysis: the three county-level networks with their subdivisions and key individuals. The methods used to collect data pertaining to this question included participant observation and documentation, i.e., review of correspondence, minutes, and entries in the project calendar and log.

#### Informing the Target Population

Informing the target population is the first of the three elements that Patti views as essential to the task of acquiring clientele. He discusses "three critical publics [that] should be reached if a population. . . is to be adequately informed of the new program." They include

organizations and programs. . . who have ongoing contact with the clientele of interest. . . , groups whose primary function is advocating for and representing the rights and interests of the at-risk population to which the program is targeted," [and potential participants themselves]. (1983b, 115)

Patti also identifies "several commonly used means of disseminating program information: media. . . ; brochures,

leaflets, and newsletters; speeches, presentations, and announcements; agency staff meetings and professional conferences; special events. . . ." He notes that these methods "are often supplemented by the manager's participation in local planning and coordinating bodies . . . , professional associations, and contacts with administrators of other agencies." Involving "persons from the community" in program activities is also mentioned "as a bridge to the larger target population." (1983b, 116)

Mondros and Wilson also stress the use of multiple methods to "attract and build bridges" to the greatest possible number of recruits." (1993, 77)

The project's efforts to reach each of the "critical publics" using a variety of dissemination methods are presented in the following section.

#### Organizations that have contact with target populations

The members of organizations listed in Table 6.1 were the block grant project's "clientele of interest." Liaison persons from the organizations that supported the proposal and from the CHSACs in the demonstration counties were important links to the project's designated beneficiaries.

Unit chairs were asked to appoint ELAN coordinators and chairpersons of the program committee as project liaisons. School administrators were asked to appoint a student liaison and one or more faculty intermediaries--preferably members responsible for the internship program and/or for teaching in the social policy area.

An enthusiastic student from the state university graduate school of social work's main campus in Ewell County heard about the project and expressed an interest in becoming involved in the Chapter's social action effort. She was an unanticipated link to graduate school students on the main campus. The project director also assigned her to coordinate the activities of the three undergraduate student liaisons.

Fifteen liaison persons from the schools and local units were identified by September, 1983. Student liaisons received small stipends; the other intermediaries volunteered their services.

Once appointed, faculty liaisons were asked to arrange a time early in the Fall semester for the project director to meet with field instructors and other faculty members. Student liaisons were asked to publicize the project through formal structures such as the student association and informally through contacts with classmates.

The four counties in the demonstration area chose similar organizational structures for their CHSACs--being part of county government (rather than the alternate structure of being independent of, but sanctioned by, county government).

As indicated in Chapter V, it was not politically feasible to ask each council to officially endorse the Chapter's demonstration project and appoint liaison persons. Consequently, the project director had to identify and

recruit individual social workers associated with CHSACs as members or staff to serve as project connections to the councils. (This process is described in Chapter V.) Twenty-two council appointees and two council staff persons in the four demonstration counties were subsequently identified as NASW members.

These members were contacted between September and December, 1983; and nine of them agreed to serve as informal links to their respective councils. The two staff persons had to be more circumspect. Because the county director of social services (a former county legislator) was suspicious of the research project's "real" goals, staff were not allowed to meet with the author or to "officially" provide any information on the council's structure or composition.<sup>16</sup> "Unofficially" they were very helpful.

Due to a variety of unexpected circumstances, several of the original liaison persons had to vacate their positions and new people had to be recruited. These occurrences required an on-going process of orienting new people to project goals and activities. The project overview (developed as part of the case study protocol discussed in Chapter II) was a useful tool for orienting new members. It helped ensure that new people had similar understandings of the project's purpose.

The use of organizational liaisons was one of the project's primary methods of disseminating information to target populations.

Although members of the organizations listed in Table 6.1 were the "clientele of interest," the project was designed to help this "clientele" participate in social action efforts on behalf of SSBG clients. The project director developed relationships with other groups having similar interests.

Groups that advocate for the at-risk population

Low income persons receiving SSBG services, i.e., children and poor families, the elderly, and the disabled, were the at-risk population of concern. NASW's national PROJECT BLOCK GRANT and this demonstration project were designed to help social workers understand how reductions in the level of SSBG funding and changes in federal, state, and county policies affected the availability of social services for these vulnerable citizens. Once informed, the goal was to recruit members to advocate for increased funding as well as for a fair allocation of funds within and between counties.

The project director either already belonged to and/or developed relationships with other programs having similar interests: Fair Budget [Action Campaign], the [State] Block Grant Coalition, the Human SERVE Fund Campaign, the Social Action Center of the graduate school of social work, the social policy committee of the League of Women Voters, and the Association for Children of [State]. Examples of these relationships--one an established association and one a new connection--follow.

An established association. The project director was a long-time member of the Association for Children of [State]. Prior to the development of the block grant demonstration project, she had facilitated the involvement of ABU social work students in Child Watch, a national project developed by the Children's Defense Fund and the Association of Junior Leagues. The project was designed to assess the local impact of the 1981 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act's budget cuts and policy changes on children and their families. In the study state the Association for Children coordinated project efforts in eight counties during the spring and summer of 1982 and the winter of 1982-83. (Geismar, Fagan and Deignan, 1983)

Three of these eight counties--Austin, Dover, and Chester-- eventually became part of the block grant project's demonstration area.

The findings from participating states were incorporated into the Children's Defense Fund's publication, A Children's Defense Budget: An Analysis of the President's FY 1984 Budget and Children. (1983) The project director's connection with the Association for Children was a valuable one once the project began. The Association was a reliable source of information and resources and a strong advocate for vulnerable children and families.

A new connection. When the project began, the author joined the [State] Block Grant Coalition that supported a new state regulatory system to replace defunct federal

directives. The group was working to secure passage of Senate Bill #S-X0. The bill sought to establish an Interdepartmental Advisory Council on Block Grants that would make recommendations for all state departments administering block grants. These recommendations would insure public participation, civil rights protection, access to information, and targeting of funds to those who needed them. Participation in this group provided many opportunities to exchange information and to secure speakers for the continuing education events.

Contacting social work advocates. Attempts were also made to identify NASW members involved in monitoring block grant processes for advocacy groups representing a wide range of clients. The article (published in the Chapter's September, 1983 newsletter) that asked social workers serving on CHSACs to contact the author also invited advocates to come forward. No members from advocacy groups responded. Successful contacts were made with human service advocates interested in block grant issues at the various meetings and conferences described in Chapter V.

#### Potential participants

Liaison persons, representatives from the groups mentioned above, and Chapter staff facilitated the project director's efforts to reach potential participants. Some of these efforts are highlighted below.

1. The executive director invited the author to make a presentation on the block grant project at the Chapter's



29th annual meeting held in September 1983 in Resort City. Sixty of the association's 3,700 members attended this meeting.

2. A series of articles about the project and meeting announcements were written by the project director and/or a volunteer from the Chapter's public relations committee. They were published regularly in the Chapter newsletter that reached 3,700 members.

3. When notified, Chapter staff mailed fliers announcing upcoming project meetings to members in selected counties. The membership coordinator sent the author updated lists of ELAN members in the demonstration areas.

4. The director of Fair Budget shared her lists of CHSAC officers and staff persons and of state officials entrusted with implementing block grant policies. She periodically sent updates as new information became available.

5. The graduate student liaison was on her school's planning committee for the annual Profession's Weekend that "kicked off" the Fall semester. She was able to secure two time slots on an already full agenda for the project director to discuss block grant issues. Forty students and two faculty members attended these sessions.

6. Faculty, students, and field instructors from the two social work programs in Austin County--Follett College and ABU--were invited to the county's Human SERVE Voter Registration Drive's "kick-off" meeting. The event,

organized by social work interns from Follett College, was held at ABU, the block grant project's home base. Approximately 45 people (faculty, students, and field instructors from the two schools) attended the meeting where they learned about both social action projects.

7. Although a meeting with Coyle College's field instructors was not feasible, lively meetings with Altmeyer-Buell University's and Dunham Hall University's agency supervisors were arranged by each school's field coordinator.

Whether or not to involve students in agency activities associated with the local human service advisory councils was a hotly debated issue at the two sessions with field instructors. Local agencies were in the process of completing needs assessment studies and resource inventories for the county HSAC's, and the project director recommended that interns be involved in this process.

Some field instructors felt students could be involved in the agency's data collection process particularly in relation to gathering needs assessment information from clients. However, others felt that entry level undergraduate students needed to focus on beginning skills related to delivering services to clients and that involvement in agency funding and policy activities was not appropriate at this stage of their professional development.

The agency director and CHSAC member that felt NASW should not have a role in relation to the councils (see Chapter V) had no problem introducing her agency's interns to the council process. She intended to bring interns to the council's Planning Committee and Allocation Committee meetings. She felt students could assist in some committee tasks.

8. The project director met with the faculty from the three participating schools during the fall semester. In two of the schools, the process ran smoothly. However, it took considerable persistence to schedule a meeting with the director and faculty of the third school.<sup>17</sup>

When the project director arrived at the school on the agreed upon day and time, the director of the social work program was not available. When he finally appeared, it was apparent that he had forgotten to arrange a meeting with faculty. The author was unceremoniously "dumped" on faculty that were engaged in other activities.

Once the awkwardness of the situation was acknowledged, a series of productive sessions with individual faculty members ensued. The faculty member that taught in the social policy area was interested in the Block Grant Project's Selected Bibliography. The field coordinator provided lists of students and field supervisors. A faculty liaison person was designated; the faculty agreed to caucus and recommend a student liaison; a date for the continuing education program was agreed upon; and the director agreed to provide the welcoming remarks at the event.

Efforts to contact liaison persons from the cooperating organizations and intended participants have been described in some detail. The outcome of these efforts is reported below.

#### Results of Recruitment Efforts

The author assisted by the project secretary and Chapter staff expended considerable effort in identifying and contacting the target populations listed in Table 6.1. Although a detailed breakdown of actual hours is not available, some idea of the energy spent can be ascertained from the information presented above. This effort resulted in recruiting liaisons from all the participating

organizations and in identifying over 2,000 potential participants in the four-county demonstration area.

Fifteen liaison persons from the schools and local units and nine NASW members serving on the four CHSACs were recruited to serve as "bridges" to their respective constituencies.

A mailing list of 2,242 potential participants in the demonstration counties was compiled. The Chester network list included 654 members from the three target organizations, the Dover network roll numbered 641, and the Austin-Bedford network roster contained 947 names. Names and addresses were obtained from a variety of sources: school liaisons, representatives from advocacy groups, Chapter staff, networking materials distributed at conferences listed in Chapter V, unit officers, and staff and members of CHSACs.

The use of the Chapter newsletter to reach social workers involved in implementing (or monitoring the implementation) of county and state SSBG policies and procedures was unproductive.

The "effort" expended in the initiation stage to establish data collection procedures and a system for filing and retrieving information was crucial to the project's ability to develop, organize, and continually update these lists of potential and actual participants.

Once the participants were identified, efforts to involve them in project activities began.

### Bringing "Program Content and Clientele" Together

The continuing education program was launched with a pilot meeting of the Austin-Bedford Unit hosted by ABU's social work program. It was held approximately one month before the fall elections. The agenda included PACE endorsements, the Human SERVE Voter Registration Drive, and updates on SSBG funding and the human service advisory councils in both counties. (See Chapter IV for additional information on this meeting.) Twenty-eight "ELANers," five ABU faculty members, and approximately fifty junior and senior students were invited.

Four people attended the meeting--the graduate student liaison to the project, the ABU student liaison, and two unit members--neither of them "ELANers." The project's first effort to bring "program content and clientele" together in the counties where the project director's personal network was strongest was unsuccessful. Although four of the unit's 28 ELANers were present; they were the two speakers, the project director, and the chair of the Austin-Bedford unit. The vice-chair who represented the Bedford contingent of the unit did not attend. To paraphrase Steiner, whose original reference was to service operations, there is nothing quite so disturbing as a [reasonably] well-funded social action operation waiting with open doors for social workers that never appear. (cited in Patti 1983b, 114)

"ELANers"--considered to be the project's core population--did not show up for the first continuing education event that was specifically designed to attract them. When this occurred, the project director had to review several factors that may have limited the attendance--the meeting arrangements (day, time and place), the agenda, and characteristics of the target population. Some possibilities emerged:

1. the meeting targeted three different groups and the arrangements may not have been equally convenient for all three--when dealing with multiple constituencies, one group's "bridge" can be another group's "barrier;"
2. Austin County was heavily Republican; and many citizens (including social workers) supported the Reagan administration's policies; and/or
3. "ELANers" primarily interested in the licensing issue may have been involved with other groups such as the [State] Association of Clinical Social Workers.

For various reasons, "ELANers" did not respond to the invitation to attend this meeting. So this investigator had to reassess who in the association might be more interested in participating. The following evaluation question addresses these topics.

#### Engaging Participants, Contact Question 4

Question 4, effort, asks, "To what extent are alternative strategies sought and used when efforts do not appear sufficient to reach and/or engage target groups?"

The focus is on participating organizations and their subdivisions. The data sources consisted of documentation, interviews, and participant observation.

### Facilitating Access

"Developing mechanisms and processes that will minimize obstacles or facilitate access to the service" is the second of Patti's elements related to the successful acquisition of project participants. (1983b, 114)

Mondros and Wilson (1993, 72-73) and Patti (1983b, 117) discuss several potential barriers that may prevent people from accessing programs. Some of these barriers include (a) geographic distance; (b) issues related to race, class, political affiliation, or sex; (c) obstacles that prevent people with disabilities from attending meetings in nonaccessible buildings; (d) changes in the economy that cause people to work longer hours making them less available for community participation; (e) gains associated with participation being outweighed by the opportunity costs, i.e., the options a member (or an organization) would forego by taking part in the program; (f) discrepancies between members' interests and project objectives; and (g) meeting logistics. Some of these impediments could be anticipated and minimized in the future. Others could be more difficult to alleviate.

### Barriers to Participation

The pilot meeting in the Austin-Bedford area gave an early indication that "ELANers" might not assume as

prominent a role in project activities as was originally anticipated. The poor turn-out prompted the project director to conduct follow-up interviews with several members of the meeting's target groups and with representatives from the advocacy groups mentioned above.

The conversations with respondents from the groups invited to the Austin-Bedford meeting elicited various reasons for not attending--many were related to the barriers described above.

Students talked about having an evening class, working at part-time jobs, and being "overwhelmed" by their new roles as interns. Wednesday was a field work day for seniors and many did not live on campus. Student attendance probably would have been higher if the meeting were held on a Tuesday or Thursday evening as most social work classes were held on those days. However, these evenings weren't convenient for the speakers and the unit officers.

Two of the ABU faculty lived in a neighboring state and were active in that state's NASW Chapter; other faculty felt the project was the author's "baby" and that they could learn about it at regular faculty meetings.

Some of the "ELANers" talked about having part-time private practices, about working evening hours at their agency, about being unwilling to travel from Bedford to Austin County, about "unexpected things" that came up that prevented them from attending, and about already being aware of the importance of the senate race for the licensure bill.



None mentioned a strong interest in the other two topics-- client voter registration and the impact of changes in federal and state SSBG policies on the local service delivery system. Two "ELANers" working in the mental health sector were more interested in the implementation of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Block Grant (ADAMH). The state Division of Mental Health and Hospitals' planning and allocation procedures did not involve counties in the decision making process to the extent that the state Division of Family Services did.

Discussions with the director of the social action center at the state university, the chair of the state university's MSW branch campus in Dover County, and representatives of advocacy groups mentioned in Question 1 above, confirmed the project director's belief that the populations that were most likely to be interested in the grant topic were agency administrators, state and county planners, United Way representatives, and county and state officials responsible for implementing SSBG policies.

Members of these groups were not necessarily social workers and those that were were not well represented in NASW. The few social workers engaged in macro practice areas that belonged to the professional association did not participate in unit activities. They were more likely to be involved in task forces concerned with specific populations or service areas and/or in state practice sections such as

the one on administration. Line workers and middle managers seemed to be the largest groupings in the local units.

There was a close correspondence between the complexity of block grant implementation issues and the concerns of graduate students in administration and social work administrators. The issue did not fit as well with the interests of undergraduate students and direct service practitioners.

Information gathered during this stage of program development confirmed earlier intimations about a mismatch between the task and the potential actors on the county level. The decentralization of responsibility for social services' planning and funding decisions created a need for strong advocacy efforts at both the county and the state level. The county level was the primary concern of the grant. The block grant social action project was developed by the Chapter leadership; the "rank and file" did not petition the Chapter to take on this issue. Yet project success was dependent on developing membership support at the local level.

#### Strategies to Lessen Barriers

The project director decided to (a) continue with vigorous recruitment at the county level and increase dissemination efforts to try and attract those NASW members and other social workers who might be interested in the topic, (b) supplement the work with branch units by developing relationships with state-level Chapter groups

that might have a stronger interest in the topic, and (c) facilitate connections between the two levels, if possible.

To try and increase attendance at upcoming unit meetings in Dover and Chester counties, the usual procedure of listing a meeting in the state newsletter and word-of-mouth contact was supplemented with the efforts of liaison persons to inform their constituencies and with mailing attractively-designed flyers to target populations: faculty, students, field instructors, members of the local unit, "ELANers," and all members of the county human service advisory councils.

To implement the decision to pursue state-level project connections, the following decisions were made:

1. A state-level practice/education network was added to the project. Project resources were used to strengthen the informal network linking the Chapter's Administration Section and the Administration Sequence of the graduate school of social work. Negotiations resulted in an agreement to sponsor a forum on local planning. This state-wide forum, rather than a multi-county event, would be the finale to the project's continuing education series. The chair of the Chapter's Administration Section, the chair of the graduate school's Administration Sequence, a widely-respected county administrator who was an

NASW member, and the project director served on the forum's planning committee.

When this state network was added, an additional 350 selected people were identified and added to the project mailing list. They included: SDHS central and regional staff; chairpersons and lead staff members of all county human service advisory councils in the state; social workers serving on the CHSACs in three additional counties; members of the Chapter's Administration Section; United Way administrators; Chapter leadership persons including Board members, selected state Chapter committee chairs, and officers of the units that were not in the demonstration area; directors of all county human services departments in the state; county alcoholism coordinators;<sup>18</sup> and students in the Administration Sequence at the graduate school of social work.

2. The author and a faculty liaison person from one of the other undergraduate programs responded to a request for proposals from the Social Workers' Day Conference Program Committee.<sup>19</sup> They proposed a legislative workshop on the conflict between the state's new rational planning model and interest group politics at the local level. This annual

conference celebrating "the tradition and values of the profession" was scheduled for March 9, 1984. The conference usually attracted 300+ participants and included a mixture of social action and practice-oriented workshops. Each year a nationally prominent speaker was engaged; and the Citizen of the Year and the Social Worker of the Year were honored.

The project director was cognizant of the need to facilitate connections between the state and unit levels. The project could serve as a model for productive state-local collaboration. However, because the block grant project was time-limited, it could not assume an on-going role. Ways for Chapter staff, leadership, and various other structural components to do this emerged during the implementation phase of the project and will be discussed in Chapter VII.

### Summary

As described above, efforts were made to determine what prevented the target populations from attending the first meeting. Some of the impediments to participation included geographic distance, the meeting day and time, mismatch between members' interests and meeting agenda, and economic factors.

Efforts were also made to reassess which groups would be most interested in the topic. Administrators, planners, government staff responsible for implementing the new SSBG

processes were likely candidates, and plans to involve them in project activities were made.

Later in this chapter, the effectiveness of these plans is assessed.

The next question discusses the project's effectiveness in bringing the representatives of the target organizations together to participate in planning and implementing the project's continuing education and social action activities.

#### Maintaining Relationships, Contact Question 6

Question 6, effectiveness, asks, "To what extent have contacts resulted in positive working relationships among target groups in each county?" County networks are highlighted in this question. Interviews and participant observation were the main forms of data collection.

#### Building County Networks

The continuing education plan was modified to end with a large conference and to begin with unit meetings in each demonstration area. These local meetings served two purposes:

1. to inform NASW members of the SSBG issues and develop grassroots interest and support for the project, and
2. to give the target groups in each county network a task they could work on together.

The continuing education events would be jointly sponsored by the participating school and the local unit of NASW. Social workers and other key members serving on the

county HSAC's would be recruited to make presentations at these sessions. Faculty liaisons would be asked to help with meeting arrangements and to serve as moderators. Student liaisons would stimulate student interest prior to the meetings and would be responsible for participant registration and distribution of educational materials and evaluation forms at the meetings. The goal was to bring representatives from the county networks together to begin an on-going discussion of SSBG implementation policies and procedures.

In an attempt to strengthen relationships among the three target organizations in each demonstration area, the project director had to play a more active role than originally anticipated. As described in Chapter V, the undergraduate programs and local units had small work groups. The block grant project competed for attention with many other issues of concern. The author worked with liaison persons to schedule meetings, interviews, and/or telephone contacts with representatives from the participating organizations. The following is an example of contacts made in relation to one of the network organizations in Chester County--the CHSAC.

#### County HSAC Contacts

1. Secured list of Chester County HSAC members and information on the CHSAC's structure from former chair of the Chester Unit. The list included the names of council members serving on two of the council's three "tiers": the 21 member Delegate Committee that handled the council's mandated functions and 179 members serving on 15 of the 19 service systems committee's

specialized areas. The Process Committee was not yet formed.

2. Placed article in Chapter newsletter asking members serving on CHSACs to contact the project director. No one from Chester County responded.

3. Reviewed CHSAC membership list of 180 names with Chester Unit steering committee members who identified 27 people as social workers--6 serving on the Delegate Committee and 21 serving on one of the service system sub-committees.

4. Sent Chapter membership coordinator list of 27 names to check against membership list. Coordinator verified that 12 of the people were NASW members--10 were affiliated with the Chester Unit and 2 with other units in the state.<sup>20</sup> Three of the ten served on the Delegate Committee.

5. Contacted member of the Delegate Committee who was also a member of ELAN and president of the State Society of Hospital Social Work Directors to recruit her as a liaison to the council and/or as a panel member for the Chester Network's SSBG continuing education program.

Although she was unable to take on any additional responsibilities, she recommended that the chair of the Delegate Committee be invited to speak. The chair was not a member of NASW. However, she was a social worker, the administrator of a large public agency, and known to be "quite knowledgeable" about the CHSAC's evolving structure and responsibilities.

6. Contacted the chair of the Delegate Committee who agreed to serve on the panel and recommended the SDHS county representative (an ex-officio member of the council) and the CHSAC staff person (a senior planner in the county department of human services) as additional panel members.

7. Invited the 12 NASW members serving on the CHSAC to the Chester County SSBG meeting. (Two attended.)

Meetings and contacts with the representatives from the two other participating organizations in the county took place simultaneously. This process was repeated in the other demonstration areas.



In each county, contacts resulted in establishing working relationships between the school and the local unit. Individual members and/or staff of the CHSACs were identified and agreed to participate in the project's continuing education component. Relationships were tenuous as the project competed with many other issues for the attention of the participants. Considerable time needed to be spent on supporting these relationships.

### Building Trust

Patti (1983b) calls the third critical element in acquiring and maintaining clients "building trust." He describes the development of trust from the perspective of delivering services to clients. (118)

Mondros and Wilson (1993) look at the trust issue from a community organization perspective. They express a concern for helping newcomers "feel comfortable" with the organization so they will continue their participation. To accomplish this, they suggest several ways to help the new recruit get "on board." The suggestions include repeated personal contact between the recruit, current members, and the organizer; orientation and training that let newcomers know they are valued and expected to participate; and access to committees with real work. (79)

The project's plan to assist ELAN coordinators in orienting and training new members recruited at the continuing education events exemplifies this approach.

During the early phase of the contact stage, developing trust between the project director and the organizational liaisons was most crucial. There were several indications that this occurred: a "cooperating" school that had been slow to get involved with the project became more active, the faculty liaisons shared data on their student body and field placement agencies even though the project director worked for a "competing" school; unit chairs in the demonstration counties and in three other units assisted the author in securing names of CHSAC members and other key people in their respective counties; the CHSAC staff mentioned above "unofficially" shared information despite their supervisor's misgivings about NASW and the author.

This initial trust was built through continued contact between the liaisons and the project director, an orientation that informed liaisons of project goals and let them know they were expected to participate; modifications of project plans that reflected their recommendations; and as much involvement in the project's work as they were able to manage. For the most part, relationships that the project director had developed over time with several of the organizational representatives were a good foundation for resuming cooperative relationships in this new endeavor. However, as described in Question 1 above, a previous relationship created misgivings on the part of a key actor that had the potential to interfere with efforts to learn

about the composition of the CHSAC in one of the demonstration counties.

Issues related to "building trust" with participants are discussed in Chapter VII, Evaluation of Program Implementation Stage.

Thus far, contact stage questions related to recruiting and engaging target populations and building and sustaining relationships among representatives of key organizations have been presented. This chapter's final question describes the number of participants that attended project events and their characteristics.

#### Attributes of Participants, Contact Question 10

Question 10, efficiency, asks, "Are certain attributes of participants more related to successful project contacts than others, i.e. membership in NASW, being part of the ELAN network, holding multiple roles in network? other characteristics?" This question considers all the units of analysis: the whole project, county and state networks, and participating organizations and their subdivisions. Four sources of data were utilized: archival records, documentation, participant observation, and evaluation forms.

#### Introduction

The revised Continuing Education Plan included six major events--four county network meetings, one state network meeting, and a workshop at the Social Workers' Day Conference. In addition, the project director participated

in four other meetings sponsored by other Chapter components and/or other organizations. Participants at three network events (two county and one state) completed meeting evaluation forms.<sup>21</sup>

The form for the county network meetings was developed by the project director. The questionnaire for the Forum was developed by a representative of the Chapter's administration section. There were some variations in the forms. (See Appendix B and Chapter II, endnote #15.)

Information on each program's format, speakers, and content is included in Chapter IV. The participants' assessment of the quality of the presentations is presented in Chapter VII. This question is concerned with describing the participants--how many there were, who they were, why they came, and what interest they had in becoming activists--and drawing some inferences from the information.

As described earlier in this chapter, the groups listed in Table 6.1 were not intended to be mutually exclusive. It was expected that persons would occupy multiple roles in the county social service networks. Therefore, figures are given for both the number of attendees and, when known, the number of roles (or "categorical positions") filled by these participants.

Because the amount of information collected on participants' attributes varied, the number of "categorical positions" reported is underrepresented. For example, only 10 of the 33 people at the Dover network meeting completed

evaluation forms that asked for information about the participant's role(s) in the target organizations.

Therefore, conclusions related to participants' positions, discussed in the latter part of this section, are suggestive rather than definitive. However, the results provide some direction for the professional association by indicating who is most likely to be interested in the topic.

### Participation

#### How many came?

Table 6.2 presents attendance figures for all the continuing education events--project-sponsored programs as well as those events sponsored by other groups that included information on the block grant demonstration project as one of their agenda items.

| <b>TABLE 6.2</b>                                             |                   |                                                                                                                                    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Number of Participants at Continuing Education Events</b> |                   |                                                                                                                                    |
| <b>Name of Event</b>                                         | <b>Attendance</b> | <b>Comments</b>                                                                                                                    |
| <b>Network/Project Sponsored Events</b>                      |                   |                                                                                                                                    |
| Austin-Bedford Pilot Meeting                                 | 4                 |                                                                                                                                    |
| Austin-Bedford Network Meeting                               | NA                | Meeting was dropped from schedule.                                                                                                 |
| Chester Network Meeting                                      | 39                |                                                                                                                                    |
| Dover Network Meeting                                        | 33                |                                                                                                                                    |
| State Network Meeting (Forum)                                | 49                |                                                                                                                                    |
| Legislative Workshop, Social Workers' Day Conference         | 0                 | Meeting was cancelled due to inclement weather. Approximately 340 people were pre-registered; 50 were expected to attend workshop. |
| Subtotal                                                     | 125*              |                                                                                                                                    |

Continuation of Table 6.2

| Name of Event                                                         | Attendance  | Comments                                                                                        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Events Sponsored by Other Groups/Organizations</b>                 |             |                                                                                                 |
| Eliot University's Professions Weekend                                | 42          |                                                                                                 |
| Chapter's 29th Annual Meeting                                         | 60          |                                                                                                 |
| [State] Association of Baccalaureate Social Work Educators            | 10          |                                                                                                 |
| Follett College's Human SERVE Campaign Kick-Off Meeting/Austin County | 45          | Event was hosted by Altmeyer-Buell University's social work department, the project's home base |
| Subtotal                                                              | 157*        |                                                                                                 |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                                          | <b>282*</b> |                                                                                                 |

\* This is not an unduplicated count as the same participant could attend more than one event.

As depicted in Table 6.2, 125 participants attended project-sponsored events and an additional 157 people learned about state and county SSBG policies at meetings sponsored by other groups. The project successfully engaged 282 participants--56 percent of the original estimate. If the Social Workers' Day Conference had not been "snowed out," approximately 330 participants (or 66 percent of the estimated number) would have attended one or more of the continuing education programs.

Austin-Bedford network. The first continuing education event was held in October, 1983 in the Austin-Bedford area.

Eight people were present: 2 speakers, 2 representatives from the sponsoring organizations, and 4 attendees.

The CEP included a second meeting in the Austin-Bedford area for all the target groups listed in Table 6.1 above. However, the proposed meeting was deleted from the schedule because of impending changes in the NASW branch unit and in the university's social work department that preoccupied the leadership of both groups.

Chester network. The Chester County network meeting, "Update on Social Services Block Grant/Human Services Planning" was held in January, 1984.

Program flyers were sent to 654 members of the three target organizations in Chester County: 340 NASW members (including a second mailing to the 16 ELAN members), 7 faculty members, 63 field instructors, 65 students, and 180 county HSAC members. As anticipated, there was some overlap in membership.

Forty-six people were present: 3 speakers, 1 faculty moderator, 1 student liaison, 2 representatives from the sponsoring organizations, and 39 attendees. Only one of the unit's 16 "ELANers" attended. Twenty-four of the 39 participants completed meeting evaluation forms.

Dover network. The Dover County network meeting, "Update on Social Services Block Grant/Human Services Planning" was held in February, 1984.

Program flyers were sent to 641 members of the three target organizations in Dover County: 552 NASW members



(including a second mailing to the 13 ELAN members), 3 faculty members, 19 field instructors, 40 students, and 27 county HSAC members.

Forty people were present: 3 speakers, 1 faculty moderator, 1 student liaison, 2 representatives of host organizations, 23 participants who registered, and 10 who didn't register (but were included in head count). Two of the unit's 13 "ELANers" attended.

Due to a mix-up with registration and distribution of materials, including the evaluation forms, only nine participants completed the evaluation form. In an effort to reach those people who did not complete an evaluation form, a follow-up letter was sent to everyone that registered.<sup>22</sup> The enclosures included project materials distributed at the meeting as well as the evaluation form and a self-addressed stamped envelope. One additional evaluation was received. This brought the number of completed evaluations to 10. Approximately two-thirds of the attendees did not complete evaluations thus limiting the amount of information collected at this event.

State network. The Spring Forum, "Human Services Planning Issues Confronting Local Decision-Makers," was co-sponsored by the block grant project and the Chapter's Administration Section with assistance from Eliot University's Graduate School of Social Work/Administration Sequence.

The Forum was designed for 50 participants that were involved in and/or interested in the state and county implementation of SSBG policies and procedures. Invitations were sent to 350 selected people including the attendees and presenters at the three previous county-level meetings. (See question 4 above for list of groups that were invited.) No projections of an optimal number of participants from each group were made. The goal was to have a "good mix" from the target populations.

Because Spring Forum participants had to pre-register, their names and agency affiliations were known. Sixty-one people pre-registered. Forty-nine of the pre-registrants attended the meeting. It was an unseasonably hot Friday afternoon in early June, so some people who planned to attend may have started the weekend early! Those who didn't attend were sent conference packets.

Twenty-eight of the 49 conference participants completed evaluation forms.

Social Workers' Day Conference. The Social Workers' Day Conference was scheduled for Friday, March 9, 1984. There were 340 prepaid registrants. Dr. Nancy Humphreys, the immediate past president of NASW, was the keynote speaker. The administrator of a large sectarian agency who was an advocate for low income and disabled persons was the 1984 Social Worker of the Year. The project-sponsored workshop, "Muddling Through or Rational Planning" was one of six being offered in the morning. The project director and

the faculty liaison from one of the participating schools were co-leading the workshop. Fifty participants were expected.

A heavy snowstorm caused the Chapter leadership to cancel the conference early on the morning of the 9th. Efforts to reschedule were partially successful--a dinner honoring the social worker of the year was held but the workshops could not be rescheduled.

Events sponsored by other groups/organizations.

Additional people were contacted and engaged through the project director's participation in four other continuing education events: 40 students and two faculty at Eliot University's Profession's Weekend, 60 NASW members at the Chapter's 29th Annual Meeting, 10 baccalaureate educators at the February meeting of the [State] Association of Baccalaureate Social Work Educators, 45 people (mix of students, faculty, agency representatives) at the Human SERVE Austin County meeting.

As indicated in Table 6.1, the project estimated that approximately 500 participants would attend the project-sponsored continuing education activities. Based on data collected at the project-sponsored meetings, this investigator revised the original estimate from approximately 500 project beneficiaries to approximately 300. The rationale for this decision follows.

### Revision of Estimated Number of Project Beneficiaries

The author used "an educated guess" to estimate the number of participants that would attend the project's continuing education programs. The original goal was approximately 500 direct beneficiaries, 300 of whom were staff from the participating schools' field placement agencies. Changes in the plan altered the number of schools that were involved in the project.

1. Two social work programs located in Dover County were expected to participate in the continuing education program; however, only one school actually participated. This school had a small program with less than 15 field agencies.
2. Another school's field placement staff were not invited to a pilot meeting for ELAN members. The second meeting scheduled for the Austin-Bedford area, to which field placement staff would have been invited, was cancelled.
3. When a different branch of the state university was added to the project in the spring semester, its field agency staff were not one of the target groups invited to the Forum.

These circumstances caused the author to reduce the estimate for field placement staff from 300 to 100 attendees.<sup>23</sup> This resulted in revising the total for all categories of direct beneficiaries from approximately 500 to approximately 300. The project engaged 94 percent of the

revised attendance figure. Forty-four percent attended project-sponsored events and 56 percent attended events arranged by other groups.

The next section presents information on the attributes of the 125 participants that attended project-sponsored events. The focus is on this grouping for two reasons:

1. these participants specifically decided to attend a meeting on the SSBG planning and allocation responsibilities of the newly-formed CHSACs and
2. this investigator had access to information on their attributes: meeting evaluation forms, registration materials, mailing lists, etc.

Who were they?

Table 6.3 summarizes information about the "categorical positions" (or roles) held by the 125 participants who attended the four events sponsored by the project.

| <b>TABLE 6.3</b><br><b>Number of Categorical Positions Filled:</b><br><b>Four Continuing Education Events</b> |                                 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <b>Position</b>                                                                                               | <b>Number</b>                   |
| <b>Direct Beneficiaries/Schools</b>                                                                           |                                 |
| Student                                                                                                       | 31*                             |
| Faculty                                                                                                       | 12*                             |
| Staff from field placement agencies                                                                           | 18*                             |
| <b>Direct Beneficiaries/Chapter Units</b>                                                                     |                                 |
| Officers/local units                                                                                          | 5*                              |
| Officer/administration section                                                                                | 1*                              |
| NASW leadership (staff and volunteer)                                                                         | 3*                              |
| General membership (including "ELANers")                                                                      | 61*<br>(including 7* "ELANers") |
| <b>Direct Beneficiaries/CHSAC's</b>                                                                           |                                 |
| Member/CHSAC                                                                                                  | 17*                             |
| Staff/CHSAC member agency                                                                                     | 4*                              |
| Staff/CHSAC                                                                                                   | 5*                              |

Continuation of Table 6.3

| Position                                             | Number |
|------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| Others                                               |        |
| State government officials                           | 7*     |
| County government officials                          | 7*     |
| Private non-profit administrators                    | 8*     |
| Public agency administrators (direct service agency) | 1*     |
| United Way representatives                           | 4*     |
| Foundation representative                            | 2      |
| Spouse of NASW member                                | 1      |
| Unknown                                              | 14     |
| Total                                                |        |
| Categorical Positions                                | 203*   |

\* Denotes fact that one or more persons in category occupied multiple roles, i.e., an NASW board member and a faculty member.

As indicated in Table 6.3, the participants at the four continuing education events filled at least 203 "categorical positions." As expected, many people held multiple roles in the networks. Some examples include: (a) unit officer and field instructor; (b) CHSAC member, "ELANer," and staff of field placement agency; (c) state government official and

NASW member; (d) graduate faculty member and NASW Board member; and (e) student, NASW member, employee of agency represented on CHSAC, and intern at a different agency.

The number of positions held by the 125 participants is significantly underrepresented due to variations in the amount of data collected at each event. The most information was available for those who attended the Spring Forum; the least amount of information was available for participants at the Dover network meeting. There were 10 attendees at the Dover network meeting and four at the Chester meeting who were "unknown." It is possible that these unidentified people were staff members from field placement agencies or from agencies that had a representative on the CHSAC.

The categories that came closest to meeting the original estimates were NASW members (101 percent) and faculty (100 percent).

Close to two-thirds (65 percent) of the estimated number of participants affiliated with CHSACs attended. This category included members and staff of CHSACs as well as staff members from agencies that were represented on the CHSACs. Many of these participants were not social workers.

Slightly more than half (55 percent) of the estimated number of unit officers attended. This was an unexpectedly low turnout. The Chester Unit's large, active steering committee was temporarily reduced in number. The new ELAN coordinator resigned, the program chairperson was seriously



ill, and his spouse (the vice-chairperson) was not able to attend meetings. Only one of the Dover Unit's officers attended.

Only 39 percent of the student positions were filled. This low turnout of students can be attributed to some of the barriers to participation mentioned above: economic factors, discrepancies between undergraduate students' interests and the topic, problems meshing the academic calendar with project events. The fact that the Spring Forum was held after the spring semester ended is one example of the latter "barrier."

The category that was significantly underrepresented, even after the original estimate was reduced, was staff of field placement agencies (18 percent). This came as a surprise; the author expected field instructors to emerge as strong links between the schools and the professional association.

Some possible explanations for this low turnout include: (a) field instructors for baccalaureate students tend to be first line supervisors and their interests may not have been congruent with the project's topic; (b) field instructors for graduate students were not one of the target populations for the Spring Forum; (c) both BSW and MSW programs recruit field placement settings across county and sometimes across state lines; and/or (d) the projection of five staff members from five field placement agencies per school was overly optimistic.

The experience with staff from Coyle College's placement agencies illustrates some of these points. Although the social work department placed 65 students in 56 agencies, approximately half were located outside Chester County to accommodate students living in other counties. Staff and student interns from agencies located in other counties were less likely to be interested in how Chester County was organizing its CHSAC to carry out SSBG planning and allocation functions. However, that still left 28 Chester county field placement agencies to draw from.

Eleven staff members from 5 placement agencies did attend the Chester network meeting. However, eight of the eleven came from two agencies. The unit chairperson was a field instructor at one of these agencies. Three other staff members attended. The director of the second field agency with a large contingent served on the CHSAC's Delegate Committee. He attended the meeting along with three other staff members--none of whom supervised interns. Although the agencies were placement settings, this may have been of secondary importance. Each of the remaining three agencies had one representative.

There were no attendance projections for the various target populations invited to the Spring Forum. The goal of attracting a "good mix" of participants was achieved. Representatives from all of the invited groups attended. Approximately two-thirds of the state's counties were represented. Half of the participants were NASW members;

the other half were staff of a variety of county and state public and private human service agencies. The author viewed this as an indication of NASW's growing visibility and credibility in the state's block grant information network.

The next section looks at the reasons participants gave for attending the continuing education programs. This information is based on responses from half of the 125 participants at the Dover and Chester county network meetings and the Spring Forum.

Why did they come?

Sixty-two respondents mentioned 55 reasons for attending the three continuing education events listed above. These reasons are enumerated in Table 6.4.

| <b>TABLE 6.4</b><br><b>Participants' Reasons for Attending Selected</b><br><b>Continuing Education Events</b> |                                    |                         |                                    |                         |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
|                                                                                                               | <b>Continuing Education Events</b> |                         |                                    |                         |
| <b>Reasons</b>                                                                                                | <b>Chester<br/>(N=21)</b>          | <b>Dover<br/>(N=11)</b> | <b>Spring<br/>Forum<br/>(N=23)</b> | <b>Total<br/>(N=55)</b> |
| 1. Topic                                                                                                      | 11                                 | 6                       | 6                                  | 23                      |
| 2. Publicity,<br>Brochure                                                                                     | 0                                  | 0                       | 6                                  | 6                       |
| 3. Faculty<br>recommendation                                                                                  | 4                                  | 2                       | 0                                  | 6                       |
| 4. Opportunity to<br>discuss issues<br>with other<br>planners                                                 | NA                                 | NA                      | 5                                  | 5                       |
| 5. Speaker                                                                                                    | 2                                  | 0                       | 1                                  | 3                       |
| 6. Interest in<br>increasing<br>activity in<br>NASW                                                           | 2                                  | 0                       | 1                                  | 3                       |
| 7. No other plans<br>for that<br>evening                                                                      | 1                                  | 1                       | 0                                  | 2                       |
| 8. Sponsorship of<br>Administration<br>Section                                                                | NA                                 | NA                      | 1                                  | 1                       |
| 9. Interest in<br>supporting NASW<br>Project                                                                  | 0                                  | 0                       | 1                                  | 1                       |
| 10. Interest in<br>learning how to<br>make CHSACs<br>work                                                     | 0                                  | 0                       | 1                                  | 1                       |
| 11. Location was<br>accessible                                                                                | 0                                  | 1                       | 0                                  | 1                       |
| 12. Work with<br>clients who are<br>affected                                                                  | 1                                  | 0                       | 0                                  | 1                       |

Continuation of Table 6.4

| Reasons                                            | Continuing Education Events |                 |                           |                 |
|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
|                                                    | Chester<br>(N=21)           | Dover<br>(N=11) | Spring<br>Forum<br>(N=23) | Total<br>(n=55) |
| 13. Commitment to effectiveness of unit            | 0                           | 1               | NA                        | 1               |
| 14. Interest in clients who don't receive services | 0                           | 0               | 1                         | 1               |
| <b>Total</b>                                       | <b>21</b>                   | <b>11</b>       | <b>23</b>                 | <b>55</b>       |

Approximately 70 percent of the reasons for attending the block grant project's continuing education programs related to the topic, speakers, and concern for clients. Another 11 percent attended because of faculty recommendations. The remaining 19 percent of the reasons varied: location was accessible, respondent had a free evening, people were committed to the unit, the administration section, the project, and/or the Chapter. Although only one person mentioned the fact that the Administration Section's sponsorship of the program prompted them to come, fifteen people requested additional information about the Administration Section.

Seventeen of the 28 respondents who completed Spring Forum evaluation forms indicated that they would like to be informed of additional meetings related to the block grant implementation process.

The common draw was an interest in the topic. Faculty recommendations were of some importance for those students who attended the county meetings. An opportunity to network with their counterparts in other counties was important to some of the planners who attended the Forum.

There was some indication that the project's county-level continuing education programs attracted NASW members that usually did not attend unit meetings. The county meeting evaluation form asked respondents to indicate how frequently they attended the sponsoring unit's meetings. Twenty NASW members answered this question.

- \* Five attended "frequently."
- \* One attended "occasionally."
- \* Three attended "rarely."
- \* Four were attending for the first time.
- \* Seven came to the meeting even though they were not affiliated with the unit sponsoring the program.

Three-quarters of the NASW members who responded to the question did not participate in the sponsoring units' meetings on a regular basis. What this means is difficult to deduce. Obviously, some new people were attracted to these meetings. However, only one of the seven members from other units indicated why s/he attended a different county's meeting on the CHSAC. The respondent worked in Sullivan County and was affiliated with that branch unit; however, she attended the Chester County meeting because her agency's

main office was located in Chester and the executive director was on the Chester County HSAC.

Educating members and other human services personnel about the changes in social welfare policy was the project's first goal; the second was to involve participants in collective social action. Participants at the county network meetings were asked if they were interested in becoming politically active. Their answers to this question are reported in the following section.

Were they interested in social action?

The proposal stated that an unspecified number of people who attended the continuing education activities would become involved in social action activities organized by the county ELAN teams. Table 6.5 indicates how many people expressed an interest in "working toward greater support for human service funding, equitable allocation of human service funds in your county, and against deregulation that weakens protection for clients."<sup>24</sup>

| <b>Table 6.5</b><br><b>Participants' Interest in Social Action</b> |                                                                  |                                                                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Network</b>                                                     | <b># of Participants<br/>that Completed<br/>Evaluation Forms</b> | <b># and % that<br/>Expressed Interest<br/>in Social Action</b> |
| Dover                                                              | 10                                                               | 6/60%                                                           |
| Chester                                                            | 24                                                               | 11/45%                                                          |
| <b>Total</b>                                                       | <b>34</b>                                                        | <b>17/50%</b>                                                   |

Fifty percent of the 34 people who completed evaluations at the Dover and Chester county network meetings expressed an interest in becoming politically active. This is an unduplicated figure. It is an extremely high percentage when compared to the proportion of members involved in ELAN.

In 1983 approximately three percent of the association's membership was involved in ELAN. Using that ratio, one would expect approximately 1 of the 34 respondents to express an interest in becoming involved in political action activities.

The six people at the Dover meeting that expressed interest in this area were all NASW members; however, three of them did not belong to and/or did not participate in the Dover unit.

Eight of the eleven respondents in the Chester County area were NASW members; three people worked for agencies that were represented on the CHSAC and were not social workers.



Because the ELAN apparatus was not functioning well, other ways to accomplish the project's social action objective had to be developed. And ways to involve those who were not social workers in the Chapter's SSBG social action activities needed to be improvised. O'Connor (1983) points out that "there is an absence of formal mechanisms within the [professional association] aimed at establishing linkages" with potentially sympathetic allies. (17) These issues are introduced here and will be discussed more fully in Chapter VII, Evaluation of the Program Implementation Stage.

Question 10 asked if certain attributes of participants were more related to successful project contacts than others. Information on the number of participants, their "categorical positions" (or roles), their reasons for attending the meetings, and the extent of their interest in social action has been presented. The final section describes those participant characteristics that appear to be associated with successful or unsuccessful project contacts. Those characteristics common to both categories are also identified.

Attributes related to effective and ineffective project contact<sup>25</sup>

Chart 6.1 lists a series of attributes and indicates whether each attribute is identified with (a) effective project contact, (b) unsuccessful project contact, or (c) both categories.

| <b>Chart 6.1</b><br><b>Attributes Related to Effective and</b><br><b>Ineffective Project Contact</b>                                                              |                              |                                      |                                                            |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Attribute</b>                                                                                                                                                  | <b>Effective<br/>Contact</b> | <b>Ineffec-<br/>tive<br/>Contact</b> | <b>Effective<br/>and<br/>Ineffec-<br/>tive<br/>Contact</b> |
| <b>Organisational<br/>Affiliation:</b><br><br>1. NASW Chapter<br>Unit officer<br>Section officer<br>Volunteer leadership<br>General membership<br>ELAN membership |                              |                                      | X                                                          |
| 2. CHSAC<br><br>Affiliation with<br>CHSACs (members, staff<br>of member agencies, and<br>HSAC staff persons)                                                      | X                            |                                      |                                                            |
| 3. Schools<br><br>Faculty liaison<br>Student liaison<br>Student body<br>Faculty<br>Staff/field agency                                                             | X<br>X<br><br>X              | <br><br>X<br><br>X                   |                                                            |

Continuation of Chart 6.1

| Attribute                                              | Effective Contact | Ineffective Contact | Effective and Ineffective Contact |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Other:</b>                                          |                   |                     |                                   |
| Interest in Topic                                      | X                 |                     |                                   |
| Density of Individual's Network                        |                   |                     | X                                 |
| Holding Multiple Roles in Network                      |                   |                     | X                                 |
| State and/or County SSBG Implementation Responsibility | X                 |                     |                                   |

Chart 6.1 lists 15 characteristics of participants-- eight were associated with effective project contact, four with ineffective contact, and three with both successful and unsuccessful project contacts. It is not the intent of this section to discuss each characteristic. Some have been commented on previously, i.e., staff position in field placement agency, student position, affiliation with a CHSAC, unit officers. This section will briefly discuss six attributes that have not been addressed in prior sections: membership in NASW, faculty position, Chapter leadership position, member of Chapter's social action network, density of individual's professional network, and holding multiple roles in human services network.

General membership. The profile of the NASW member who attended the county meetings that emerged was of someone who

did not attend unit meetings on a regular basis, who had an interest in SSBG implementation processes, who had an interest in social action activities, and who was not a member of ELAN. Sending flyers to approximately 1200 members in three of the four demonstration counties "flushed out" a segment of the general membership that was interested in the topic and able to attend the scheduled meetings.

The NASW member who attended the Spring Forum was likely to have some responsibility for implementing SSBG procedures, was not a member of the Administration Section but was interested in learning more about it, and was not a member of ELAN.

Faculty. Although ABU social work department faculty members did not attend the pilot meeting, faculty members were well represented at the three subsequent project-sponsored meetings. As expected, faculty participated in the programs that were hosted or connected with their respective schools. This enabled them to fulfill the school's community service mission, to stay current with changing social welfare policies, to provide a service to the professional association, and to meet or renew contact with key actors in the county human services system. Some faculty also saw the meeting as an opportunity to recruit potential students for the school's basic or continuing education programs.<sup>26</sup>

Only one BSW faculty member also attended the Spring Forum. Prior to the inception of the project he had

conducted a block grant study for the [State] Association of Counties; and he had a reputation as an advocate for vulnerable, disadvantaged people--particularly those with developmental disabilities and elderly people in boarding homes.

Chapter leadership position. The project director made a presentation to the Board of Directors in May and invited them to the June Forum. They also received invitations. Only two board members attended--the new chair of PACE and the treasurer. The treasurer was also a faculty member in the administration sequence at the graduate school of social work, and this latter role may have prompted his attendance.

The board members that initiated the project and were instrumental in its funding didn't attend. Patti notes that this is not unusual. He states that "Organizational superiors who exercised a dominant role in the formulation of the program. . .will often become less intimately involved" partly due to time constraints. (1983, 107)

Member of Chapter's social action network. There were 57 ELAN members listed on the roster for the four demonstration counties. They all received two notices of the SSBG meetings--a general flyer that went to all members as well as an individual invitation. Three of the 57 came to the county network meetings. Four "ELANers" attended the Spring Forum--the speakers at the Austin-Bedford pilot meeting; the chair of PACE; and the executive director of a private non-profit agency who was a member of the

Administration Section and one of the Forum's workshop recorders.

Four additional "ELANers" participated in project-sponsored meetings--two were unit officers, one was the project director, and the fourth was a speaker at the Dover meeting.

The conspicuous lack of participation by "ELANers" and the vacancies in state and county ELAN leadership positions raised misgivings about the viability of the Chapter's social action network. During the time period described in the narrative, the Chapter's social action agenda combined public interest issues (the state human services budget), self-interest issues (licensing, social work jobs), and a combination of the two (PACE endorsements that were partly influenced by legislators' support for licensing). Because "ELANers" did not, as a rule, provide the requested feedback on their contacts with legislators; it is difficult to know how many were carrying out their ELAN assignments.<sup>27</sup> The lack of attendance raised some basic questions.

1. Did the Chapter have an actual social action network that coincided with the published ELAN roster that had been organized so carefully?
2. What issues were of interest to "ELANers"?
3. If members of the Chapter's social action network weren't politically active in ELAN, were they active in other advocacy groups?

In his year-end report, the executive director expressed concern about members' lack of investment. He stated that verbal support for Chapter goals such as securing licensure, combating discrimination, and influencing block grant implementation was not backed up with action. He urged members to visit local legislators, to write letters to the editor, and to respond to ELAN Alerts. He also expressed concern about "a shift away from social policy concerns. . . ."

The director's report went on to say that "In the past two years I have noted little interest in the policy which shapes the services which our members deliver." The report noted that the PAF Block Grant Project was the only activity that addressed the Chapter's priority goal of promoting adequate and equitable support for health, income maintenance and human services. The executive director urged the Board "to focus more of the [Chapter's] resources on this vital task." He related this recommendation to another of the Chapter's priority goals-- achieving licensure.<sup>28</sup> ". . . many legislative aides, [governmental staff persons], and other opinion leaders. . . want to know what else NASW supports or is interested in besides licensure. If it is only self-serving goals, there will be less support among state officials for legal regulation of social work." <sup>29</sup>

Individual's network. The density of an individual's network sometimes resulted in increasing participation and

sometimes had the opposite effect. An example of the former is the student liaison who was a junior and brought seven other juniors to the county meeting hosted by her school. Only one senior attended. Possible examples of an individual's network contributing to decreasing participation include groups that registered for the Spring Forum but didn't attend. Four of the eight registrants from Dover County that didn't attend were connected to the County Department of Community Services; and four of the six people from Melrose County who didn't come were affiliated with the CHSAC.<sup>30</sup>

Holding multiple roles in the human services community.

Holding multiple roles was also associated with both successful and unsuccessful project contact. The chair of the Chester Unit was a field instructor and an agency supervisor. She was instrumental in encouraging the attendance of three other agency supervisors, an intern, and the former unit chair. The chair of the Dover unit was a supervisor in a large public agency, an "ELANer," and active in other Chapter committees. In this instance, the fact that the unit chair held multiple roles in the human services network did not result in increased attendance. Not enough is known about each situation to infer why the same attribute possessed by two people in similar positions resulted in very different outcomes. What can be assumed is



that holding multiple roles needs to be connected with other attributes or circumstances to have a favorable outcome.

### Recapitulation

A review of the activities that took place during the project's contact stage indicates that effective engagement of participants was related to some of the following circumstances:

1. Interest in the topic is a key attribute. When it is paired with other attributes such as being part of a dense personal network or holding multiple roles in a network, participation tends to increase.
2. If interest in the topic is lacking, participation is still likely if the potential attendee perceives that needed benefits will be received in exchange for the time devoted to the activity. For example, unit chairs may not have had a strong interest in the topic but they secured program support, increased attendance at the unit's monthly meeting, and garnered recognition from other branch units and the Chapter leadership. The fact that none of the unit officers went on to attend the Spring Forum may be related to limited interest in the topic with no anticipated benefits.
3. If interest in the topic is lacking, loyalty to an organization (or a subunit) may motivate attendance. Some reasons given for attendance related to loyalty to the project, a branch unit, the administration section, or the Chapter.

4. Interest in the topic is not enough to motivate participation if the gains associated with attendance do not outweigh the opportunity costs, i.e., the options one foregoes by taking part in the program. The NASW member referred to in question 6 above who served on the Chester CHSAC and was president of the [State] Association of Hospital Social Work Directors did not attend the Unit meeting. Possibly, she did not see any gains from participating in NASW-sponsored project activities that would compensate her for the time allotted to the meeting.

5. Even if the density of an individual's network doesn't result in increased attendance at a specific event, it still can contribute to the diffusion of information about new policies. For example, the author's faculty colleagues didn't attend the pilot meeting; however, they were interested in learning about changes in social service policies at a subsequent faculty meeting.

Modifications that have been presented at various points throughout this chapter are summarized in the next section.

### Project Modifications

The experience of bringing the "program content and clientele together" resulted in the following program changes that occurred during the contact stage:

1. enlargement of the demonstration area from four counties in the northern part of the state to include the whole state;
2. addition of a state level practice/education network to the project;
3. targeting new groups of potential participants, i.e., SDHS central and regional staff; chairpersons and lead staff members of all county human service advisory councils; known social workers serving on the CHSACs in non-demonstration counties; members of the Chapter's Administration Section; United Way administrators; Chapter leadership persons including Board members, selected State Chapter committee chairs, and officers of units that were not participating in the project; county directors of human services departments; county alcoholism coordinators; and students in the Administration Sequence at the state university's graduate school of social work;
4. adding two statewide continuing education events to the CEP--one new event and one revised event (concluding the continuing education series with statewide Forum instead of a multi-county conference); and

5. revising the number of estimated beneficiaries from approximately 500 to approximately 300 to reflect changes in the projected number of participating staff from field placement agencies.

#### On-Going Issues

In Chapter V, Evaluation of the Program Initiation Stage, the following issues associated with NASW-sponsored county-level social action efforts were presented: (a) the poor "fit" between the organizations in the county networks and the substantive issue; and (b) the potentially divisive nature of deciding what was a "fair" allocation of SSBG funds in each county given the wide range of services that relied on this funding source.

During the contact stage, two additional concerns emerged. First, the decision to bend the "eligibility requirements" and involve significant numbers of people who were not social workers in project activities presented the professional association with a dilemma. This change improved the "fit" between the substantive issue and the participants, but presented the quandary of how to involve "outsiders" in the professional associations's social action network.

O'Connor (1983) addressed this issue in the following way:

In the profession's formative years social workers toiled along with philanthropists and reformers to promote social reform and social welfare. The distinction between social worker and socially conscious citizens and other professionals in the welfare arena wasn't always that clear. . . .As

social work has become professionalized, its organizational boundaries have tightened which tended to screen out potentially sympathetic allies. (17)

Second, organizing social action efforts within county boundaries didn't fit well with the way ELAN was organized and with the interests of the BSW programs' constituents. Although the participating BSW programs were located in specific counties, a sizable number of their faculty, students, and field placement supervisors were also connected to other geographical areas. Because units and legislative districts were not coterminous, there was some discontinuity built into the ELAN structure. For example, although the Dover County Unit encompassed parts of six state legislative districts, the unit's ELAN coordinator was only responsible for four of them. The fifth district was assigned to the Austin-Bedford ELAN Coordinator; and the sixth to the Chester Unit Coordinator.<sup>31</sup>

These issues cut across the four stages of program development and will be addressed more fully in the final chapter.

The conclusion to this chapter assesses how well the project accomplished the contact stage's major administrative and programmatic tasks.

### Assessment of How Well Project Managed

#### Contact Stage Tasks

##### Administrative Tasks

The principal administrative task of the contact stage is resource acquisition. Potential program beneficiaries

are the designated resource. The project's initial goal was to engage approximately 500 participants from participating organizations in continuing education activities and a smaller, unspecified number in social action activities. As indicated in the preceding section, the target figure was subsequently reduced to approximately 300 beneficiaries.

The project actually engaged 282 participants, 94 percent of the revised attendance figure. Approximately 44 percent (125 persons) attended project-sponsored events and another 56 percent (157 persons) attended events arranged by other groups or organizations. Attendees at two of the county meetings evidenced a higher than typical interest in social action efforts when compared with the proportion of NASW members involved in ELAN.

#### Early in the Contact Stage

Early in the block grant project's contact phase the focus was on reaching potential participants affiliated with the cooperating organizations: schools, NASW local units, and county HSACs. A key target group was members of the professional association's social action network in the demonstration counties.

The pilot meeting suggested that "ELANers" were not interested in learning about and attempting to influence the implementation of SSBG planning and allocation processes at the county level.

For the next two unit meetings, a very wide net was cast to inform all unit members, as well as other human

service personnel, of the project in an effort to attract those interested in the local impact of changes in the SSBG.

Attendance at the Dover and Chester county meetings far surpassed the normal attendance for a regular monthly unit meeting. The project was able to attract groups that did not attend unit meetings on a regular basis--a certain segment of the general membership, undergraduate faculty, a small group of students, and persons affiliated with the CHSACs. Members of the latter group were not usually social workers.

Without the project's financial and staff support, the units would not have had the resources to mount a similar effort.

#### Later in the Contact Stage

As described in the previous chapter, the block grant project was developed by the Chapter leadership. The "rank and file" did not request that the Chapter take on this project. Association members who were active in local units tended to be involved in direct service. The issues addressed by the project were of more interest to administrators, policy makers, and planners--groups that were not well represented at the unit level. In light of this, the operating plan was revised to focus on people who needed the program--some were NASW members, some were not.

The additional target populations included: state and county government officials, agency administrators, other human service personnel whose work involved them in SSBG

planning and allocation functions, constituents of Chapter entities other than the local units, and graduate students and faculty in the MSW administration sequence.

Approximately 350 people from the above target groups were identified and invited to the Spring Forum that focused on one of the CHSAC's mandated tasks--conducting needs assessments to provide data for comprehensive county social services plans.

The Spring Forum reached its goal of attracting approximately 50 participants from the various target groups. Half of the attendees were not social workers.

In addition to stage-related administrative tasks, the operating plan included programmatic tasks that related to one or more of the program stages.

#### Programmatic Tasks

Three of the demonstration project's nine tasks were associated with the contact stage goal of reaching and engaging social workers and other human services personnel in project activities.

#### Task 1. Building a Network of Relationships

Meetings with liaison people from the participating organizations began in the Initiation Stage and were increased as the Contact Stage moved into the forefront. A sampling of the types of contacts made with one organization in one county is recounted in Question 6, Maintaining Relationships, above. Similar contacts were made with all the organizations in the county and state networks.



Beginning the continuing education program with local meetings was one way of encouraging the formation of loose networks of the target county organizations.

### Task 3. Designing a Continuing Education Program

Three of the Continuing Education Program's design elements involved identifying those people in the four-county demonstration area that the project wanted to reach, developing promotional materials to use in attracting the identified populations to the project's events, and selecting accessible locations for workshops/forums.

Over 2000 potential participants located in the demonstration areas were identified and informed of project activities via flyers and notices in the Chapter newsletter. Organizational liaisons were also used to "build bridges" to participants.

When additional populations were identified, 350 new people were added to the list of potential participants. Promotional materials, i.e., flyers and notices in the Chapter newsletter were developed to interest them in the Spring Forum. The flyer singled out "social workers serving on Human Service Advisory Councils, agency administrators and planners, local and state government officials, and CHSAC chairpersons and staff members" and invited them to a Forum on "Human Services Planning Issues Confronting Local Decision Makers."

The Social Workers' Day Conference Committee was responsible for preparing the brochure describing the day's events. Over 340 members pre-registered.

Some dissemination methods worked better than others. The most effective were the use of organizational liaisons, special events (such as the Human SERVE meeting), mailing attractive fliers to all members of the participating organizations in each target area, and working with other components in the professional association. The least effective were presentations to groups such as field instructors and Chapter board members and putting announcements in the Chapter newsletter.

Accessible sites were secured for five continuing education programs--four regional schools and one centrally located hotel with conference facilities.

#### Task 5. Recruiting Participants for Local ELAN Teams

Recruiting additional ELAN members (and reactivating old members) was seen as an integral part of the project's continuing education events. This task was not accomplished. "ELANers" as a group did not attend project meetings, and the Chapter's social action network was not functioning adequately. A larger number of participants than expected expressed an interest in social action efforts.

Alternatives to the ELAN structure needed to be developed for association members and for non-members.

These are discussed in Chapter VII, Evaluation of the Program Implementation Stage.

#### Summary

For a program in the contact stage, the resource acquisition task involves "attracting and maintaining a stable clientele whose needs can reasonably be addressed by the program's services and technologies." (Patti 1983b, 113)<sup>32</sup> During an extended contact stage, the project struggled to identify and engage participants interested in learning about and attempting to influence the implementation of SSBG planning and allocation processes at the county level. The operating plan was significantly revised to include new populations whose "needs" more closely matched the project's "services."

This evaluation of the Program Contact Stage has focused on the project's ability to engage participants in SSBG Demonstration Project events. Chapter VII, Evaluation of Program Implementation Stage, looks at project outcomes.

## Chapter Endnotes

1. Chapter PAF Proposal, Developing a Practice/Education Network to Increase Social Action on the Local Level Regarding Block Grants, February 18, 1983, 10.
2. In Patti's model, facilitating contact with potential participants is not seen as a separate stage. It is included in the program implementation stage.
3. Mondros and Wilson (1993) define bridges as structures that "facilitate initial joining and subsequent involvement," barriers as "structures which impede involvement or entree to leadership positions," and gates as structures "which move people to new statuses or positions in the organization." (75)
4. Chapter PAF Proposal 1983, 8.
5. Executive Director. ELAN ALERT, May 19, 1982.
6. ELAN ALERT, May 19, 1982.
7. Executive Director. ELAN Alert to Selected Legislative Districts:. . . , May 19, 1982.
8. Executive Director. ELAN Alert, Fall, 1982 (no date).
9. These regulations included HHS's decision to no longer ask for public comments prior to publishing final rules, the Health Care Financing Administration's proposal to remove social work services as a condition for hospital participation in Medicare and Medicaid, and the Department of Education's proposed regulations to delete social work services, parent counseling and training, and school health servies from the definition of "related services" included in the Federal Handicapped Education Act.
10. Chapter Executive Director. Memo to ELAN Unit Coordinators, (no date).
11. Executive Director. ELAN Alert, April 19, 1983.
12. Austin-Bedford Unit Chairperson. Memorandum to ELANers in Unit, September 21, 1983.
13. Austin-Bedford Unit Chairperson and Unit ELAN Coordinator. Memorandum to Social Work Students at Altmeyer-Buell University, September 21, 1983.
14. Executive Director. Memorandum to Austin County Members, October, 1983.
15. Table 2.5 Evaluation Questions and Strategies, Program Contact Stage can be found in Chapter 2 and in Appendix A.4.b.

16. Telephone conversation between project director and HSAC staff member, June 7, 1983.

Neither the staff person or the author knew the specific reasons for this distrust. However, some possibilities include:

a. NASW was known as an organization that supported the Democratic Party. The director was a former Republican county legislator.

b. The author and the director had been on opposing sides of an impassioned discussion of the Reagan Administration's FY1982 Budget.

In May 1981, the Austin-Bedford Unit presented a program on "Social Work in Politics." The author, who was the Unit's ELAN coordinator, and the county director of social services were the panelists.

The author spoke about the detrimental impact of the new administration's proposed budget on clients and urged participants to contact members of the state Congressional delegation and the chairmen of the Senate and House budget and finance committees. She told the audience about the ABU social work department's efforts to organize university students and faculty and field instructors to protest the proposed cutbacks in human service funding. She distributed a packet, "The Reagan Federal Budget: What Can I Do?", that included information on who to contact, how to communicate with legislators, when to contact them, and preliminary information about the impact of cuts on clients.

The director of social services spoke in support of President Reagan's budget and emphasized the importance of increasing the military budget even if it was at the expense of the human services. She stated that a day program for the developmentally disabled attended by a family member might have to reduce the number of days and hours that service was available or even close because of proposed cuts in the human services budget. But she said that her relative "was happy" to make a contribution to the country's defense even if it meant that he could no longer attend this program. She urged members to support the budget.

c. The director's management style was one of close supervision of staff that included wanting to know who they had lunch with and what was discussed.

d. Paradoxically, even though NASW did not seem to be one of the director's favorite groups, she was one of the few county

human services administrators who hired social workers to staff the new Human Service Advisory Councils.

Later in the project year, the director was appointed to a position in the state department of human services. The new head of the county human services department had a reputation as a strong client advocate and had a more open management style. The agency he headed prior to his appointment had served as a field placement setting for ABU social work interns.

17. This school had been a diffident member of the project--its letter of support to submit with the proposal never materialized, no representative attended the initial planning committee meeting, and faculty and student liaisons had not been appointed.

18. The alcoholism coordinators were included in the list because two chapter members were key administrators in the SDHS' Division on Alcoholism.

19. Social Workers' Day Workshop Coordinator. Memorandum to chapter leadership, September 10, 1983.

20. Members can affiliate with the unit where they live or the unit where they work.

21. Evaluation forms were not used at the pilot meeting in the Austin-Bedford area and two additional meetings were subsequently cancelled.

22. Project Director. Letter to people who attended the Dover Unit Meeting, February 28, 1984.

23. Calculation for revised number of staff from field placement agencies: 5 staff x 15 agencies x 1 social work program; 5 staff x 5 agencies x 1 social work program = 100 staff persons.

24. Evaluation form for county SSBG meetings.

25. The information about participant attributes was collected from a number of sources: (a) evaluation forms; (b) a review of names on sign-in sheets by unit chair, project director, and chapter membership director; and (c) comparison of names on sign-in sheets and the forum registration list with those listed on CHSAC rosters; field instructor, faculty, and student lists; and United Way, county alcoholism coordinators, and chapter leadership lists.

26. Chair, Department of Social Work, Dunham Falls University. Letter to Participants at Block Grant Project meeting re: social work courses and continuing education events, March 19, 1984.

27. As ELAN coordinator for the Austin-Bedford Unit, this investigator seldom received formal follow-up information from "ELANers." Occasionally, this information came through informal

channels, i.e., meeting a network member at an event unrelated to ELAN activities.

28. In 1983, "twenty-nine states or jurisdictions [had] some form of legal regulation." (Teare 1983, 123)

29. Executive Director. 1983 Year-End Operating Report. January 6, 1984.

30. It is also possible that a crisis situation arose that prevented staff from attending.

31. ELAN Responsibilities, Legislative Districts, 1982-83. April 26, 1982.

32. In Patti's model of program development, facilitating contact with potential beneficiaries is not seen as a separate stage. It is included in the program implementation stage.

## CHAPTER VII

### EVALUATION OF PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION STAGE

#### Introduction

During the third phase of its development, the implementation stage, the project was concerned with achieving its main objectives:

1. sponsoring continuing education programs on changing social service block grant implementation processes in the demonstration areas,
2. mobilizing program participants to become advocates for an equitable allocation of social service funds in their counties and for state-wide block grant regulations that would protect clients' rights, and
3. formulating a plan that would enable the professional association to continue the work of the project once the grant period ended.

Chapter VII evaluates the Block Grant Demonstration Project's ability to "build program competence" (Patti 1983b, 149) and effectively deliver services to members of the professional association and their allies. This assessment begins with a brief description of the implementation stage's salient characteristics.

#### Description of the Stage

##### Definition

"Program implementation is that stage in which a program, having achieved the necessary conditions of initiation and program contact, applies its technology,



services. . .toward the attainment of ultimate program goals." (Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978, 7)

Technology has been defined as the "techniques employed to accomplish the work of the organization." (Patti 1983b, 136) The SSBG project used a collaborative practice/education approach to organize the educational and social action efforts at the county level.

#### Time Frame

The project's implementation stage began in October 1983 and continued until June 1984. (See Chapter IV, Figure 4.1, Block Grant Demonstration Project's Movement Through Developmental Stages.) The county-level continuing education programs were launched in the Austin-Bedford area in October 1983. The final state-wide forum was held in June 1984.

Because additional target populations were identified as the project progressed, contact stage tasks (discussed in the previous chapter) continued to require considerable attention during this nine-month period. The project figuratively had a foot in each stage.

#### Goals

The goals of the implementation stage include: building an internal capacity for competent program performance, "defining and securing a service domain; and reducing uncertainty in relations with units and organizations whose cooperation and resources are required to effectively implement the program plan . . ." (Patti 1983b, 149)

By domain, Patti refers to "the array of social problems with which the program deals, the clients in these problem populations that are actually served, and the services that are provided to them." (1983b, 113)

Low-income persons receiving SSBG services, i.e., children and poor families, the elderly, and persons with disabilities, were the at-risk populations of concern. NASW's national PROJECT BLOCK GRANT and this demonstration project were designed to help social workers understand how reductions in the level of SSBG funding and changes in federal, state, and county policies affected the availability of social services for these vulnerable persons.

Because the SSBG (and its forerunner Title XX of the Social Security Act) is the major source of federal funds to states for a range of essential social services, NASW had a history of advocating for increased funding and against restrictive regulations at the federal level. (See Mott 1976, Richan 1981)

As noted in Chapter V of this report, the State Chapter had consistently made efforts to influence state-level policies and funding levels for human services. The new aspect of this "domain" claimed by the project was the professional association's interest in influencing county-level social service policy and funding decisions. The proposal asserted that the Chapter's experiences at the state level made it "ideally suited to help guide and shape

an effort for equitable distribution of block grants by local government." (Chapter PAF Proposal, 1983, 8)

### Tasks

#### Stage-Related Administrative Tasks

Patti describes "selected management tasks that must be addressed in the implementation stage to translate program potential into competent performance." (1983b, 106) They include: fleshing out the rudimentary organizational structure created during the initial developmental stage, developing and maintaining staff/volunteer capability, and resource acquisition.

#### Developing Organizational Structure

[organizational]. . .structure consists of those formal, relatively stable arrangements that prescribe how the functions and duties of an organization are to be divided and then coordinated, how authority is to be distributed, and how work responsibilities are to be carried out . . . . Organizational structure is less a description of what is, than a blueprint for how activities should be orchestrated to achieve desired objectives. (Patti 1983b, 127)

As a membership organization, the work of the Chapter was carried out by a small professional and support staff, volunteer leaders, and the general membership. During the project period, the staff consisted of an executive director, a bookkeeper, a membership coordinator (unpaid), a secretary, a newly-hired part-time Special Projects and Development Coordinator, and the part-time PAF project director and secretary.

The Chapter's various committees, sections, and task forces were grouped according to the NASW's four functional

areas described in Chapter II (professional advancement, professional standards, social policy, and membership and organization) plus the management function.<sup>1</sup> Chart 7.1 updates Chart 2.1 and depicts Chapter components that were part of the "blueprint for how activities should be orchestrated" during the project's implementation period. Three new committees were added--Licensure Fund Raising Committee, Unit Definition and Function Committee, and the Sanctions Committee.

| <b>CHART 7.1</b><br><b>NASW/[XX]'s Organizational Structure</b><br><b>According to Functional Areas *</b><br><b>(Program Implementation Stage)</b> |                                                                 |                                                                                                    |                                                                                |                                         |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| <b>Profess-<br/>ional<br/>Advance-<br/>ment</b>                                                                                                    | <b>Profess-<br/>ional<br/>Standards</b>                         | <b>Social<br/>Policy</b>                                                                           | <b>Membership<br/>and Organi-<br/>zation</b>                                   | <b>Manage-<br/>ment</b>                 |
| Continuing<br>Education<br>Committee                                                                                                               | Committee<br>on Inquiry                                         | <u>Policy<br/>Council</u><br>**                                                                    | Affirmative<br>Action Unit                                                     | <u>Board of<br/>Directors</u><br>**     |
| <u>Social<br/>Workers'<br/>Day<br/>Conference<br/>Committee.</u><br>**                                                                             | Licensure<br>Committee                                          | Task<br>Forces<br>(7)<br><u>Income<br/>Mainten-<br/>ance<br/>and<br/>Social<br/>Services</u><br>** | Delegate<br>Assembly                                                           | By-Laws<br>Committee                    |
| Practice<br>Councils/<br>Sections<br>(4)<br><u>Adminis-<br/>tration<br/>Section</u> **                                                             | Licensing<br>Fund<br>Raising<br>Committee<br>(new)              | <u>ELAN/<br/>State</u> **                                                                          | Membership<br>Recruitment<br>and<br>Retention<br>Committee                     | Executive<br>Committee                  |
| Practice/<br>Education<br>Committee                                                                                                                | <u>Public<br/>Relations<br/>Committee</u><br>**                 | <u>PACE</u> **                                                                                     | Nominations<br>and<br>Leadership<br>Identifi-<br>cation<br>Committee           | Finance<br>Committee                    |
| Student<br>Affairs                                                                                                                                 | Profess-<br>ional<br>Standards<br>Utiliza-<br>tion<br>Committee | <u>Social<br/>Service<br/>Block<br/>Grant<br/>Project</u>                                          | Units<br>(12)<br><u>Austin-<br/>Bedford,<br/>Chester,<br/>and<br/>Dover</u> ** | <u>Program<br/>Committee</u><br>**      |
| Social<br>Worker as<br>Psycho-<br>therapist<br>Institute                                                                                           |                                                                 |                                                                                                    | Ad Hoc Unit<br>Study<br>Committee                                              | <u>Sanctions<br/>Committee</u><br>(new) |

Continuation of Chart 7.1

| Profess-<br>ional<br>Advance-<br>ment | Profess-<br>ional<br>Standards | Social<br>Policy | Membership<br>and Organi-<br>zation                        | Manage-<br>ment |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
|                                       |                                |                  | Unit Defi-<br>nition and<br>Function<br>Committee<br>(new) |                 |

\* Source: Leadership Handbook and Minutes of the Board of Directors.

\*\* Underline indicate entities that SSBG Project developed or attempted to develop reciprocal relationships with.

As indicated in Chart 7.1 the SSBG Project was located in the Social Policy functional area. The project developed reciprocal relationships with several of the groupings listed in the chart (three branch units, administration section, public relations committee, Social Workers' Day Conference Committee) and depended on others to sanction and/or supplement the work of project staff (professional and support staff, PACE, and the board of directors). Three components that were either inactive or functioning with critical leadership vacancies (ELAN/State Committee, the Policy Council, and the Income Maintenance and Social Servicess Task Force) hindered the accomplishment of some project objectives.

#### Staff/Volunteer Capability

According to Patti, "the quality of a program's. . . personnel--their knowledge, skill, and commitment--is a

crucial ingredient in successful program implementation."  
(1983b, 137)

Paid project staff consisted of a quarter-time project director and a quarter-time secretary. Four student liaisons received stipends. The project relied primarily on volunteers to carry out significant project responsibilities. In addition to liaisons from the participating organizations, "key actors" in the implementation of county SSBG policies had to be identified and recruited to deliver the continuing education program.

#### Resource Acquisition

During the implementation phase, resource acquisition refers to "developing a network of reciprocal relationships with groups and agencies in the community and other units in the host organization whose support and cooperation are essential to the program's operations." (Patti 1983b, 113)<sup>2</sup>

Since few, if any, programs are self-sufficient, one of the manager's critical tasks is to build a system of reciprocal relations with selected organizations in the community and other units in the host agency that will permit the program to acquire the resources it requires in order to effectively pursue its objectives. (Patti, 1983b, 119)

Successful efforts to identify and contact designated agencies and selected Chapter subunits during the initiation and contact stages were discussed in the two previous chapters.

However, Patti cautions that although

commitments of cooperation and support may have been obtained when the program was being planned, it is during the implementation stage that these arrangements

are first subjected to the test of daily operations. The constraints of time, limited resources, communication problems and procedural conflicts often undermine the most carefully cultivated agreements. (1983b, 108)

As the author began to carry out the programmatic tasks described below, the strength of prior commitments was tested.

#### Stage-Related Programmatic Tasks

Six of the demonstration project's nine programmatic tasks are identified with the program implementation phase.

Three of these tasks were designed to begin when the project entered its implementation stage in October 1983.

They included:

1. conducting the continuing education program--task 4;
2. assisting ELAN unit coordinators in training volunteers interested in the association's political action efforts--task 5; and
3. providing on-going consultation to ELAN unit coordinators--task 6.

Three on-going tasks came to fruition during this stage of program development:

1. completing the revision of the continuing education protocol--task 3;
2. designing a structure to sustain activities when the external funding ceased--task 7; and
3. evaluating the collaborative practice/education model--task 8.



### Stability of Host Organization

As the project's host organization, the State Chapter's stability was crucial to the implementation of the block grant program and to its eventual institutionalization as a continuing part of the Chapter's social policy program. Patti (1983b) notes that "such things as changing political sentiments, economic circumstances, and turnover in organizational leadership, developments over which the manager has little control, may have a determinative impact on the program. . ." (69)

The following chronology depicts the changing "state of the Chapter" during the project's implementation stage.

## Narrative

### October, 1983:

"Following two years of reduced operations to reduce the . . . deficit, the Board of Directors . . . approved the addition of a part-time [Special Projects and Development Coordinator]. . ."<sup>3</sup> The Search Committee selected a highly-respected, semi-retired social work executive. His responsibilities included membership recruitment, support for unit and committee leadership persons, and assistance in fund raising.

### November, 1983:

The Board of Directors and the executive director mutually agreed that the director would end his 10 year tenure with the Chapter at the end of his contract year, June 30, 1984.<sup>4</sup>

### December, 1983:

The chair of the Ad hoc Unit Study Committee presented the committee's report at the December board meeting.<sup>5</sup> He indicated that the findings and recommendations were not "new or of the blockbuster variety," but they were important to the unit members and leaders that responded to the committee's membership and leadership surveys. (See Chapter II for description of findings.)

The report contained several recommendations pertaining to unit strengthening. Some that were pertinent to the project included:

1. units should link up with other Chapter entities or human service groups to assist with programs and not try "to do it alone";
2. the Chapter and the units should recruit more BSWs as members to bring "fresh ideas, enthusiasm, and energy" to the units;
3. the board should schedule periodic meetings of unit chairs prior to the monthly board meeting so they can exchange ideas and possibly coordinate some activities;
4. unit chairs should try and recruit program and membership coordinators;
5. various strategies should be developed to publicize activities, to recognize contributions made by unit chairs, to communicate with members, and to make new members feel welcome.

At a subsequent meeting Unit chairs endorsed the Ad Hoc Unit Study Committee's report and recommended that the committee continue to work on clarifying the role of the unit in the organizational structure. The Board created a Unit Definition and Function Committee.<sup>6</sup>

In his 1983 year-end report, the executive director discussed Chapter staffing, volunteer leadership issues, Chapter finances, office operations, and programs. Some topics relevant to this study are highlighted here.<sup>7</sup>

## 1. Volunteer Leadership:

a. The director reiterated his concern about long-standing vacancies in crucial leadership positions, i.e., the state ELAN coordinator and the Chairperson of the Affirmative Action Unit. ". . .it is difficult to understand how the chapter can achieve its program goals without. . . important leadership people. ELAN is essential to all political goals: licensure, standards, [supporting adequate] funding [for social] services, and influencing social policy. It clearly relates to PACE and increasing political activity."

b. "Because of multiple appointments. . .the leadership base is narrowing. Further, as the number of working groups diminishes, the number of members involved in the affairs of the chapter shrinks as well. Rather than reaching out to involve more and new members. . .many of the same people are being used in multiple roles. This not only minimizes the support for the chapter, but uses up members' energy, thus increasing the recruitment problem in the future."

c. The report also discussed the absence of a "common framework" that unified the Chapter's various groupings. ". . .the annual meeting [had served as] a training session for new board members, delegate assembly [representatives] and the chairpersons of the various [chapter groups]. In recent years this function of the annual meeting has [been eliminated]. . . Without a common orientation, Board functioning. . .and interaction among sub-groups is hindered. . ." The executive director recommended that the board restore the Annual Meeting's training function.

## 2. Finance/Office Operations:

a. The executive director happily reported that "severe restraints on spending" during the previous two years had restored the Chapter's financial health--a

large deficit was erased and a reserve fund was created.

b. The decision to computerize office operations had been delayed for three years for several reasons. Although the intraorganizational, fiscal, and technical concerns were resolved, the executive director recommended that the decision to buy computer equipment and software programs be postponed until the new executive director had an opportunity to review the plan.

### 3. Program:

The report stressed three concerns in the program area: (a) members and volunteer leaders don't follow through on association commitments such as combating discrimination, securing licensure, or influencing block grant implementation; (b) the Chapter has moved away from social policy concerns; and (c) the planning process has narrowed the goals of the Chapter with serious consequences. Items (a) and (b) were presented Chapter VI. Item (c) is recounted here.

"For several years the Board has narrowed the goals of the chapter. Some of this was necessary. In doing so, the interests of some members are deferred. These concerns are the basis for many of the splinter groups which have arisen. Unmet needs give cause for grievances against the association. . . .in its program planning [the Association] should maintain sensitivity to the vast array of social work interests, practice specialties and professional concerns. Program planning should not be an excuse for ignoring the legitimate concerns which members bring to the Association. It should be a tool for directing the time, energy and resources of the Association. . .to the most important professional goals."

#### January, 1984:

The PACE chairperson resigned his position "for personal reasons." Two committee members agreed to act as co-chairs for the duration of the term.<sup>8</sup>

#### February, 1984:

For the Chapter, 1983 was a disappointing year in regard to licensing. The licensure bill "died" in committee. A new legislature took office in January. The re-numbered licensing bill was prefiled and assigned to a different committee.

An article in the February newsletter urged social workers (a) to contact the members of the Senate committee and urge them to schedule the bill and vote for its release as quickly as possible, (b) to contact their own legislators and get their written commitment to support the bill when it is considered by the full house, (c) to make a list of influential friends (political office holders, important citizens serving on boards of non-profit and profit-making organizations, and other opinion leaders in the community) and (d) to secure commitments from these friends to support efforts to license social workers.<sup>9</sup>

The Board debated whether or not to change their licensure strategy from one where NASW/XX was "the prime mover behind action to pass a licensure bill to [one where the Chapter] was a member of a multi-group coalition."<sup>10</sup>

The Chapter submitted four proposals to the PAF Subcommittee. One of them involved "developing unit-based committees to work on licensure and [to] give members skills for other group efforts."<sup>11</sup> The proposal writer and the Chapter leadership did not confer with the author to learn about or build on the Block Grant Demonstration Project's experiences in working at the unit level.

An eight-person Executive Director Search Committee was formed. Two of the unit chairs participating in the Block Grant Demonstration Project were appointed to the committee; one of them was the chair.<sup>12</sup>

#### April, 1984:

The board voted to spend up to \$10,000 to hire a lobbyist to "facilitate" the Chapter's licensing efforts. A crash fund-raising drive, asking members to donate \$50 to \$100, would be undertaken to raise the money.<sup>13</sup>

A member of the Administration Section who was also a faculty member at the Eliot University School of Social Work presented the Chapter's testimony on the human services portion of the state's FY 85 budget.

The testimony covered the inadequacy of the state's basic welfare grant, the need to provide adequate low-income housing and a realistic basic welfare grant as partial solutions to the state's serious homelessness problem, the need to reconsider the state's policy of deinstitutionalization while providing more community support programs for the

mentally ill, the need for home-based services for the "frail elderly" to prevent premature institutionalization, and the need to oppose proposed federal cuts in entitlements such as Medicaid and W.I.C.<sup>14</sup>

At the April Board meeting, a motion was carried to add an additional item to the testimony--"clients are entitled to the [best] quality service possible and consequently social services are to be provided by professional social workers."<sup>15</sup>

May, 1984:

1. The May board meeting covered a number of planned and unplanned topics.<sup>16</sup>

a. Members of an "ad hoc committee of concerned social workers" attended the meeting and demanded that the Chapter make a stronger commitment to political action on behalf of "vulnerable children, adults, and families." The committee felt that licensure and the Social Worker as Psychotherapist Institute received the most attention; while other priorities were slighted.<sup>17</sup>

Committee members included the former ELAN coordinator, past and current PACE chairpersons, chair of the licensure committee, chair of the gay and lesbian task force, faculty members from two schools, a former board member, and staff from public and private non-profit organizations. Many members lived or worked in Chester County. Three were involved with the Block Grant Project.

The committee presented a written statement of its concerns and some examples of how the board could address them.<sup>18</sup> The group's recommendations included: beginning on-going dialogues with key state commissioners to work on critical service delivery issues, developing pro-active position papers that clearly communicated the Chapter's views on critical social policy issues, building coalitions with citizen and other advocacy groups, and reinstituting annual Legislative and Budget Days as one way of informing members about current issues and the realities of the state's political processes.

The Board voted to refer the statement to the Program Committee and invited signatories to the document to join the committee.

b. The author presented a final report on the Block Grant Project that assessed the effectiveness of

the model developed to educate members and influence policy at local levels of government. (This is discussed in the latter part of the chapter.)

2. In her term-end report, the Board president discussed difficulties, achievements, Chapter functioning, the need to support and "reward" membership leaders, and offered some recommendations to the new Board.<sup>19</sup>

She noted that while it had been a "tough and painful two years," there were many achievements such as (a) the well-attended Social Worker as Psychotherapist Institutes, (b) the nationally-recognized Committee on Inquiry, (c) the receipt of a PAF award for the Block Grant Project, (d) the formation of a Coalition for Social Work Licensing, (e) the plan to hire a lobbyist to assist with the licensing effort, (f) the Administration Section's testimony on the state budget, (g) the accomplishments of several other hard-working committees, and (h) the resurrection of inactive units.

As President-Elect and then as the President, she was "personally committed" to holding "the organization accountable for agreed upon goals." Both Chapter staff and membership leaders had to be "whipped" into "measurable action" on program goals. "The Chapter could not be effective in doing all of the activities identified as necessary to achieve the goals if most of the work was left up to the staff. . . those membership leaders who were active could not continue very long to be 'used up' and to get little or no recognition for their considerable effort. Finally, it seemed to be extremely wasteful to lose the know how, know who, and know what of leaders who left office where a committee culture was not established to carry on the work--hence inactive [Chapter components] and over-reliance on staff."

The report detailed several efforts to recognize and reward membership leaders--holding the Annual Meeting at a resort area, initiating an Installation Dinner to honor membership leaders, and the formation of a Leadership Council made up of past Chapter officers and Social Workers of the Year to stem the "brain drain." All these efforts were focused on "having effective leaders [to implement] activities related to Chapter goals."

3. A farewell party for the out-going executive director was held in May. The Board presented him with a resolution formally thanking him for his "decade" of service to the organization.

An article in the June, 1984 Chapter newsletter reflected on the association's accomplishments during this 10 year period. It stated that, "The. . .Chapter is among the leading [associations] of NASW. Two PAF grants have been awarded to the Chapter. . .The Committee on Inquiry is among the best in the country. A. . .training program for committee members has been put into practice. . . .sixteen new practice sections, committees and task forces have been formed. . ." <sup>20</sup>

June, 1984:

The Chapter's new officers were installed and current officers retired at the Installation Dinner. The new president was the board member who was instrumental in securing the project's PAF grant. Two of the project's three participating units had new officers. The Executive Director's position was vacant.

What had been a reasonably stable organizational environment became quite turbulent as the block grant project moved through the implementation stage. This chronology reveals several strains among different Chapter entities that had a bearing on project implementation-- tensions between members interested in mounting "aggressive political activity" on behalf of "vulnerable children, adults and families"<sup>21</sup> and members interested in a vigorous pursuit of licensing; concern about the role and function of the unit in the association's structure; and differences between the professional staff and the volunteer leadership on how to address issues such as setting organizational goals, unifying different segments of the membership, counteracting member burnout, and filling vacancies in key positions.

As the evaluation of the implementation stage is recounted, reference is made to this chronicle of Chapter



events in an effort to better understand the context within which the demonstration project attempted to achieve its ultimate goals. As in the two previous chapters, selected stage-related evaluative questions provide the framework for assessing the project's effectiveness.

Evaluation Questions/Answers--Table 2.7<sup>22</sup>

Table 2.7. Evaluation Questions and Strategies, Program Implementation Stage, includes eleven evaluation questions that pertain to the third stage of program development.

Four of the eleven questions, selected in accordance with the criteria described in Chapter II, are answered below. These questions focus on (a) acquiring needed resources, (b) assessing project outcomes, (c) establishing a service domain at the county level, and (d) evaluating the effectiveness of the project's collaborative practice/education model.

Acquiring Additional Resources,

Implementation Question 2

Question 2, effort, asks, "What staff efforts are involved in the respecification of goals and in the location of additional resources judged necessary to achieve project results? This question focuses on the main unit of analysis. Documentation is the primary data collection method. One of the stage's management tasks--developing and maintaining staff/volunteer capability is addressed in this question.

### Respecification of Goals/Tasks

While the programmatic objectives did not change during the implementation stage, the means to accomplish two of them did. Ways to carry on the work of the project and to involve members in local social action efforts were modified. The changes are discussed in the latter part of the chapter.

### Resource Acquisition: Volunteers, Facilities, and Technical Assistance

Although a detailed breakdown of actual hours spent on the "location of additional resources" is not available, some idea of the energies expended in this area can be ascertained from the following:

1. Paid project staff consisted of a quarter-time director and a quarter-time secretary.
2. More than thirty presenters with the necessary expertise were identified, successfully recruited, and oriented to the project's goals. Selecting competent people that had credibility in their respective areas was crucial in "promoting trust" between the project and its intended beneficiaries and between the professional association and other human service organizations.

Only four of the thirty speakers received honoraria; all others volunteered their time in exchange for non-monetary benefits, i.e., providing service to the professional association; gaining

recognition from peers; and/or disseminating information about changes in county and state policy and procedures to social service personnel.

4. Various techniques to ensure that selected speakers were familiar with project goals and objectives were employed, i.e., providing speakers with selected parts of the case study protocol, organizing a pre-meeting luncheon for the Spring Forum presenters.

5. To gain credibility with new target populations, a planning committee for the Spring Forum was formed. Members included the chair of the Chapter's Administration Section; the chair of the graduate school's administration sequence; a well-known, respected administrator of a large public agency; and the project director.

7. Resource materials (described in Chapter IV) related to the substantive area and to political action efforts were collected and/or developed for the various audiences.

8. Accessible sites were secured for five network-sponsored continuing education programs and for the Human SERVE Austin County meeting.

This effort was expended so that the project's main objectives could be realized. The following question assesses the project's ability to accomplish these objectives.

**Evaluating Service Effectiveness,  
Implementation Question 8**

Question 8 asks, "What results have been achieved that could be attributed to the project? Are there changes in knowledge, attitudes and/or behavior on the part of participating individuals and/or organizations? This question focuses on the whole project, on organizations and their subdivisions, and on individuals. Informal interviews, participant observation, and questionnaires were used to collect data.

The answer to this question is presented in two sections: (a) participants' assessment of the quality of the information presented at the network-sponsored continuing education events and (b) project results.

(Organizational changes are addressed in the succeeding question.)

**Changes in Participants' Knowledge**

Chapter IV contained overviews of the project-sponsored continuing education programs. This section summarizes participants' assessments of the quality and the usefulness of information presented at these programs. The project did not have on-going contact with participants, and no data on changes in attitudes or behavior were collected.

This assessment of changes in participants' knowledge is based on post-meeting evaluations completed by 62 of the 125 participants at three network-sponsored events.<sup>23</sup> The percentage of participants who completed evaluations at each

of the three events ranged from 30 per cent at the Dover meeting to 57 per cent at the Spring Forum and 61 per cent at the Chester meeting. This disparity may affect the reliability of the findings. However, there was no known bias that affected who did or did not complete evaluations. Follow-up letters were sent to the Dover meeting participants requesting that they complete and return the evaluation form if they had not done so at the meeting; one additional response was received.

Given the limitation described above, the evaluations do provide some basis for assessing participants' opinions of the caliber of the continuing education programs.

Table 7.1 presents participants' assessments of the quality of the total program and of the main presentation at three project-sponsored events.

| TABLE 7.1                                                |      |     |           |     |                   |     |      |    |      |   |
|----------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|-----------|-----|-------------------|-----|------|----|------|---|
| SSBG Demonstration Project: CEP                          |      |     |           |     |                   |     |      |    |      |   |
| Summary of Evaluations/Quality of Program                |      |     |           |     |                   |     |      |    |      |   |
| EVENT                                                    | EXC. |     | VERY GOOD |     | SATISFAC-<br>TORY |     | FAIR |    | POOR |   |
| How would you rate the overall content?*                 |      |     |           |     |                   |     |      |    |      |   |
| Chester<br>N=24                                          | 3    | 13% | 15        | 63% | 6                 | 25% | 0    | -  | 0    | - |
| Dover<br>N=10                                            | 2    | 20% | 7         | 70% | 1                 | 10% | 0    | -  | 0    | - |
| Forum<br>N=28                                            | 3    | 11% | 18        | 64% | 6                 | 21% | 1    | 4% | 0    | - |
| Total<br>N=62                                            | 8    | 13% | 40        | 65% | 13                | 21% | 1    | 1% | 0    | - |
| How would you rate the Panel (or) Keynote Presentation?* |      |     |           |     |                   |     |      |    |      |   |
| Chester<br>N=23                                          | 5    | 22% | 14        | 61% | 3                 | 13% | 1    | 4% | 0    | - |
| Dover<br>N=9                                             | 3    | 33% | 5         | 55% | 1                 | 11% | 0    | -  | 0    | - |
| Forum<br>N=27                                            | 10   | 37% | 12        | 44% | 4                 | 15% | 1    | 4% | 0    | - |
| Total<br>N=59                                            | 18   | 31% | 31        | 53% | 8                 | 14% | 2    | 3% | 0    | - |

\* This is a condensed version of question on evaluation form. See Appendix B, Continuing Education Evaluation Forms.

The Dover Unit program received the highest ratings in both categories. For example, 90 percent of the respondents felt that the Dover program was "very good" to "excellent." The comparable figures for the Chester program and the Forum were 76 percent and 75 percent respectively. Similarly, 88 percent of the respondents felt that the main presentation at the Dover meeting was "very good" to "excellent." The

comparable figures for Chester and the Forum were 83 percent and 81 percent.

The Dover County Department of Citizens Services was well organized and connected to the state block grant information network. Access to speakers was through the department's public relations person who also served on the [State] Block Grant Coalition. She worked with the author on selecting speakers and providing materials on the county's reorganization and the CHSAC for distribution at the meeting.

Because the Department of Citizens Services was interested in promulgating information about its new "decentralized" structure to the social services community, the Director of the Department agreed to be one of the speakers.

As described in Chapter IV, the Chester County HSAC had an elaborate three-tier structure with close to 180 members. Parts of the structure were still in the development stage. The moderator had recently conducted a study of the state's initial implementation of the social services and community services block grant implementation processes. He gave a lengthy introduction on the history of federalism and interjected several lengthy remarks. Participants' written comments reflected their attempts to understand the often-bewildering amount of information.

Participants' Comments:

1. "Not enough time for questions/comments from group."
2. "Seemed to be some discontinuity among panel members."
3. ". . .visual aids would be of help."
4. "Since I did not have an abundance of knowledge, any information is helpful."
5. "First time I heard much of this information and it was somewhat confusing--much to assimilate (sic) the first time."
6. "I still have some confusion as to various areas."
7. "Moderator spoke too much."



Table 7.2 focuses on the participants' assessment of the usefulness of the information they received.

| <b>TABLE 7.2</b><br><b>SSBG Demonstration Project: CEP</b><br><b>Summary of Evaluations/Usefulness of Information</b> |                    |               |                        |                   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Event</b>                                                                                                          | <b>Very Useful</b> | <b>Useful</b> | <b>Somewhat Useful</b> | <b>Not Useful</b> |
| <b>Usefulness in Understanding Issues?*</b>                                                                           |                    |               |                        |                   |
| Chester<br>N=23                                                                                                       | 7    30%           | 7    30%      | 9    38%               | 0    -            |
| Dover<br>N=10                                                                                                         | 6    60%           | 3    30%      | 1    10%               | 0    -            |
| Forum<br>N=27                                                                                                         | 8    30%           | 11   41%      | 5    19%               | 3<br>11%          |
| TOTAL<br>N=60                                                                                                         | 21   35%           | 21   35%      | 15   25%               | 3<br>5%           |
| <b>Usefulness in Becoming an Effective Advocate?#</b>                                                                 |                    |               |                        |                   |
| Chester<br>N=22                                                                                                       | 5    23%           | 6    27%      | 11   50%               | 0    -            |
| Dover<br>N=8                                                                                                          | 3    38%           | 3    38%      | 2    25%               | 0    -            |
| TOTAL<br>N=30                                                                                                         | 8    27%           | 9    30%      | 13   43%               | 0    -            |

\* This is condensed version of question on evaluation form. See Appendix B, Continuing Education Evaluation Forms.

# This question was not included in the Forum evaluation form.

The information presented at the Dover network meeting was seen as being more useful in helping participants understand the issues than was the content introduced at the other two meetings: Dover, 90 percent, Chester, 60 percent, and Forum, 71 percent.

Ratings for "usefulness in becoming a successful advocate" were lower than the ratings for "usefulness in understanding the issues." Seventy-six percent of the respondents at the Dover meeting felt the information was "useful" to "very useful" in this regard. Half of the respondents (50 percent) felt the information they received at the Chester meeting was "useful" to "very useful" in helping them become more effective advocates.

As mentioned in Chapter IV, the participants at the Dover meeting were given specific information about how and when to present testimony on two issues: the county human services budget and the state hearings on services for the homelessness. Although neither issue was directly related to the work of the CHSAC, participants left with information on two concrete issues. The Unit chair was also the ELAN coordinator and was available for consultation.

The lower ratings in Chester may have reflected the CHSAC's early developmental stage, the complexity of the material presented, and the lack of concrete advocacy issues. Also, the unit's ELAN coordinator had recently resigned.

The Forum planning committee selected three topics for the "critical issue" workshops:

1. Purchase-of-Service vs. Public Agency Developing Capacity to Deliver Services
2. Expanding Local Planning Capacity: How and With What Resources?

### 3. Service Coordination vs. Service Integration at Local Level

Participants were asked if attendance at a specific workshop increased their knowledge of the "critical issue." Table 7.3 presents their responses.

| TABLE 7.3                                                                                                                   |     |     |           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----------|
| SSBG Demonstration Project: CEP<br>Spring Forum's Critical Issues Workshops<br>Summary of Evaluations/Increase In Knowledge |     |     |           |
| Event                                                                                                                       | Yes |     | No        |
| Did workshop increase knowledge of issue?*                                                                                  |     |     |           |
| Forum<br>N=28                                                                                                               | 26  | 93% | 2      7% |

\* This is a condensed version of question on evaluation form. See Appendix B, Continuing Education Evaluation Forms.

Although 93 percent of the respondents stated that the workshop they attended increased their knowledge of the issue being discussed, written comments indicated somewhat higher satisfaction with the purchase-of-service and local planning workshops than with the service coordination/integration workshop. Some respondents felt that the latter workshop was "too elementary."

Evaluations of the three continuing education sessions indicated that most of the participants who completed evaluations felt that they increased their knowledge of the

general and specific issues and that the information was useful.

Copies of each meeting's evaluations were given to the appropriate chairperson who was responsible for following-up on suggestions, requests for further information, and interest in becoming more involved with the unit or the section.

Tripodi and associates (1978) state that "The purpose of the program-implementation stage is synonymous with the ultimate goals of the program. . . .[and the point in the developmental cycle] where the outcome of program planning can be measured." (32, emphasis in original) The second part of the answer to the "services effectiveness" question focuses on project outcomes.

### Project Results

#### Establishment of informal networks

With the professional association taking the lead, informal organizational networks consisting of NASW branch units, schools of social work, and members of human service advisory councils were organized in the four-county geographical area covered by the three participating units. Due to the units' small, over-taxed work groups, the project director took more responsibility for organizing the county networks than she had anticipated.

The Chester and Dover networks operated more effectively than did the Austin-Bedford network. That network conducted a pilot meeting for "ELANers" in October

and intended to offer a second event similar to the ones in the Chester and Dover county areas. Internal changes in the unit and in the social work educational program interfered with the two-county unit's ability to conduct a second program.

As the project progressed the need for a practice/education network at the state level became apparent and an already existing linkage between the Chapter's Administration Section and the state university's graduate program in social work was strengthened through project participation and resources.

#### Design and implementation of Continuing Education Program

A series of continuing education events were designed and implemented. Two of the six scheduled project events were cancelled--one due to an unseasonable snow storm and one due to the organizations in the Austin-Bedford network's preoccupation with internal problems. (See Chapter IV for a description of the Continuing Education Program.)

Each of the four networks sponsored educational activities related to county and state SSBG implementation policies. The program began in October, 1983, just three months after the first group of CHSACc were approved by their respective county legislators and certified by the state DHS. The final event took place in June, 1984.

Based on information gathered during the initiation and contact stages, modifications were made in the original design. Instead of beginning with a multi-county conference

followed by county events, this order was reversed. Additional target populations were identified with a concomitant expansion of the project's geographic area for the final continuing education event.

As described in Chapter VI, approximately 125 participants attended the county and state network-sponsored programs. (An additional 50 social workers had pre-registered for the project workshop at the Social Workers' Day Conference that was "snowed out.")

Eighty-four per cent of the 62 participants who completed evaluation forms indicated that the presentations were "very good" to "excellent."

The project director took part in four additional continuing education events that reached an additional 157 persons. Information about changes in the implementation of SSBG policies reached 282 participants--94 per cent of the revised target figure.

#### Mobilization of political potential of membership

Political action at the county level. Members of the participating units' social action networks ("ELANers") did not participate in project activities as expected. However, the project did attract a larger than predicted number of NASW members (as well as other human service workers) who expressed an interest in working "toward greater support for human services funding, for an equitable allocation of human services funds in [their] county, and against deregulation that weakens protection for clients."<sup>24</sup> Efforts to in-

volve these people in collective political action on the county level were not realized for several reasons.

1. The CHSACs' were in an early developmental stage and local issues that NASW branch units could conceivably address had not yet crystalized.
2. The association's process for selecting social action issues (described in Chapter II) needed to be assessed to determine if and/or how to choose county issues.
3. Two critical components in the Chapter's social policy program structure were not functioning--the state ELAN Committee and the Income Maintenance and Social Services Task Force were leaderless and moribund.
4. The resignation of the Chester unit's ELAN coordinator and the multiple roles carried by the ELAN coordinators in the other two participating units hindered efforts to involve participants in local NASW-organized collective social action activities such as monitoring the work of the CHSACs.
5. How to involve participants who were not social workers in NASW-sponsored social action activities needed to be thought through.
6. Because local units were viewed as the catalysts for organizing and implementing the county-level social action efforts, ways to strengthen this component needed to be addressed.

A different approach to preparing and involving members in local social action efforts was devised. Participants at the county-level continuing education events were given information they could use as members of other advocacy groups or as individuals. This information included:

1. state and county government data including names and addresses of legislators<sup>25</sup>;
2. information on how to monitor and influence block grant decisions<sup>26</sup>;
3. state administration contact people for each block grant<sup>27</sup>;
4. ways to become more politically active as individuals or through advocacy groups;<sup>28</sup> and
5. information on Senate Bill #S-X0 that sought to establish an Interdepartmental Advisory Council on Block Grants that would make recommendations for all state departments administering block grants.<sup>29</sup>

Whether attendees went on to monitor council activities, or to advocate for equitable allocations, for increased funding and services, for enactment of Bill #S-X0, and/or for procedural safeguards for clients is not known.

During the implementation stage the project helped potential activists become familiar with the new procedures and learn the identity of the "key actors" at the county and state levels. They were urged to participate in and/or monitor the planning processes in their respective counties.



No NASW-sponsored, county-level collective political action activity was undertaken.

Political action at the state level. The Administration Section emerged as a potential vehicle for members' block grant lobbying efforts on the state level. In addition to offering educational programs for members, the section is charged with lobbying for "adequate support and funding for health, income maintenance and human services," one of the Chapter's four major goals for PFY84.<sup>30</sup> The section is also responsible for preparing and presenting the Chapter's annual testimony on the state human services' budget. Testimony about the SFY85 budget, summarized in the narrative, incorporated information on the negative impact of "New Federalism" policies on people in the state.<sup>31</sup>

Both the executive director and the author represented the association on and participated in the [State] Block Grant Coalition's lobbying efforts on behalf of Senate Bill #S-X0.

Linkage between Chapter and state SSBG information network

The project enabled the Chapter to become a more integral part of the growing block grant information network in the state. One indication of this was the author's ability to recruit "key actors" to participate in the project's continuing education events. For example, the Chair of the [State] Block Grant Coalition; the Director of the SDHS's Office of Human Services Planning; the Supervisor

of the State Department of Community Affairs, Office of Community Services; and the Vice Chair of the state legislature's Joint Appropriations Committee agreed to be panelists for the project's workshop at the Social Workers' Day Conference.

Efforts to recruit NASW members involved in carrying out or monitoring SSBG implementation activities to serve on a "technical advisory committee" were not successful. Only one person responded to newsletter appeals to come forward. However, once members in key positions were identified and contacted, many were helpful on an individual basis. They were not willing to make an on-going commitment to serve on a Chapter advisory committee. Some indicated that they were involved with other professional organizations or advocacy groups that served specific populations such as the County Child Protection Coalitions, the State Society of Hospital Social Work Directors, or the Association of County Welfare Directors.

#### Amelioration of the original problem

Patti (1978) cautions that the criteria against which a recently implemented program is to be evaluated is of major concern. He asks:

Is it sufficient for a program to show that its services are reaching the target population in anticipated numbers, that appropriate staff have been recruited and trained and are operating in a reasonably efficient manner? Or must it, in addition, provide evidence that the problem it was originally created to address has in fact been reduced or ameliorated in the desired directions?  
(276)

He recommends that program directors guard against "prematurely exposing the [new] program to a test of its effectiveness." (1978, 276) Mindful of Patti's advice, this section makes a preliminary assessment of the project's ability to ameliorate the original problem--ensuring that SSBG funds would be equitably distributed in the counties and that clients' rights would be protected.

Having the desired impact on the problem would mean that (a) the professional association was successful in gathering strategic and tactical information about the transfer of social service block grant planning and allocation responsibilities from the state to the counties, (b) this information was disseminated to approximately 300 social workers, (c) a significant number became involved in NASW-coordinated social action efforts to influence the counties' allocations of block grant funds, (d) counties allocated their SSBG funds in an "equitable" manner, and (e) efforts to enact state regulations protecting clients' rights were successful.

As indicated above considerable progress was made in gathering the needed information and conveying it to association members as well as other human service personnel. Although some participants expressed an interest in becoming politically active, no collective social action efforts were undertaken.

In reference to (d) above, determining what would be an "equitable" allocation of SSBG funds in each county was a

formidable task. As a rule, CHSACs did not have access to information on all the county human service funding streams. (Schreiber and Botsko, 1983) Data on how funds were being allocated among the various service populations and which agencies were receiving funds was not readily available. For example, some agencies received funds from several county divisions or from more than one county. The CHSACs' efforts to accumulate this kind of information for their initial comprehensive human services plans ran into technical and political obstacles. For example, one study county's office on aging and mental health board would not share funding information with the CHSAC; in another county, legislators often awarded grants directly to agencies without notifying the appropriate county divisions. Legislators and agency administrators were ambivalent about changing these practices.

Any NASW attempts to determine whether funds were being allocated "equitably" were premature. However, the professional association could advocate for access to data on funding and disbursements that could help CHSAC members as well as NASW make an informed decision about how human service funds, including SSBG dollars, were being allocated.

As for (e) above, the [State] Block Grant Coalition's efforts on behalf of Senate Bill #S-XO were at a standstill in June 1984. The coalition developed two strategies--one that targeted the legislature and one that targeted low-income persons.<sup>32</sup>

The legislative strategy included:

1. keeping pressure on key members of the Joint Appropriations Committee;
2. developing bi-partisan support for the bill; and
3. considering amendments that would counter the opposition of key legislators.

The strategy to involve low-income persons in the coalition was based on the fact that legislators didn't feel any urgency to enact the bill. Identifying individuals who had personal examples of the problems in the block grant system and encouraging them to call legislators or give testimony was seen as "a key to getting [#S-X0] moving."

#### Recapitulation, Question 8

The project was successful in gathering strategic and tactical information about the transfer of social service block grant planning and allocation responsibilities from the state to the counties. Twenty-four liaisons from the participating organizations were identified and recruited. Thirty presenters with the needed expertise were selected to deliver the continuing education program designed to disseminate this information to NASW members and other human service workers.

The project attracted 94 percent of the revised targeted number of participants--44 percent attended network-sponsored events and 56 percent attended programs sponsored by other groups.

A larger number of participants than expected expressed interest in participating in local social action efforts. No collective effort to direct members' political action activities was realized. Instead participants received information to assist them in carrying out social action efforts as individuals or as members of already existing advocacy groups.

Wolk's (1981) survey of social workers found that social workers in macro-level areas (administration, teaching, community organization) of practice tended to be more politically active than workers from micro-level areas. Programs like the Social Workers' Day Conference which focused on both practice concerns and social action issues and the Spring Forum (an "institute" for administrators) that attracted a relatively small number of administrators, planners, and educators may have yielded better payoffs in increased political activity than did the unit programs.

Social workers did not seem to recognize NASW as a vehicle for local political action efforts related to the SSBG. Although it was not clear why this was so, some possibilities for this viewpoint include:

1. Because the association's activity at the local level was limited and usually focused on educating members about practice-related issues, the activist role was not credible.

2. CHSACs were carrying out their first state-mandated tasks and may not have wanted "interference" from any additional professional or human service groups.

3. Providers serving on the CHSACs were appointed to represent specific client groups or service areas and were possibly more connected to advocacy groups representing particular clients or services.

4. The changing policies resulted in considerable "environmental uncertainty" for social work administrators and they may not have wanted another "player" on the local scene.

Changes in Organizations' Knowledge, Attitudes, and/or Behavior

The institutionalization of project objectives depended on the professional association's and the participating schools' willingness to continue collaborative efforts once the grant period ended. The following question/answer assesses the Chapter's effectiveness in expanding its social action domain to include the county level of government.

**Establishing Service Domain,  
Implementation Question 4**

Question 4 asks, "Has the project made a beginning place for itself--in the social work organizations that participated in the block grant project? in the social service community? The focus is on the main unit of analysis--the whole project--and on participating organizations. Documentation, archival records, interviews, and participant observation were the data collection methods utilized.

Three questions one could ask to determine whether or not the project made a beginning place for itself in the State Chapter, the cooperating schools, and the social service community include:

1. How widely did information spread beyond the liaison persons from each organization to their respective constituents?
2. Were there any indications of mutual activities following the jointly-sponsored block grant continuing education meetings?
3. Were social workers and other human service personnel involved in the new SSBG processes willing to share their knowledge with the State Chapter and its subunits?

These questions are addressed in the order of their presentation above.



## Diffusion of Information

### Schools

Undergraduate. The three participating schools at the county level were undergraduate programs with relatively small faculty groups. In two of the three schools, faculty teaching in the social policy and in the field curriculum areas attended the NASW unit meeting hosted by their school. Some faculty strongly recommended that their students attend the meeting also. Student liaisons publicized the program among peers with varying results. Prior to the continuing education programs, the project director was invited to make presentations at field instructors' meetings at two of the three participating schools.

The author also presented information on the project at the February meeting of the [State] Association of Baccalaureate Social Work Educators.

Two faculty members and the three student liaisons from participating undergraduate programs attended the Spring Forum. One of the faculty members had a strong interest in the topic prior to the project's inception; the author was the second faculty member. The students oversaw conference registration as part of their liaison responsibilities. So, the Forum did not attract any additional undergraduate faculty or students. This may be due to the lack of congruity between the undergraduate curriculum and the complex issues related to the social service delivery system.

Graduate. As indicated in Chapter VI, the graduate student liaison arranged for the project director to conduct two workshops on block grant issues at the school's Professions Weekend. Forty students and two faculty members attended the sessions.

The administration sequence of the state university's graduate school of social work was a member of the project's state-level "practice/education" network. The chair of the sequence served on the planning committee for the Spring Forum on Human Services Planning Issues Confronting Local Decision-Makers. He was a member of the panel that responded to the keynote address and he also co-led the workshop on "Service Coordination vs. Service Integration at the Local Level." Four other faculty members, the MSW student liaison, and several other students from the administration sequence attended the Forum.

The graduate school's administration sequence had a strong link with the Chapter's Administration Section. The chair of the section was an alumna of the graduate program; a faculty member in the administration sequence was active in the administration section. Each year he participated in the section's development and presentation of the Chapter's testimony related to the state's human services budget. The testimony on the SFY 1985 budget included issues related to "New Federalism."

Summary. During the grant period, an awareness of SSBG issues spread beyond the undergraduate and graduate schools'

faculty and student liaisons. The substantive policy issue was more compatible with the interests of graduate faculty and students interested in administration than it was with the baccalaureate programs' constituencies.

The issue also competed with many others in the schools' environments. The most pressing at the time was a severe drop in applications and enrollments at the undergraduate and graduate levels of social work education.

#### NASW/XX

Chapter. In 1983-84 two of the Chapter's four major program goals related to the block grant project.<sup>33</sup>

Program goal #2 was "to promote adequate and equitable support and funding for health, income maintenance and human services." The Chapter's action plan gave the Administration Section responsibility for facilitating the accomplishment of program goal #2. The plan also recommended that units link with a special sector group and offer at least one program a year related to goal #2.

The project provided the Administration Section with resources to help carry out the Chapter's mandate related to goal #2. The leadership of the section expressed an interest in block grant issues--its October 1983 monthly meeting was devoted to this topic and it was a co-sponsor of the project's Spring Forum. The chair, a state administrator in the Office of Contract Administration, co-led the workshop on "Purchase-of-Service vs. Public Agency Developing

Capacity to Deliver Services." Section members volunteered to be recorders at the three workshops.

Some participants at the Spring Forum expressed an interest in joining the section, others recommended that the section sponsor a follow-up program on Purchase-of-Service issues. The Forum was proclaimed the first in a series of annual "Social Worker as Administrator" institutes.<sup>34</sup>

(The Chapter had sponsored fourteen successful "Social Worker as Psychotherapist" institutes.)

Monthly articles in the Chapter newsletter were designed to keep all members apprised of project activities.<sup>35</sup>

Program goal #3 was "to strengthen the chapter." The action plan delineated several objectives related to this goal. They included (a) promoting "the involvement of members in human service coalitions on the local, county and state levels," (b) assisting "units in developing programs. . .to enhance member participation," and (c) recruiting and involving BSW's in the Chapter.

ELAN and PACE, in consultation with other Chapter groups, were given the responsibility for identifying members serving on coalitions, reaching out and recruiting them to be official liaisons to the Chapter, and coordinating all NASW members serving on these coalitions. ELAN and PACE were not able to do this. The former was inactive; the latter had a small work group, a recent change in leadership, and a full agenda devoted to selecting

legislators for PACE endorsements. Therefore, the project's efforts to identify members serving on CHSACs was a beginning attempt to accomplish this goal.

Members of the Ad Hoc Committee of Concerned Social Workers that expressed their concerns about the lack of political action on behalf of disadvantaged clients were influential in the Chapter. Three members were associated with the Block Grant Project. Several of their recommendations, detailed in the narrative, coincided with the work of the project.

The project "made a place for itself" at the Chapter level. But the effect of the impending change in Chapter leadership on that "place" and whether resources would be allocated to project-related objectives remained uncertain. Once the grant was secured, the Chapter's volunteer leadership did not participate in project activities. Only two board members attended the Forum--one of PACE's new co-chairs and the treasurer who was also a faculty member in the administration sequence at Eliot University. And the Chapter was embarking on a major fundraising drive to support the licensing effort. Whether the Chapter was both willing and able to support political action in two major areas depended upon the conviction of new leaders, both paid and volunteer.

Richan notes that "one of social work's virtues--its concern for the full range of human problems--is potentially its undoing, for if one tries to deal with all problems the

likelihood is that no problem will be dealt with successfully." (1981, 244)

Units. As described in the narrative, the Chapter's Ad Hoc Unit Study Committee recommended that units not try to do extensive programming alone and that they try and recruit BSW members.<sup>36</sup> The Program Committee's action plan also recommended that the units link up with a "special sector group and offer at least one program a year related to goal #2."

The PAF project served as a prototype for these suggestions. The grant provided resources that helped link three units with BSW programs so that could jointly sponsor a program on SSBG planning and funding at the local level.

Chairs in four additional units participated in identifying NASW members and other social workers serving on human service advisory councils. Identifying these "key informants" was helpful to the project and also provided the chairpersons with resources if they wanted to replicate the programs presented in the demonstration units.

In the Austin-Bedford Unit, two social workers who staffed the Austin County HSAC joined the unit's steering committee. Both staff persons were also active in the Administration Section. This type of linkage was unusual and it augured well for keeping the block grant issue alive in that unit. However, whether the unit would remain viable was in question. Some members were dissatisfied with the large two-county unit and wanted to dissolve it and form two

single-county units. At least 30 members in each county needed to form a steering committee and petition the Board to authorize a new single-county unit. Austin County members were further along in this process than were Bedford members.

The Ad Hoc Unit Study Committee's report indicated that unit chairs often recruited Steering Committee members from their own agency or field of practice.<sup>37</sup> This could result in the unit leadership being partial to certain services or client groups and/or limiting the carry-over of information when different core groups took office. The President's Report referred to the loss of "know how, know who, and know what" when over-worked leaders left their offices.<sup>38</sup> Two of the participating units installed new officers as the project's implementation stage was coming to an end. And as mentioned above, the third unit (Austin-Bedford) was attempting to reorganize.

The project's place at the unit level was tenuous. Key project participants were leaving office. An effort to orient new officers to the goals of the project would need to be undertaken. However, the most likely organizational positions to do this--the executive director, the chair of ELAN, and the chair of the Task Force on Income Maintenance and Social Services--were vacant. The latter two positions were vacant when the SSBG project was initiated and they continued to be unoccupied as the implementation stage was ending.

A sustained investment in local block grant issues depended upon social workers in the units and in the county planning councils continuing to see the sharing of information as a priority. The block grant implementation issues didn't "fit" as well with the interests of direct service practitioners who comprised the largest group in the local units. Although unit chairs welcomed the project's help with programming, they did not seem to have a strong interest in the issue, i.e., none attended the Spring Forum. Many social work administrators serving on the HSACs were not NASW members and those that were tended not to be actively involved in unit activities.

The PAF-funded SSBG project was the main way that the association was implementing its goal "to promote adequate and equitable support and funding for health, income maintenance and human services." Whether the Chapter and its subdivisions would continue the work of the grant seemed unlikely. Securing licensure was a priority issue for many members and leaders. The Board was rapidly moving toward a Level V action strategy--"no holds barred, everything committed to the issue"--in an effort to achieve licensure.

#### Joint Activities/Exchanges

Jointly sponsoring the meetings with NASW enabled the schools to meet their community service mission, to inform their faculty and students about an important shift in social welfare policies, and to meet key agency representatives involved in the county and state SSBG



implementation process. It provided units with program assistance and visibility.

Following the jointly-sponsored county-level continuing education events, two of the undergraduate schools independently contacted members of their respective units. However, the contacts were not related to county block grant implementation topics.<sup>39</sup> One school, in response to requests made at the block grant meeting, informed participants of elective courses and upcoming continuing education events on child welfare and gerontology topics.<sup>40</sup> Based on discussions at a meeting with field instructors, the second school agreed to take responsibility for enlisting the local unit's assistance in influencing the Chapter to develop publicity that would improve the public's perception of the social work profession.<sup>41</sup>

The networks provided an opportunity for "informal information sharing in a non-threatening social context." (Coleman and Barton 1982, 73) Information other than block grant issues was exchanged among participants.

Graduate faculty were heavily involved in Chapter activities and several served in leadership positions. Undergraduate faculty were more active in state-wide Chapter committees, sections, task forces, etc. than they were in local unit activities. Relationships between the two organizations at the local level seemed to focus on the schools' internship component and continuing education/community service activities. This investigator expected

field instructors to be important linking people at the unit level. As indicated in Chapter VI, very few people from this group participated in the county continuing education events. The author's experience attests to the fact that undergraduate field instructors have ties with both the professional association and the schools, but the block grant issue may not be an area of common interest.

#### Legitimation Within the Social Services Community

In Chapter V, the author asserted that "acquiring social legitimation [within the social services community] was closely connected to the willingness of knowledgeable social workers and their allies to contribute their expertise to the project."

Social workers, as well as other human service personnel, were identified and recruited to share their knowledge with the general membership, social work students, and personnel interested in the new SSBG local planning process.

The author and the unit chairpersons recruited speakers from the target populations to make presentations at the continuing education events. This was one way to strengthen their ties with the professional association.

As part of his remarks at the Spring Forum, the Director of the SDHS's Office of Policy and Planning publicly congratulated the Chapter "for getting involved in the local planning process."<sup>42</sup>

As indicated above, NASW members and other social workers involved in implementing or monitoring SSBG activities were helpful once the project director found out who they were and contacted them. They were not willing to make a commitment to serve as on-going liaisons to the Chapter.

#### Summary

On balance, the project made some progress in "establishing its domain" with the various constituencies at the local level and maintaining its domain at the state level.

Whether this progress could be sustained when the project activities were incorporated into the on-going work of the Chapter was questionable.

The Administration Section and the graduate school's administration sequence had the strongest interest in the topic, the most stable leadership, and more to gain from carrying on some of the project's activities. This created a dilemma, because the main emphasis of the project was to develop the professional association's capacity to influence county-level SSBG decisions. Whether the section had an interest in and/or the resources to take on the responsibility of linking up with the organizations in the local networks could not be determined.

The two prior questions evaluated the project's effectiveness in accomplishing its main objectives and in establishing its domain at the local level. The final

implementation-stage question evaluates the viability of the collaborative practice/education model.

**Feasibility of Project's Collaborative Model,**

**Implementation Question 7**

Question 7 asks, "How effective is the practice/education collaborative model used to educate members so they could influence policy implementation at the local level?" This question concerns the whole project as well as the networks. Documentation, archival records, interviews, participant observation and questionnaires were used to gather data.

The project's goal was to bring representatives from the three designated county organizations together to begin an on-going discussion of SSBG implementation policies and procedures. The presenters were recruited from the participating organizations with the intent of involving them in the county networks.

As local issues requiring political action efforts emerged, ELAN, functioning in the role of a "task-related social action group," (Coleman and Barton 1982, 76) would be responsible for organizing collective political action efforts.

The collaborative practice/education model was effective in gathering and disseminating information. With significant support from the project, three county networks were formed. The units, as lead organizations, needed

considerable support from the Chapter's PAF grant and, to some extent, from the main office staff.

Each county network did sponsor a continuing education program related to changing SSBG policies. Each of the participating units, schools, and CHSAC liaisons were actively involved in their respective county's educational program.

It then became the unit leadership's responsibility (with the project director's assistance) to identify issues of concern and carry out a range of possible "institutionalized social action" (Epstein 1969) activities such as testifying before public bodies, lobbying, influencing public opinion, serving on a human services coalition, and/or monitoring the implementation of legislation.

During the implementation stage, the units did not initiate any collective social action efforts for the varied reasons described above. Whether or not the model was an effective one for organizing social action efforts was not adequately tested. The vacancies in key NASW positions at the local and state level hampered the project's ability to mount county-level social action efforts.

It is possible that even if conditions were more favorable, it still would have been difficult to select local issues. Local coalitions that are population based or service based may be better equipped to carry out social action activities.

Finally, social work educational programs were not located in all counties. As discussed in Chapter II, there were six units encompassing eight counties in the northern and metropolitan regions of the state. Half of the units in these regions (covering four counties) did not have a social work educational program located in their county or counties. The baccalaureate social work programs that did exist had a regional focus. It is possible that schools could work with several local units and CHSACs in their region.

The professional association's role in organizing county-level social action efforts needed to be reconsidered. O'Connor (1983) suggests that NASW, at the national and state level, should put its resources into serving as a resource center rather than trying to organize social action groups. He feels that social action groups organized around specific issues are crucial, but recommends that the responsibility for their actual organization and development be assigned to "different elements and individuals within the profession." He states that NASW State Chapters could assist in "gathering information relative to the legal, economic, political, and demographic aspects of welfare problems and issues" and "in the identification and selection of potentially influential allies." (19)

O'Connor's suggestions seemed pertinent given this researcher's experiences with the SSBG project. It was important and it took considerable effort to collect and

distribute current information to members. Some members indicated that they belonged to coalitions or advocacy groups related to specific issues or populations where they could use this information.

Modifications that have been presented at various points throughout this chapter are summarized in the next section.

### Project Modifications

The following program adaptations took place during the implementation stage:

1. Because no collective political action efforts were initiated at the local level, participants were given information to help them become involved in advocacy efforts as individuals or as members of other groups.

2. Any NASW attempts to determine whether funds were being allocated "equitably" were premature. However, the professional association could advocate for directives that would lessen the fragmentation among county human service planning groups and mandate the publication of data on funding and allocations. It is quite possible that this would not be a popular decision with some segments of the profession.

3. The original project plan envisioned the formation of a new Chapter committee to continue project activities once the PAF funding ended. However, the Administration Section emerged as the most appropriate part of the Chapter to carry on many of the SSBG activities. Support from two

other critical Chapter components--the Income Maintenance and Social Services Task Force and the state-level ELAN committee--would also be required. However, these elements would have to be reactivated by the Chapter leadership.

Because the counties will continue to play an important role in the social service block grant implementation process, ways to link local units to the Administrative Section need to be considered. Ways to involve social work administrators in the Chapter and in the units need to be thoughtfully developed. They could be valuable links between units and issue-focused statewide committees. This is not an easy task. The project experience corroborates recent studies indicating that administrators do not see the professional association as a vehicle for meeting their needs. (Gibelman and Schervish 1993, 1997)

The growth of the Administration Section may help. To do this, the Section would have to broaden its membership base and develop ways to involve more members in reviewing the human services budget and suggesting content for the testimony. Reinstating Chapter "budget days" and "legislative days" as suggested by the Committee of Concerned Social Workers is one way to do this.

#### On-Going Issues

In the two previous chapters, issues arose that tended to cut across program stages. During the Program Implementation Stage additional cross-cutting issues emerged.



1. Units ostensibly carried much of the responsibility for implementation of the association's goals. The weakness of the unit structure was documented by the Ad Hoc Unit Study Committee Report, and this project corroborated these findings. It seemed unlikely that the over-burdened unit structure could take on additional responsibility for identifying local issues, referring them to the Policy Council for authorization to act, and mounting effective local social action strategies. As noted in the narrative, the Unit Chairs recommended that the Chapter create a Committee on Unit Definition and Structure to further clarify the unit's role in the association.

2. Additional information related to the task of determining what would be an equitable allocation of SSBG funds in each county emerged. Many of the CHSACs did not have access to information on all human service funding streams coming into the county. Data on how funds were being allocated among the various service populations and which agencies were receiving funds also was not readily available. For example, many agencies received funds from several county and state divisions and/or from more than one county. The CHSACs' efforts to collect this information for their initial comprehensive human services plans ran into technical and political obstacles. (Schreiber and Botsko, 1983)

Various "organizational and individual actors" were concerned with turf issues. For example, in one study

county the office on aging and the mental health board would not share funding information with the CHSAC; in another county, legislators often awarded grants directly to agencies without notifying the appropriate county divisions. Neither the legislators or the agency administrators (some of whom were social workers) wanted to change these practices.

3. Concerns that had the potential to become issues in some counties began to emerge at the continuing education events. They included:

- a. determining which level of government should administer SSBG contracts with public and private, non-profit providers; and
- b. debating whether or not counties should have full responsibility for allocating all SSBG funds (not just new dollars) based on the results of the local needs assessment processes.

#### Assessment of How Well the Project Accomplished

##### Implementation Stage Tasks

"The success of program implementation rests in part on the attainment of the necessary conditions of program initiation and contact. It also depends on the relevancy of the services offered or on the efficacy of the technology employed." (Tripodi et al 1978, 32)

The selected evaluation questions have addressed how well the project accomplished its implementation stage tasks, both administrative and programmatic. The final

evaluative question addressed the "efficacy of the technology." Consequently, that information is not repeated here.

The project's PAF funding ended in June, 1984 and brought the implementation stage to an end. Plans were made to have certain Chapter components, as indicated above, take on the responsibility for continuing the work of the project. Chapter VIII, Evaluation of the Program Stabilization Stage, assesses the extent to which the Chapter's state and local components were able to incorporate project tasks into their on-going responsibilities.

## Chapter Endnotes

1. NASW/XX Leadership Handbook, 1985-1986.
2. As indicated in Chapter 7, Patti's model also includes attracting and maintaining a clientele as one of the tasks in the implementation stage. In the "differential evaluation" model, contacting participants and/or clients is a separate stage.
3. "[Special Projects and Development Coordinator] Joins Staff," NASW. . .NEWS, November/December, 1983.
4. Secretary of the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Board of Directors, November 10, 1983.
5. Chair, Ad Hoc Unit Study Committee. Memorandum to Board President, November 2, 1983.
6. Acting Secretary of the Board of Directors, Minutes of the Board of Directors, February 9, 1984.
7. Executive Director, 1983 Year End Operating Report, January 6, 1984.
8. Chair, PACE-New Jersey. Letter to Board President. January 23, 1984.
9. "32, 33. . .48, 49, 50," NASW. . .NEWS, February, 1984, p. 8.
10. Acting Secretary of the Board of Directors, Minutes of the Board of Directors, February 9, 1984.
11. Chapter PAF Proposal, "Developing Unit-Based Committees. . ."
12. NASW/XX Chapter President. Memo to Committee and Task Force Chairpersons, March 8, 1984.
13. Secretary of the Board of Directors, Minutes of the Board of Directors, April 12, 1984.
14. "State Budget Impacts on Human Services in [State]," NASW . . .News, May, 1984, p. 1.
15. Secretary. Minutes, Board of Directors Meeting, April 12, 1984.
16. Secretary of the Board of Directors, Minutes of the Board of Directors, May 10, 1984.
17. The Committee of Concerned Social Workers of NASW/XX. Statement to NASW/XX members and the social welfare community, n.d.

18. Committee of Concerned Social Workers. Letter to Board of Directors, May 10, 1984.
19. NASW/XX President's Report 1982-1984, May 2, 1984.
20. "Decade of Growth," NASW. . . NEWS, June, 1984.
21. Committee of Concerned Social Workers. Letter to Board of Directors, May 10, 1984.
22. For each question the table indicates the combination of data collection methods that were used to compile information on the three criteria of program evaluation: effort, effectiveness, and efficiency.
23. Four persons attended the Austin-Bedford network's pilot meeting, but they did not complete evaluation forms.
24. County Meeting Evaluation Form
25. Sample copies of the League of Women Voters 1984 Citizen's Handbook were available along with information on how to order the publication.
26. Sample copies of Block Grants and You: A Citizens Handbook were available along with ordering information.
27. State Block Grant Information prepared by Fair Budget [Action Campaign] and the Center for Non-Profit Corporations was distributed to participants.
28. For example, those attending the Dover Network meeting in February, 1984, were advised of when and how they could present testimony in relation to the upcoming county human services budget hearings. Participants at the Austin/Bedford meeting in October, 1983 were informed about PACE endorsements and who to contact if they wanted to work on key campaigns targeted by PACE. Participants at all events were given information on their respective HSACs meeting places and dates to assist them in monitoring the councils' initial activities.
29. [State] Legislature. Senate. 1984. An Act establishing an Interdisciplinary Advisory Council on Block Grants. Prefiled for Introduction in the 1984 Session, S-X0.
30. Chapter Action Plan for PFY '84.
31. Chair, Chapter Administrative Section and Professor of Administration, Eliot University School of Social Work. Memorandum re: draft of Joint Appropriation Committee Testimony on the State Budget as it Impacts on Human Services in [State], April 9. 1984.
32. Chair, [State] Block Grant Coalition. Memo to Coalition Members, November 8, 1984.

33. NASW/NJ Action Plan for PFY [Program Fiscal Year] '84, May, 1983.
34. "Forum Serves to Initiate Annual Institute," NASW. . .NEWS, July and August, 1984.
35. NASW. . .NEWS:
  - "NASW/NJ Awarded PAF Grant." July/August, 1983
  - "Identifying the Players." September, 1983
  - "Annual Meeting." October, 1983
  - Bulletin Board Announcement--October Meeting of Administration Section, "Human Services Planning on the County Level: Impact on Social Work Administrators." October, 1983
  - "Block Grant Project Holds Local Meetings." November/December, 1983
  - Unit Center Announcement--Union Unit Meeting, "How Social Services Block Grant is Being Implemented in Union County." January, 1984
  - "Union County Block Grant Process Examined." March, 1984
  - Announcement--Spring Forum, "Human Services Planning: Issues Confronting Local Decision-Makers." June, 1984
  - "Forum Serves to Initiate Annual Institute." July/August, 1984
36. Chair, Ad Hoc Unit Study Committee. Memorandum to Board President, November 2, 1983.
37. Chair, Ad Hoc Unit Study Committee. Memorandum to Board President, November 10, 1983.
38. NASW/XX President's Report 1982-1984, May 2, 1984.
39. This is an example of the fluidity of informal network goals and the various kinds of information that can be shared. (Coleman and Barton 1982)
40. Chair, Department of Social Work, Dunham Falls University. Letter to "colleagues who attended our block grant project meeting" regarding upcoming continuing education events and courses of interest to practitioners, March 19, 1984.
41. Coordinator of Field Work, Center for Social Work, Altmeyer-Buell University. Minutes of March 23rd meeting for field instructors, March 30, 1984.

**42. Case study notes, June 1984.**

## CHAPTER VIII

### EVALUATION OF PROGRAM STABILIZATION STAGE

#### Introduction

The stabilization stage completes the program development cycle. A program that reaches this stage has successfully accomplished the tasks associated with each of the three prior stages, and its existence usually is not in question. (Bielawski and Epstein 1984) However, grant-funded programs are vulnerable at this stage if, as was the case with this project, the organization attempts to absorb the project's objectives into its on-going work. (Patti 1983b, Vosburgh and Perlmutter 1984)

In addition to dealing with the topics described in Chapter IV for evaluating the project's stabilization stage, Chapter VIII also includes an epilogue consisting of several episodes that occurred in the post-June 1985 period. This addendum provides information that further clarifies issues related to the professional association's social action role at the county level.

The assessment of the stabilization stage, like the assessment of the three prior stages, begins with a description of the characteristics of this stage: definition, time period, goals, and tasks.



## Description of Stage

### Definition

According to Patti, the

stabilization stage is both an end and a beginning. An end in the sense that it represents the potential realization of what the founders of the program had hoped for, and the staff have sought to achieve; a beginning, because even as the program realizes its potential, both internal and external forces inevitably pose new challenges that require change and renewal. (1983b, 155)

### Time Frame

The stabilization stage began in July, 1984 and culminated in June, 1985. The author was no longer a paid staff member of the Chapter once the PAF grant funding ended in June, 1984. However, she continued her involvement in unit and Chapter activities, e.g., temporary chair of the Austin County Unit's reorganization committee, member of the Chapter's Continuing Education Committee and the Professional Standards/Utilization Committee, elected Treasurer of the Chapter.

The author also sought and received an appointment to fill a consumer advocate position on the Austin County Human Services Advisory Council. These positions, in addition to periodic contact with the Chapter's new executive director, enabled her to monitor on-going SSBG implementation initiatives as well as efforts to incorporate the demonstration project's objectives into regular Chapter activities.

### Goals

Patti (1983b) states that the stabilization stage's main goal is to develop ". . .an ability to adapt and change in response to problems and emerging realities." (203)

The Chapter's Program Committee recommended and the Board approved the continuance of PFY 1984's program goals into the PFY 1985. These goals included:

1. securing legal regulation of social work,
2. promoting adequate and equitable support and funding for health, income maintenance and human services,
3. strengthening the Chapter, and
4. furthering the end of discrimination against minorities and disadvantaged groups within the state.

The SSBG project's activities were related to goal 2. When the stabilization stage began in July 1984, the Chapter's staff and volunteer leadership resources were limited. And program goal 2, promoting adequate funding for human services, competed with goal 1, securing licensure.

### Tasks

#### Stage-Related Administrative Tasks

Three tasks are associated with the stabilization stage: (a) staff maintenance and development, (b) program change or modification "to enhance its effectiveness or efficiency or the satisfaction of its participants," and program assessment. (Patti 1983b, 203)<sup>1</sup>

Patti noted that "information derived from systematic assessment is only one of several factors that may influence managerial decisions and actions." (173) He cites Weirich's (1980) observation that:

Decisions are often made on political grounds, for ideological reasons, out of tradition or habit, because of economic feasibility, from personal intuition and bias, or sometimes from simple expedience. Some decisions are never consciously made: things just seem to happen. (Weirich 1980 cited in Patti 1983b, 173)

#### Stage-Related Programmatic Tasks

The main programmatic task was to recommend a structure to the Board of Directors that would enable the project's various components to continue once the grant ended. When the project director left, there was no single staff person responsible for all aspects of the project.

As stated in Chapter II, Methodology, there are similarities between the first stage of initiation and the fourth stage, stabilization. The administrator continues to systematically collect and analyze data from various aspects of the program's environment. This information provides the basis for making decisions about the efficacy of the current program and about the potential benefits and costs associated with alternative approaches to service delivery.

However, one of the major differences between the first and last stages is the existence of special interest groups in the stabilization stage that may resist and/or advocate for change. Groups of clients and/or members, senior staff members, board members, or groups of unserved or underserved members may have strongly held opinions about

the need for changes in the program. This issue played a part in the extent to which the Chapter was able to continue the work of the project once the grant period ended.

As the project's host organization, the State Chapter's stability was crucial to the implementation of the block grant program and to its eventual institutionalization as a continuing part of the Chapter's social policy program. Patti (1983b) notes that "such things as changing political sentiments, economic circumstances, and turnover in organizational leadership, developments over which the manager has little control, may have a determinative impact on the program. . ." (69)

#### Stability of Host Organization

The following chronology continues the description of the changing "state of the Chapter" begun during the project's implementation stage.

## Narrative

### August, 1984

The Chapter Board selected a new executive director. He was from out-of-state.<sup>2</sup>

### February, 1985

1. In a memo to the licensure committee, the Board President clarified the role of the this committee "vis-a-vis the Coalition." She stated that the committee's job was to "organize, mobilize, activate our own. . .members" for a two-year effort to secure licensure. The committee needed 1) to let members know that everyone's help was needed, 2) to promote and support the licensure fund-raising committee's efforts, 3) to discuss licensure issues with members as well as other public groups, 4) to reach the Chapter's units, task forces, committee's to get them excited about licensure, 4) to develop a state-wide telephone tree so the association can mobilize resources quickly when needed.<sup>3</sup>

2. The chair of the block grant coalition reported on the status of the block grant improvement legislation, An Act establishing an Interdisciplinary Advisory Council on Block Grants. "The Senate and Assembly sponsors. . .approved a number of amendments in December 1984 that would expand the scope of the legislation and community participation in the process.

As amended. . ., the bills would now include representatives of county and municipal government on the special interdepartmental advisory council as well as public members, legislators and commissioners of four major state executive departments (community affairs, education, health, and human services). Other changes provide that all current or future federal block grant programs would be evaluated by the special council, whose work would be coordinated with the Joint Appropriations Sub-Committee on Federal Funds. The law would expire after two years of operation.<sup>4</sup>

### March, 1985

1. An article in the March newsletter titled "Hot News from the Licensure Front" announced the formation of the Coalition for Advancement of Social Work Standards. The initial eight organizational members included NASW, the [State] Association of Hospital Social Service Directors, the Clinical Social Workers of [State], a coalition of Jewish social agencies, a coalition of Catholic social agencies, the state's

graduate social work program, the Baccalaureate Social Work Educators, and the Council of Family Service Agencies.<sup>5</sup>

2. In March 1985 the Chester Unit held "a special meeting on licensing and what members can do during this phase of the campaign. Fund raising, political contact, and phone networking will be included . . . [Chair] of the Chapter's Fund Raising Committee will. . . help us set up our program."<sup>6</sup>

3. Approximately 400 social workers attended the Social Workers' Day Conference. A highly esteemed administrator of a public welfare agency was named "Social Worker of the Year." A state assemblyperson was named "NASW Citizen of the Year" because "He is an effective legislative advocate for the disadvantaged at-risk groups in our society. . . ." He sponsored legislation related to hunger, homelessness, senior citizens' health concerns, and technical job training for urban women. A congressman gave the keynote address and several key people from the state legislature and the executive branch came to honor the awardees.<sup>7</sup>

#### April, 1985

Efforts to reactivate ELAN were initiated by the newly-appointed state chairperson. The chairperson was a member of the Committee of Concerned Social Workers and was active in the Chester Unit. In a letter to former "ELANers" the new chair invited them to serve again and indicated that the committee was "attempting to identify a limited number of priority issues."<sup>8</sup>

#### June, 1985

1. The chair of the block grant coalition reported that "The block grant improvement bills were merged and passed by both houses of the state legislature in May. The bill was sent to the governor who conditionally vetoed the measure on June, 1985. This means he generally approved the bill but returned it to the Senate requiring certain amendments before he would sign it. The Senate approved the amendments on June 27, 1985.

The amended bill will have to be approved by both the Senate and the Assembly and signed by the Governor to become law. We hope for consideration by both houses when they reconvene in the Fall."<sup>9</sup>

2. The executive director's year end report stated that ". . .needless to say, the licensure effort of 1984-85 consumed much of my time. . .this was expected since licensure is a top priority." Licensure added three new components to work with--the Coalition to Advance Social Work Standards, the Chapter's licensure fund raising committee, and a lobbying consultant.

For PFY 85-86 the executive director anticipated spending more time in other areas such as declassification and Professional Standards/Utilization.<sup>10</sup>

This narrative provides a backdrop for presenting evaluation questions and answers for the Program Stabilization Stage.

#### Selected Evaluation Questions/Answers--Table 2.8

There are nine questions in Table 2.8 Evaluation Questions and Strategies, Program Stabilization Stage. The two discussed below include one question that assesses efforts to secure alternative resources and one question that assesses whether the SSBG project maintained the place it had tenuously secured for itself during the implementation stage.

#### Developing Alternative Resources, Stabilization Question 1

Question 1, effort, asks, "What is the extent and type of activities devoted to developing alternative sources of needed inputs? The focus is on the main unit of analysis. Documentation and participant observation are the data collection methods.

The project director presented an assessment of the SSBG project's effectiveness at the Chapter's May, 1984 Board of Directors' meeting.<sup>11</sup> She made several

recommendations for incorporating the project's activities into the on-going work of the professional association.

These recommendations included having the Chapter:

1. serve as a clearinghouse for information on block grants for its members as well as other organizations,
2. continue to lobby at the state level for increased funds for human services, for regulations that would protect client rights, and for Senate Bill #S-XO, An Act Establishing an Interdisciplinary Advisory Council on Block Grants.
3. review its process for selecting social action issues and consider the potential problems connected with county-level political action efforts,<sup>12</sup>
4. make selected members of the Program Committee responsible for coordinating SSBG educational and political activities among the units and state-level groups such as the Income Maintenance and Social Services Task Force,
5. consider ways to initiate and/or maintain contact with social workers serving on the various local planning groups, e.g., human services advisory councils, youth service commissions, alcoholism committees, area offices on aging, and mental health boards.

The first recommendation stressed the importance of the professional association's role as a source of information. The association needs up-to-date information to distribute



to its members and to other influential persons in the community. Because local planning processes are in a constant state of development and change, the Chapter needs links to sources of innovation and information in these key organizations. It is important for social workers to serve on these bodies, and it is equally important for other social workers to monitor the work of the various committees.

If the Chapter leadership decides to maintain what the SSBG project accomplished and expand the program to other counties, resources (staff, technical, and financial) need to be allocated to support activities related to Chapter program goals 2 and 3.

The Chapter has resources that could be utilized. The new Special Projects staff person could help integrate the project's objectives into on-going Chapter business. The anticipated purchase of a computer would allow the Chapter to maintain and increase the data base developed by the project. A reactivated ELAN network could take on the responsibility given to them and continue the process of identifying members serving on other county planning bodies and coalitions and recruiting these members to be official liaisons to the Chapter.

When one considers the extent of the "effort" expended to develop these programs, as outlined above and in Chapter V, and recognizes that there were another nine units encompassing from one to three counties in the Chapter, the

need for continued financial and personnel resources becomes apparent. Although various persons and committees could take on responsibility for some of the project's activities, it was also essential for the new executive director (or the Special Projects staff person) to take on overall responsibility for a project that was the Chapter's primary vehicle for accomplishing Program Goal #2.

Maintaining Service Domain,

Stabilization Question 6

Question 6, effectiveness, asks, "Has the program maintained a place for itself--in units? in participating schools? in the state chapter?" Documentation and participant observation were the methods utilized to collect data on project organizations and their subdivisions.

Three questions were asked in the implementation stage to determine whether or not the project made a beginning place for itself in the State Chapter, the cooperating schools, and the social service community. Variations of two of these questions are used to determine if the program maintained a place for itself during the stabilization period. The questions are:

1. Were there any indications of mutual activities following the jointly-sponsored block grant continuing education meetings during the stabilization stage?
2. Were social workers and other human service personnel involved in the new SSBG processes willing to

share their knowledge with the State Chapter and its subunits?

### Jointly-sponsored activities

#### Units

The three participating units had new officers. The Chester Unit advertised in the Chapter newsletter for members who wanted to serve on the unit's steering committee.

The Chester Unit's October 1985 meeting was held at Coyle College and members of the Committee of Concerned Social Workers shared some of their concerns and ideas for strengthening social work and the professional association in the state. A faculty member from Coyle College was the new unit chair. She also chaired the Chapter's licensing committee.<sup>13</sup> As indicated in the narrative the Unit also devoted a meeting to learning about the licensing efforts.

An open meeting to reactivate the Austin-Bedford Unit was held in May, 1985. The meeting convener was one of the social workers that staffed the county HSAC. She was also a member of the Administration Section. The participants voted to establish a separate Austin County unit.<sup>14</sup>

The Austin Unit held its first reorganization meeting on June 14, 1985, at Altmeyer-Buell University. Although the university was in the beginning stages of "phasing out" the social work program, the social work department continued to host meetings of the local NASW unit. Co-chairpersons of the newly-organized Austin Unit were from

the public sector, one was an agency administrator who served on the CHSAC. Almost everyone on the steering committee worked for agencies that received funding through the CHSAC. The unit's first program focused on how demographic changes would impact on the CHSAC's planning processes. Social workers who staffed the CHSAC were active members of the unit steering committee.<sup>15</sup>

The Dover Unit had new officers and unit activities focused on practice issues as well as on helping the United Way with its fund-raising telethon.

To the best of the author's knowledge, no additional units offered programs on the implementation of SSBG policies and procedures in their localities.

## Chapter

The Chapter's Administration Section and the Administration Sequence at Eliot Graduate School of Social Work jointly sponsored a Human Services Management Institute--the second annual social worker as administrator institute! Two of the 13 workshops were related to block grant issues.<sup>16</sup>

The faculty member of the Eliot School of Social Work's Administration Sequence who was also a member of the Chapter's Administration Section again presented the association's testimony at the Joint Appropriations Committee's April hearing.

Linkages between Chapter and social workers on county human services advisory council

The CHSACs were more actively involved in carrying out their mandated functions. Social workers, some of whom were NASW members, were serving on these councils. However, no organized effort to maintain connections established by the project was undertaken. As indicated in the narrative, the new executive director was devoting his time to learning about the state and organizing the various groups involved with licensing--the Coalition, the Chapter's licensing committee and fund-raising committee, and the recently-hired lobbying firm.

As planned, the SDHS gave the councils additional planning and allocation responsibility for other funding sources, e.g., federal, state, and county homeless funds; state funds for community-based services for persons with physical disabilities; state dollars targeted to troubled youth and their families, etc.

As the councils progressed in their work, additional issues emerged. They included:

1. deciding how unrestricted funds should be allocated among service populations,
2. developing principles to guide budget reductions, and
3. dealing with "political interference" from county legislators when awarding contracts to public and private, non-profit agencies.

Social workers serving on the councils were involved in deliberations related to these issues, but there was not a formal connection with NASW local units or with state entities.

Assessment of How Well Project Met  
its Stage-Related Tasks

A program that reaches the stabilization stage is apt to be near the "peak of its performance capability." (Patti 1983b, 156) Information received in previous stages have resulted in "successive refinements," staff have learned about the type of participants that are most likely to gain from the program, and the program has been tailored to meet participants' needs. Patti notes that "even while a program is becoming more directed and coherent, external events that may have little to do with its intrinsic value sometimes arise and threaten to disrupt" the program. (1983b, 156)

Some activities of the SSBG Project were continued. The second annual institute for administrators was maintained because key people in the Chapter and in the graduate school had an interest in increasing the visibility of social workers involved in administration. One of the local units that participated in the project sustained connections with social workers serving on or staffing the CHSAC. Another participating unit tried to keep abreast of licensure issues as well as social policy issues. However, the combination of new leadership and a "no holds barred" approach to securing licensure, resulted in limited

attention to the Chapter's goal of promoting adequate and equitable support and funding for health, income maintenance and human services.

Reeser and Epstein note that "social workers and their professional association. . .have invested considerable resources in the quest for professional status while at the same time they continued their support of social action. . .The pairing of these two sets of efforts assumes that the two are neither mutually exclusive nor in conflict with each other." (1990, 2) While this may be true of the association in general, it appears to be more difficult for a single Chapter to embrace both of these aspects at the same time. Limited resources require making choices.

As mentioned above, the stabilization stage ended in June 1985. However, the author has been able to keep up-to-date with the evolution of the CHSACs and the changes in the State Chapter.

The following vignettes provide additional information on issues that have been raised previously.

### Epilogue<sup>17</sup>

#### The State Chapter

#### Coalition to Advance Social Work Standards (Licensing)

The State Chapter's representative to the Coalition to Advance Social Work Standards wrote an article for the October 1985 newsletter in which she gave members an update. "The summer has been a time of hard work. . .for the. . . Coalition. We have drafted proposed amendments to our

original bill which are now under discussion with our sponsors. Politically, our lobbyists. . .have been talking to many senators and Assemblymen to gain their support. Members of the Coalition have been attending various political functions [cocktail party for a senator, Governor's Ball]."<sup>18</sup>

#### Licensing Fund Raising Committee Report

In March, 1986, the Chair of the Licensing Fund Raising Committee gave the board a report on membership involvement in response to concerns that the licensing effort was "sapping" Chapter energy.

She reported that the Committee had a core group of eight. "When. . .the chairs of our phone squads and their volunteers [are added] we then have an active membership that approaches 100. While the chairs of the phone squads have been. . .active in other NASW programs, the phone squad volunteers are drawn from people interested primarily in licensing and thereby 'new' to active membership. . . .the phone squads are for fund raising and general licensing concerns. When we get licensing, we should maintain them for other current issues or for PACE and ELAN.

Our appeal for donations has also tapped 'new' members . . . we are reaching into a new group of. . .members with our licensing effort--not sapping already stretched resources. Our appeal for donations has resulted in donations from 540 members and 5 organizations, bringing in about \$21,000. . . rather than taking away from [Chapter]



goals and other activities, our licensing effort. . .is enhancing NASW in general and getting more members involved."<sup>19</sup>

#### Chapter Achieves Licensing and Begins to Work on Gaining Vendorship Status

After twelve (plus) years, the Chapter finally achieved licensure.

1. The following remarks were made by the Governor at the Bill Signing Session:

I'm very pleased to be here--to finally put [study state] on the right course when it comes to social workers and the people they serve.

Today, I'm signing a bill into law that will require social workers in [State] to be licensed by the Board of Social Work Examiners.

It's been a long time coming, and I want to begin by commending all the people who have worked so hard to get this legislation passed. That includes the many social workers and other professionals who argued and lobbied for many years. Their persistence is admirable, and I'm glad it's paid off.

Before today, anyone who wanted to call themselves a social worker could hand out a card or hang up a sign. That's just not acceptable, and after today, it will be illegal.

I think we all know how fragile human beings can be in times of trouble, or in times of need. And when they turn to social workers, they deserve to know that they're being helped by people who know what they're doing; by people who are competent and have a proven level of expertise.<sup>20</sup>

2. An excerpt from article written by the chairperson of the licensing committee.

I would like to congratulate and thank all those who have labored extensively to accomplish legal regulation in the state. . .

Let's move forward to the next phase of the process, that of affecting the right of consumer choice for psychotherapy. [A member of the licensing committee] will be chairing the [consumer choice] committee. . . We should all give him our continued person-power and monetary support. Let's all work together toward the next goal!<sup>21</sup>

3. The executive director tried to answer members' questions about the lengthy process involved in setting up the licensing apparatus.

After years of waiting for a license bill to be passed callers ask why the regulatory process is taking so long. We hasten to point out that the members of the board were not appointed until a year after the bill was passed. In addition, what was anticipated to be a relatively simple task became a highly complex one.<sup>22</sup>

#### NASW Branch Unit Attempts to Influence County

##### Administration's Appointment of Human Services Department Director

When the Director of Human Services' position became vacant in one of the study counties, officers of the NASW branch unit met with the county executive and strongly recommended that a social worker with extensive administrative experience be hired to fill the vacancy. The outgoing director had been a political appointee. The county executive promoted a politically-connected division director. Although the new Director of Human Services was not a social worker, he was recognized as a strong advocate for persons with disabilities. The unit leadership debated whether or not to protest the appointment--there had been a well-qualified social work candidate for the position. They finally decided against voicing objections partly because the CHSAC reported to the Director of Human Services, and

the NASW unit officers worked for agencies that received funding through the CHSAC.<sup>23</sup>

### Social Workers Combine Forces to Form a "Think Tank"

In a joint venture designed to capitalize on the experience and knowledge of faculty and social work practitioners, NASW/XX and the faculty of the Eliot School of Social Work combined their energies to create a social work "Think Tank". . .

The idea of a Think Tank had its genesis several years ago during a Board of Directors Retreat. At that time a small group of board members discussed the possibility that NASW/XX could position itself to become a resource to social policy makers, legislators, and other opinion leaders in the state. There was a concern about the Association's lack of involvement in the evolution of major social policies effecting citizens of the state. The "Think Tank Planning Group" selected Welfare Reform as its first topic to explore. . . There is some interest in producing a "White Paper" on the social work profession that could be used by academic institutions, funding sources and labor organizations. There has also been interest expressed in the preparation of position papers for legislators on various subjects. (Excerpts from article in August 1994 NASW. . . NEWS.

Chapter Continues to Define Unit's Purpose:1993 Task Force on Chapter Structure

The Task Force on Chapter Structure was charged with reviewing the whole structure of NASW/XX. . . . Rather than have fourteen Units, many of which are relatively (or totally) inactive, the task force considered whether or not the Chapter should be regionalized. After much deliberation, task force members developed a plan that would preserve the very active units and merge some of the less active ones into regions. Each region would have two representatives who would be voting members of the Board. In addition to the officers, four individuals would be elected to positions of "at-large Board members." These members would also be voting members. The leadership committee would be instructed to consider the most active Committee Chairpersons as likely candidates to run for at-large positions on the Board.

The task force believed that the plan would preserve the idea that voting Board members should be representative of the membership; it would also assure that Affirmative Action guidelines could be met. In addition, it would give encouragement to active Committee Chairpersons, who would be able to look forward to being elected to a voting position on the Board while maintaining their chosen role as a Committee Chair...

The Report of the NASW/XX Restructuring Task Force was submitted to the Board for future consideration. (Excerpts from article in August, 1993, NASW. . .NEWS)

#### Summary

It took several years for the Chapter to secure licensure and to work out the intricacies related to establishing the Board of Social Work Examiners. The Chapter has not yet obtained vendorship status. However, more recently the Chapter has begun to focus on social policy issues and on its role as a provider of information. As noted above, involvement in professional issues and social issues may not be in conflict with each other. However, it seems that the State Chapter in this study could not sustain a strong commitment to both. Until licensure was attained, there was little interest and time devoted to social policy issues.

Whether or not social workers are prepared for social action activities was not the main focus of this study. However, the Chapter's experience indicated that it did not take long for members interested in securing licensure (a) to organize, (b) to raise money, and (c) to carry out sophisticated political action activities. Interested members sustained a high level of involvement for several years despite numerous disappointments.

Richan (1981) noted that "to the degree that a constituency makes an intense and sustained commitment of its resources to a cause, it will be able to actualize its

potential influence." (236) Those members working for licensure made this type of commitment.

The issue of the unit's role in the structure has not been adequately resolved. In 1995, the Chapter was still trying to strengthen units and to give committee chairpersons voting rights in the Chapter.

#### County Human Services Advisory Councils

The following incidents give some indication of the political atmosphere in which the CHSACs operated.

#### Agency Director (NASW member) Challenges CHSAC's

#### Funding Decision and Requests a Fair Hearing

An agency director whose proposal was not funded challenged the CHSAC's allocation plan and requested a fair hearing. The agency director, the CHSAC staff member, and the Chair of the Fair Hearing Committee were all members of NASW. The committee decided in favor of the CHSAC.

#### Agency Leaders Circumvent CHSAC's Implementation

#### of Budget Reduction Plan

1. A sub-committee of one of the project-related CHSACs worked for several months to develop guidelines for budget reductions. The SDHS decreed that county's could not use "across the board" cuts. The guidelines were approved by the full CHSAC membership and were consequently used to decide on cutbacks when state funding for services to the elderly and persons with disabilities was decreased.<sup>24</sup>

A member of the sub-committee (who was a successful businessman and an agency board member serving in a consumer

advocate position) whose program lost funding in the budget reduction process quietly bypassed the CHSAC and urged the county administration not to approve the council's recommendations. The county executive told the CHSAC staff to restore full funding to the program and to find other programs to cut.

2. The director of a sectarian agency was upset that two of her programs got low scores based on the Budget Reduction Protocol. She organized other agencies that were part of a consortium, mounted a publicity campaign criticizing the CHSAC, and had an official representative of the religious group that sponsored the agency contact county legislators. The county administrator told the CHSAC to reinstate part of the funding while also urging the sponsoring group to give more support to its own programs.

Director of CHSAC Forms State-Level Coalition that Lobbies for Increased Government Funding for Social Services

The director (a member of NASW) of one of the few CHSACs that were not part of county government organized a state coalition to fight for increased funds for social services. Representatives from various sectors lobbied for an increase in the total appropriation for human services rather than for increases in their specific service areas. The Coalition excluded government employees because it was felt that they would not be able to advocate effectively. The Coalition held together for three years. Then the

coalition broke down as state legislators and executives, began negotiating with specific service groups.<sup>25</sup>

#### Some CHSACs Begin to Take on Expanded Advocacy Role

1. In 1987, the State Human Service Advisory Council's Subcommittee on HSAC Guidelines was considering revisions in the state regulations governing the composition and responsibilities of county human service advisory councils. One recommendation was that "the CHSACs primary function should be one of advocacy." The SDHS disagreed "in that primary focus of the CHSACs are to provide an on-going forum for public input and participation in Department decision making and resource allocation on a county level. Advocacy should be one of the functions in relation to identified client needs, as developed through the comprehensive planning process."<sup>26</sup>

2. One of the CHSACs that participated in the SSBG demonstration project has recently initiated broad-scale advocacy efforts. Members of the local NASW unit and faculty from an undergraduate social work program participated in the CHSAC's first public hearing on welfare reform. As the state has reduced its level of funding for CHSACs, the councils have developed a broader funding base and seem to be more "comfortable" in taking on a larger advocacy role in the county and in the region.<sup>27</sup>

#### Summary

NASW local units had limited ability to take a stand on many of the issues that confronted the CHSACs. Very often



NASW members were involved in all sides of the issue, e.g., the fair hearing request, the circumvention of the budget reduction policies, and the appointment of a director of human services.

The SSBG project envisioned the local unit as the catalyst that would bring local groups together. For the reasons mentioned in Chapter VII, the units were not prepared to take on this role. Neither were the schools. However, over the years as the CHSACs matured, some of them emerged as catalysts for social action. As a truly county-based organization with broad representation the councils were more readily accepted in the advocacy role.

The People Count Coalition founded by the director of a county human service advisory council testified before the Legislature's Joint Appropriations Committee, held a convention "to build consensus among the human services community," and organized rallies at the state house.<sup>28</sup> This was the only group that participated in noninstitutionalized social action behavior.

## Chapter Endnotes

1. In Patti's model of program development, ". . . assessment is a continuing managerial responsibility throughout the program development cycle, [but] takes on special significance during the stabilization stage. . . ." (1983, 174) The "differential evaluation" model considers evaluation a key task for each developmental stage. This study uses the latter approach.
2. NASW-[XX] Appoints New Executive Director. NASW Focus, September, 1984.
3. NASW President, Memo to Licensure Committee, February 13, 1985.
4. Center for Non-Profit Corporations. (1985). Amended Block Grant Improvement Bills Receive Action in [Capital City]. Update. (February) p. 4.
5. NASW Focus, March 1985, p. 4.
6. NASW Focus, March 1985, p. 2.
7. Case study notes, March 29, 1985; "Social Workers' Day Program Draws 'Who's Who' list of Social Workers, Legislators, Bureaucratic and Municipal Executives," NASW Focus, May 1985, p. 5.
8. Chairperson, ELAN. Letter to ELANers, April 17, 1985.
9. Center for Non-Profit Corporations. 1985. #S-XO. Update. July-August. p.4.
10. Executive Director's [Annual] Report, June 1985.
11. Secretary, Board of Directors, Minutes, May 10, 1984.
12. The existing process made specialized state-level task forces, such as the Income Maintenance and Social Services Task Force, responsible for informing the Policy Council (composed of Task Force Chairpersons) and the state ELAN Committee of critical issues. The Council then assigned a "level of action" to each issue recognizing that the association "has wide interests but limited resources for action."
13. NASW Focus, October, 1984. "Unit Center" Announcement. P.7
14. NASW Focus. "Unit Center," May, 1985, p. 3; Case study notes, May, 17, 1985.
15. Austin-Bedford, Unit Center Announcement, NASW Focus, September, 1985, p.2.

16. Human Services Management Institute: Networking for Administrators brochure. April 19, 1985.

17. Author was appointed Member, Budget Reduction Committee, [State] Department of Human Services. (10/86-2/87) Developed budget reduction principles, format, and evaluation instrument in response to anticipated federal and state budget reductions.

Appointed Member, State Human Service Advisory Council's Subcommittee on HSAC Guidelines, [State] Department of Human Services. (3/87-5/87) Recommended revisions in state regulations governing composition and responsibilities of county human service advisory councils.

18. Coalition to Advance Social Work Standards, NASW Focus, October 1985.

19. Chair, Licensing Fund Raising Committee. Memorandum to Board of Directors, March 14, 1986.

20. Governor. . .Signs Social Work Licensure Act. NASW. . .NEWS.

21. Applause--Applause. NASW. . .NEWS.

22. Licensure Update. NASW. . .NEWS.

23. Prior to the development of CHSACs, the unit had a more positive experience. When a previous administrative vacancy arose in a public agency dealing with troubled youngsters, a coalition of the regional school of social work, the unit leadership, and selected other community leaders lobbied strenuously for a qualified replacement. Prior appointees had always had political connections with the party in power. The county leadership involved the coalition members in the search process and appointed one of the candidates recommended by the group. Members of the coalition felt they were influential because the agency had become an embarrassment to the county partly due to inept administrators.

24. [Austin] County HSAC Budget Reduction Options, February 8, 1989.

25. Conversation with chair of coalition. June, 1994.

26. [State] Register, Monday, January 5, 1987, Human Services.

27. Case study notes, interview with administrator of local HSAC, February 28, 1997.

28. (a) The Convention: Responding to Human Needs in [State], October 6, 1989; (b) [Governor] is Urged to Shift Funds to Community Social Services; (c) [Capital City] rally for needy, disabled, June 17, 1991; (d) People Count Coalition, Rally for Community Services, May 15, 1991

## CHAPTER IX

## RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Social Welfare Policy Context--1980s

In the early 1980's the Reagan administration launched an effort to restructure federal-state relations in the social welfare domain. One vehicle for accomplishing this objective was the increased use of block grants to fund social welfare programs. The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981 combined 57 federal categorical grants into nine block grants, reduced their funding levels, transferred responsibility for their administration to states, and weakened and/or eliminated federal regulations. As some states followed the federal government's lead and transferred responsibility for determining block grant priorities and procedures to counties, a myriad of decision making units blossomed. Considerable diversity in implementation was intentionally produced.

The NASW funded two special projects to learn more about the transfer processes and how the association could influence them. PROJECT BLOCK GRANT, carried out by national office staff and selected State Chapters, focused on the federal to state transfer process. The demonstration project that is the basis for this dissertation concentrated on the state to county transfer of social service block grant responsibilities.

The case study of the SSBG Demonstration Project reported here was designed to describe how the Project

evolved in the study state and to identify strategies that might prove effective for other State Chapters of the National Association of Social Workers. In this chapter, the strategies identified in the case study will be described and related to the literature that exists with respect to social workers' individual and collective involvement in political and social action in behalf of disadvantaged groups. The investigator will also assess the utility of the "differential model" for social program evaluation.

The discussion has been organized under six headings, as follows:

1. the tasks confronting the NASW in responding to the "New Federalism" in general and the Social Services Block Grant in particular;
2. strategies employed in the SSBG Demonstration Project that appear to be amenable for use by other State Chapters in accomplishing the same goals;
3. strategies identified as problematic for the State Chapter studied here;
4. the relevance of the case study findings to the ongoing dialogue regarding the involvement of the professional association and its members in social action efforts;
5. inferences regarding the capability of a professional association to involve practitioners and students in social action initiatives; and

6. the assessment of the "differential evaluation" model.

NASW and the Challenges of "New Federalism"

The analysis of the study state's implementation of SSBG policies and procedures identified at least three tasks that were incumbent on the professional association in meeting the challenges posed by the "New Federalism."

First, the decentralization of decision-making with respect to SSBG policy implies that any organization seeking to influence these decisions must identify the governmental entities responsible for block grant decision-making and determine (a) who are the key decision makers at the state and county levels of government; and (b) what are these decision makers' historical and current policy priorities. This observation supports the contention of Zinn and Rivard (1983) that the first step in responding to the SSBG is "to identify the primary individuals, groups, and organizations that. . .control decisions concerning social service funding." (35) It is clear from the results of this study that the identification of the relevant players in the political process of allocating social service block grant funds is no small task.

Second, the study indicates that the State Chapter must be prepared to modify and augment the mechanisms in place for involving members in social action efforts. Decentralization implies both a multiplicative increase in the number of actors who must be approached to further the

professional association's goals, and a dramatic change in the role of NASW State Chapter members. The national office staff can lobby to prevent further reductions in SSBG funds and to maintain regulations that protect the rights of clients. However, the centralized lobbying efforts of headquarter's staff cannot influence decisions with respect to a state or county's allocation of scarce resources. Since the locus of decision making regarding SSBG allocations in the study state lies in the counties, it is clear that the policy priorities of the social work community must be communicated by a much larger cadre of members operating at the grass roots level. If decisions with respect to resource allocation take place at the state and county levels, then political and social action efforts of the NASW must take place at these levels as well.

This implies the necessity of deciding who should speak with respect to the interests of the professional association at the county level. If members of local units are expected to perform this function, they must be actively involved with state task forces in the selection and development of local positions on key issues. And the local ELAN coordinator must be able to assist members in carrying out political activities effectively.

### Effective SSBG Project Strategies

Four strategies employed by the demonstration project were identified as being particularly effective, including:

1. a continuing education role for State Chapter entities working with local units;
2. the use of a statewide "institute" where social work planners and administrators can join with state, county and private sector representatives to learn about on-going changes in the system;
3. the acquisition and dissemination of strategic and technical information relevant to county and state SSBG policies and procedures; and
4. the emergence of the county human service advisory council as the most probable local organization to bring social service advocates together.

State Chapter committees, task forces, and sections should be encouraged to join with local units and provide continuing education programs related to the implementation of SSBG policies and procedures. The various constituencies of the regional schools of social work as well as county human service advisory council members could also be involved in the program. Units would not be expected to offer these programs without assistance from other components of the professional association. These efforts proved effective in keeping actual and potential social activists abreast of changing policies and regulations.



The establishment of an annual institute for administrators conducted under the joint sponsorship of the Chapter's Administration Section and the graduate school's administration sequence might help to attract more administrators to NASW membership. These potential members would also be the most likely segment of the profession to carry out social action activities. (Ezell, 1993; Pawlak and Flynn, 1990)

Richan (1988) emphasized the importance of acquiring "strategic information," which he defined as knowing where the key decisions are made, who has the power to make these decisions, and who or what will influence these decisions. Considerable effort was expended by the project director to acquire this information and to make it available to the NASW. The director also established important personal contacts with key actors in the SSBG information network. The new executive director and the reinstituted state ELAN Committee should take over the responsibility for maintaining and increasing the organization's information. Several authors stated that the profession's strongest tools for influencing social policy are reliable information and the development of personal ties. (See Mathews 1982, O'Connor 1983, Richan 1981, Schacter 1992)

The SSBG Demonstration Project was based on the assumption that there was a "natural network" of organizations at the county level that could provide the foundation for learning about changing policies and for

organizing social action activities. The local NASW unit was envisioned as the catalyst for bringing members of educational and governmental groups together. For the reasons described below, the local units were not effective catalysts. However, as described in Chapter VIII, some of the CHSACs emerged as the organizers of advocacy efforts on behalf of SSBG clients. NASW members and other social workers served on these councils.

### Difficulties Implementing Certain

#### SSBG Project Strategies

The case study revealed several problems faced by the SSBG Demonstration Project in implementing its planned strategies, as follows:

1. the State Chapter had limited ability to expand its social action domain to the local level;
2. it was difficult to forge a consensus on SSBG issues at the local level;
3. fewer NASW members are active at the unit level, and those who are active tend to be concerned with practice and/or professional status issues;
4. although the participating units had a roster of "ELANers" who were ostensibly prepared to become involved in political and social action, these members did not participate in project activities;
5. there is not a correspondence among the geographical areas covered by units, the regional focus

of the schools of social work, and the organization of local ELAN sectors;

6. although "natural networks" existed at the local level, the substantive issue of SSBG policies did not appear to be a rallying topic for members who normally participated in unit activities.

The limited ability of the State Chapter to expand its social action efforts to the local level was primarily due to the limited amount of resources allocated for this purpose once the grant funding ended. During the project time period, there was also competition among different segments in the professional association--some members wanted to use the association's resources to secure licensure and vendorship status, while others wanted to use resources to develop and promulgate the association's position on critical social policy issues.

It goes without saying that fundraising efforts are very important to the success of Chapters in meeting social action goals. At one point in the post-June 1985 period, the Chapter had to decide whether to mail information to members on licensing issues or on a proposed welfare reform statute that would be detrimental to AFDC clients. The leadership decided to send the licensing material as they felt that members interested in licensing would contribute funds to cover the mailing.<sup>1</sup>

Abrams and Goldstein (1982) suggested that financial support from members depends upon the extent to which the

members are well-informed regarding the issues. Richan (1981) noted that social workers are most likely to contribute their money and their time to a social policy initiative when they perceive the issue involved to represent a "mixed agenda." This means that social workers tend to become most committed to political action when they see the issue involved as vital to both the public interest and the special interests of the social work profession. Thus, one would expect that educational efforts carried out by State Chapters would do well to point out to members how the issue will affect their jobs and livelihood, as well as how important the issue is to the goals of providing needed social services and of empowering disadvantaged groups.

An unfortunate aspect of "New Federalism" pointed out by Sosin (1990) is the manner in which it places public and private agencies in competition for scarce SSBG funds. There was considerable competition for funds among the social service agencies in each county. This competitive aspect can be expected to make the creation of coalitions difficult, since potential members tend to perceive each other as rivals, rather than as allies who have similar visions of a better society. As described in Chapter VIII, the director of one of the CHSACs (who was also a member of NASW) organized a coalition of organizations that agreed to advocate for a larger human services state budget and not to undermine each other. This strategy was successful for three years; then agencies became more competitive as

government funds were reduced and as state officials began meeting and negotiating with administrators whose agencies served specific client populations.<sup>2</sup>

Decentralization means that some of the important decisions regarding the allocation of SSBG funds will be made at the county level. This implies the need to exert political influence in each county in the state. However, as this case study demonstrated there is little correspondence between the task requirements and the available resources.

Relevance of the Findings to the Dialogue  
Regarding Social Workers Involvement in  
Social Action Efforts

The case study findings made it clear that the social workers who attended the SSBG county continuing education meetings were not regular participants in unit affairs. It is also clear that the social workers who became politically active with respect to efforts to secure licensure and independent provider status for clinical social workers were generally not the individuals who were typically active in the State Chapter. It was widely believed that some of the individuals active in the licensing campaign would use their newly-acquired political skills to pursue political and social action efforts aimed at social reform. However, in the experience of this investigator, this did not occur. There is some evidence that suggests that some social workers let their membership in NASW lapse once licensure

was achieved. (Gibelman and Schervich 1993, 1997) This finding supports the notion that social workers do not tend to pursue political and social action as a matter of course, because they are inclined toward such activities or because they feel confident that they are good at such activities. Rather, they become involved in political and social action efforts when they perceive the issue as relevant to their own needs and ostensibly to the needs of the clients they serve.

These findings also offer some support for the "process model" of professions that views professions as "loose amalgamations of segments, pursuing different objectives in different manners and more or less deliberately held together under a common name at a particular time in history." (Bucher and Strauss 1961, 325 cited in Reeser and Epstein 1990, 23)

Inferences Regarding the Capability  
of the Professional Association to  
Involve Practitioners and Students  
in Social Action Activities

Haynes and Mickelson (1992) argued that "the profession entered the 1980s without sufficient interest or expertise in political activity, neither entrenched in the public sector nor immersed in advocacy." (175) Several authors indicated that the professional association increased its political activity in the mid-1980's. (Ezell 1993, Haynes and Mickelson 1992, Reeser and Epstein 1990, Weismiller and

Rome 1995) According to Weismiller and Rome (1995) the NASW is currently committed to the goal of promoting political and social action. They indicate that this commitment is manifest in the association's increased involvement in electoral and issue politics.

Weismiller and Rome (1995) asserted that during the 1990s the major institutions representing the profession have been seeking to promote the role of social workers in political and social action. However, in this effort, the social work profession is faced with substantial disadvantages. Social workers tend not to have the resources to make large contributions to committees formed for the advancement of social action goals. Social workers do not constitute a large voting block that can command the attention of politicians by virtue of sheer numbers, like the United Auto Workers Union can. Therefore, to have an impact on decisions affecting the allocation of scarce resources, social workers must rely largely on their knowledge of social policy and the status of disadvantaged groups, which they can use to provide policymakers with accurate and relevant information with respect to specific policy issues. Unfortunately, the emphasis that the profession has placed on professionalization and the concomitant ascendance of the social casework model of social work education has limited the number of social workers who are knowledgeable enough about social policy issues to provide such information.

### Social Welfare Policy Context--1990s

Bailey and Koney (1997) comment on the similarities between the current political climate and the atmosphere in the 1980s. They note that

Spending cuts are a priority, this time to balance the federal budget. Emphasis is being placed on reducing the role of the federal government, returning power to the states, and cutting taxes. Given the policy priorities of today, political dialogue is centering more frequently on decentralization and devolution to describe "new" approaches to government reform. . . . With the focus on expanding state control of welfare and reducing social spending, competition for finite resources is increasing as well. (73)

Weil (1997) discusses the "extraordinary challenges" facing the social work profession and asserts that the profession should "respond to these changing conditions in ways that are proactive, advocate for vulnerable populations, and emphasize and expand skills in community-focused practice that connect empowerment strategies with social and economic development." (35) She maintains that

For the profession to respond to the challenges related to diminishing federal responsibility in human services and social policy, it is necessary to reinvest in community practice strategies to help build communities, strengthen local- and state-level social planning, and make connections between social and economic developments. . . . As decision making for social welfare devolves to the local level, representatives of oppressed groups and communities and social workers must be included in the planning, governance, and evaluation of programs and in cross-system collaboratives. (1997, 58)

This study raises questions about which professional organizations and individuals are willing and able to initiate the type of effort described by Weil.



## Assessment of the "Differential Evaluation"

### Model of Social Program Evaluation

The "differential model" of social program evaluation was originally designed to help administrators improve their programs by using systematic feedback at each of the three phases of program development--initiation, contact, and implementation. (Tripodi et. al. 1978) Augmentation of the model to include the stabilization stage was made during a period of "worsening economic conditions and changes in federal and state policies." (Bielawski and Epstein, 1984, 14)

The author applied the model and it proved to be useful in several ways. As an orienting framework it assisted the author in thinking through the development and implementation of the SSBG Project. Developing evaluative questions for each developmental stage prior to the initiation of the project enabled this investigator to be prepared for shifts in goals and tasks as the project moved through its sequential stages. Assessing the project's process and outcome at each of its four developmental stages resulted in programmatic changes that were beneficial to accomplishing project objectives. For example, the information collected during the program contact stage prompted the author to focus on additional populations that would be more interested in the project activities.

The "differential evaluation" model as presently conceived does not include directives related to providing a

context for the stage-related evaluation. Because the evaluative questions are linked with discrete program development stages, the researcher needs to keep in mind the broader context within which the program is located. Using Yin's (1989) case study protocol in conjunction with the model was helpful in this regard. The protocol recommended preparing an overview of the case study project that covered background information about the project and the substantive issues being investigated.

The program development process is "untidy." Therefore, the use of a "theoretical framework of change and development is a powerful tool for the administrator." (Selznick 1957 as cited in Vosburgh and Perlmutter 1984, 124) As noted by Bielowski and Epstein (1984), when the political and economic climate requires administrators to maintain programs during periods of decreasing resources the use of the model can "help administrators conceptualize and gather information that will inform a more rational choice among alternative responses to funding and constituent pressures." (23)

## Chapter Endnotes

1. Case Study Notes, Conversation with Chapter Executive Director.
2. Case study notes. Interview with chair of the People Count Coalition, June, 1994. (The chairperson was also the director of a county human services advisory council.)

## **APPENDICES**

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Case Study Protocol**

#### **A.1 Overview**

#### **A.2 Major Tasks**

#### **A.3 Evaluation Questions/Research Strategies**

- a. Program Initiation Stage**
- b. Program Contact Stage**
- c. Program Implementation Stage**
- d. Program Stabilization Stage**

## NASW/XX BLOCK GRANT DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

### A.1 Overview

#### I. Background

Human service block grants directly affect the ability of human service organizations to deliver basic and support services. NASW/XX has expressed its concern about the use of block grants as a funding mechanism; and, during the past two years, about their allocation at state levels. One of the major goals of the national project (PROJECT BLOCK GRANT) was to understand the block grant process. Available evidence suggests that the allocation of human service block grants are being transferred to county and local governments. NASW/XX needs to learn more about this process at the local level and begin to influence how these funds are allocated.

NASW/National has identified five major goals for the organization. This project relates to three of them:

1. advocating for adequate funding for income maintenance, health and human services;
2. developing and mobilizing the political potential of the membership; and
3. developing pertinent continuing education programs for members.

The National Board has also identified three areas of concentration. This project relates to two of them:

1. legislative and political action especially with regard to the support for health and human services, and

2. actions which seek to build the influence of NASW and gain public recognition of it especially as an advocate for a more humane society.

State chapters (including their local units) are urged to develop programs that relate to the major goals of the organization as determined by the Delegate Assembly. Local units and chapters around the country need to develop strategies and techniques for impacting block grant allocations on the local level before patterns are fixed and thus harder to change. The efforts of local coalitions need to be directed at the level of funding, the priorities for that funding, the procedures for allocation decisions, and the procedural safeguards now removed from block grants.

## II. Focus of Project

This project focuses on developing educational and social action efforts at state and county levels.

State-level efforts will center on working with the State Block Grant Coalition to secure passage of legislation reestablishing regulations protecting clients' rights that were eliminated at the federal level. Selected state-wide continuing education activities will be conducted under project auspices and/or in conjunction with other organizations.

The main focus, however, will be at the county level. Practice/education networks will be organized in the geographical area covered by three local units of NASW/XX.

The networks' tasks will include:

1. sponsoring educational activities related to evolving state and county social service block grant (SSBG) implementation policies; and
2. mobilizing participants to become advocates for an equitable allocation of SSBG funds in their respective counties and for state regulations that would protect consumer rights and ensure accountability.

This project assumes that strengthening grassroots efforts at the unit level will result in the state chapter having more influence on county and state block grant political processes.

### III. Project Design

The design includes the following components:

1. building collaborative networks at the local level that include schools of social work, local NASW units, and county human service advisory councils;
2. developing and delivering continuing education programs organized around the topic of "block grants and what to do about them;"
3. recruiting and mobilizing NASW members; faculty, field instructors, and students in participating social work programs; and county human service coalition members to become more active politically; and



4. providing opportunities for social work students in social policy classes to become involved in social action efforts.

This project will utilize a collaborative approach to organizing continuing education and social action efforts. Four social work programs and three local units of NASW/XX will participate in the project. They include:

| <u>School</u>                                    | <u>NASW Unit</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| Eliot University, Newark<br>BSW and MSW Programs | Dover            |
| Dunham Falls University<br>BSW Program           | Dover            |
| Coyle College<br>BSW Program                     | Chester          |
| Altmeyer-Buell University<br>BSW Program         | Austin-Bedford   |

Members of county human service advisory councils (CHSACs) will be invited to join the local networks.

The schools of social work each have a group of agencies that serve as field placement sites for students. Faculty, students and staff from these agencies comprise a sizeable group in each county. NASW/XX members of local units also include significant numbers of social workers. (Some may be serving as field instructors for the schools.) Added to this "natural" network will be human service advocates from the county HSACs. These groupings form a nucleus in each county for organizing educational and political activities.

Volunteers from the groups mentioned above will be recruited to serve as speakers and workshop leaders for the continuing education series. A nationally prominent keynote speaker will "kick off" the continuing education/social action activities. This will be helpful in publicizing the profession's interest in supporting adequate social services for clients.

Student liaisons from each school will be recruited and they will receive a small stipend (\$200). Liaison responsibilities will include keeping fellow students informed of the process, recruiting students to participate in continuing education events, making logistical arrangements, and involving students in policy analysis and social action activities. This final responsibility will be shared with faculty members at each school and with the project director.

#### IV. Available Resources

The grant project was developed in consultation with NASW/XX's executive director, program committee, and board. NASW/XX has a long standing position among social and human service agencies in the state as an advocate for equitable distribution of human service dollars. In the Title XX process the chapter was among the first to urge formation of county coalitions. For ten years the chapter has participated in the shape, form, and amount of the state's human services budget. The professional association has expressed concern about human service block grants via

letters, participation in coalitions, and meetings with key state leaders. Based on past positions, experience, and standing; NASW/XX is ideally suited to help guide and shape an effort for equitable distribution of block grants by local government. As a provider of continuing education, the state chapter is well respected. It has a large ELAN and local units are well established.

. . .The Project Director. . . is currently a faculty member at Altmeyer-Buell University where she teaches in the social policy area and coordinates the internship program. She has been an active member of the chapter, is currently chairperson of the Austin-Bedford Unit ELAN, and is a member of the Chapter's Continuing Education Committee. She arranged a reduced workload at the university for the 1983-84 academic year so she can devote 1/4 time to this project.

The NASW Program Advancement Fund award provides funds to carry out grant activities.

Contacts:

|                  |                             |
|------------------|-----------------------------|
| NASW/XX          | Chapter Phone Number        |
| Project Director | Home and Work Phone Numbers |

(Date of Original Document, June 3, 1983)

## NASW/XX BLOCK GRANT DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

### A.2 Major Tasks

The initial stage of the program development process will take place during the first two months of the project, July and August, 1983. A Planning Committee will be appointed by the Project Director and Executive Director of NASW/XX. This committee will be used to facilitate the accomplishment of beginning tasks such as identifying liaison people from the various target populations, reviewing various formats for delivering the continuing education program, and selecting topics and speakers for the forums. The Project Director will review relevant literature and establish links with appropriate organizations and individuals.

#### **Task 1. Building a network of relationships at the county level**

At the local level there are three types of already existing organizations that could work together to educate and mobilize practitioners and students around block grant issues. These organizations are schools/departments of social work, local chapter units, and county human service advisory councils. One of the first project tasks is to build a network of relationships among the three previously mentioned organizations in four demonstration counties.

This major task can be divided into the following sub-tasks:

1. appointing a planning committee composed of representatives from the three organizations mentioned above;
2. identifying liaison people from the student bodies and faculty of the participating schools, from state and local chapter units and from existing coalitions and agencies; and
3. assessing the concerns and perspectives of the various constituencies in the network regarding topics related to the use of block grants in the counties.

**Task 2. Reviewing relevant literature and programs**

This task includes reviewing information from other block grant projects to build on what has been accomplished in this area already. Particular attention will be given to the national office's experience in implementing PROJECT BLOCK GRANT in nine states. However, this project will focus on building grassroots coalitions at the local level rather than focusing on the state level.

Also, literature related to the project's intervention plan and methodology will be reviewed.

**Task 3. Designing continuing education program**

A continuing education program for chapter members; county human service advisory council members; students, field instructors and other agency personnel, and faculty at the participating schools will be developed. The program will keep participants abreast of changing policies and

regulations related to block grant implementation in the state.

In addition to informing participants about the current situation in regard to block grants, the program will also attempt to recruit participants for local ELAN teams and/or for existing coalitions of human service advocates.

This task has several sub-tasks:

1. selecting a nationally prominent keynote speaker for the opening session of the continuing education series;
2. selecting workshop topics from lists generated by constituents;
3. identifying and recruiting individuals with expertise from the membership of the participating organizations to volunteer to conduct workshops;
4. selecting locations and formats for workshops and forums;
5. selecting and/or developing training materials to distribute at workshops; and
6. developing promotional materials targeted to potential participants as well as the general public.

**Task 4. Conducting continuing education program**

The program will be conducted in accordance with the protocol developed as part of task 3 above beginning in late October [1983] and ending in February [1984]. The program will be timed to coincide with the legislative process so that newly recruited and continuing members of ELAN teams

can contact legislators on the Appropriations Committee who will be holding hearings during the early part of 1984 for the SFY85 budget.

Increasingly, the relationship between federal-state-local government funding makes multiple interventions necessary. Therefore, plans to contact congressional representatives, state legislators and local officials will be coordinated with the state ELAN committee.

**Task 5.   Assisting ELAN unit coordinators in recruiting and training volunteers for ELAN teams**

See Task 3 above.

**Task 6.   Providing ongoing consultation and assistance to ELAN coordinators**

During and after the continuing education series, the project director will provide assistance to ELAN coordinators to help train volunteers and to maximize the impact of social action efforts [such as lobbying, preparing testimony, attending hearings] on county and state legislative bodies.

**Task 7.   Building a network that will continue once the project ends**

To sustain the work of the project, the director will strive to form a permanent planning committee with leadership people identified and in place. This grassroots coalition of key organizations will need to continue to exert influence on county and state governmental bodies as new block grant directives and regulations take shape and to

press for adequate funding of human services at the state, county, and municipal levels.

County coalitions will need to monitor the implementation of block grant programs and to stay abreast of changing policies.

**Task 8. Evaluating the effectiveness of the model**

The model used to organize social workers and other human service staff at the county level is a collaborative one bringing together practitioners and educators. The effectiveness of this model will be assessed. Additionally, the discrete continuing education activities will be evaluated.



**EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND STRATEGIES**  
**PROGRAM INITIATION STAGE\***

| <b>Evaluation Objectives/Questions</b>                                                                                                                                                                                   | <b>Evaluation Strategies/Methods**</b> |                             |                  |                               |               |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | <b>Case Study Strategy</b>             |                             |                  |                               |               |
| <b>Effort</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                            | <b>Documen-<br/>tation</b>             | <b>Archival<br/>Records</b> | <b>Interview</b> | <b>Particl-<br/>pant Obs.</b> | <b>Survey</b> |
| 1. How much time and activity are devoted to identifying liaison people from each constituent group (faculty, students, NASW unit membership, county human services advisory council)?                                   | X                                      | X                           | X                | X                             |               |
| 2. What is the extent and type of activity devoted to procuring cooperation from the schools, NASW/NJ local units, and chapter committees that are essential to carrying out the project?                                | X                                      |                             |                  | X                             |               |
| 3. What efforts are focused on learning about the content of the proposed continuing education program (social service block grant implementation policies and procedures at the state and county levels of government)? | X                                      |                             |                  | X                             |               |

## Continuation of Program Initiation Stage

| Evaluation Objectives/Questions                                                                                                                 | Evaluation Strategies/Methods**<br>Case Study Strategy |                     |           |                       |        |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------|
|                                                                                                                                                 | Documen-<br>tation                                     | Archival<br>Records | Interview | Partici-<br>pant Obs. | Survey |
| <b>Effectiveness</b>                                                                                                                            |                                                        |                     |           |                       |        |
| 4. How many of the liaison positions are filled?                                                                                                | X                                                      |                     |           |                       |        |
| 5. To what extent do schools and NASW/NJ units perceive the program as related to their needs?                                                  |                                                        |                     | X         | X                     |        |
| 6. To what extent can potential participants be identified: students, ELAN members, other NASW members, human service advisory council members? | X                                                      |                     |           |                       |        |
| 7. To what extent is a program plan specified?                                                                                                  | X                                                      |                     |           |                       |        |
| 8. To what extent are data collection procedures established?                                                                                   | X                                                      |                     |           |                       |        |
| 9. To what extent have beginning relationships been formed and/or strengthened among target groups in each county?                              |                                                        |                     | X         | X                     |        |

## Continuation of Program Initiation Stage

| Evaluation Objectives/Questions                                                                                                                                                                                            | Evaluation Strategies/Methods**<br>Case Study Strategy |                     |           |                       |        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------|
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Documen-<br>tation                                     | Archival<br>Records | Interview | Partici-<br>pant Obs. | Survey |
| <b>Efficiency</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                        |                     |           |                       |        |
| 10. To what extent are there duplicated liaison functions that could result in possible ambiguity?                                                                                                                         | X                                                      |                     | X         | X                     |        |
| 11. To what extent do liaison persons perceive project objectives as similar or dissimilar; to what extent do the organizations that they represent have competing objectives that are at cross purposes with the project? |                                                        |                     | X         | X                     |        |

\* Based on format developed by Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978.

\*\* Methods are defined in Case Study Research Section of chapter. Note: An "X" indicates that the method in a particular column can be used to answer the evaluation question in the same row.

**EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND STRATEGIES**  
**PROGRAM CONTACT STAGE\***

| <b>Evaluation Objectives/Questions</b>                                                                                                                        | <b>Evaluation Strategies/Methods**</b> |                             |                  |                               |               |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|
|                                                                                                                                                               | <b>Documen-<br/>tation</b>             | <b>Archival<br/>Records</b> | <b>Interview</b> | <b>Particl-<br/>pant Obs.</b> | <b>Survey</b> |
| <b>Effort</b>                                                                                                                                                 |                                        |                             |                  |                               |               |
| 1. What amounts of time and program resources are devoted to making contacts with liaison persons from cooperating organizations? with intended participants? | X                                      |                             |                  | X                             |               |
| 2. What efforts are devoted to the compilation of data pertaining to program activity?                                                                        | X                                      | X                           |                  |                               |               |
| 3. What amounts of time and activity are devoted to finding key informants that could increase the number of contacts with target populations?                |                                        |                             | X                | X                             |               |

## Continuation of Program Contact Stage

| Evaluation Objectives/Questions                                                                                            |                    | Evaluation Strategies/Methods**<br>Case Study Strategy |           |                       |        |  |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------|--|
| Effort (con't)                                                                                                             | Documen-<br>tation | Archival<br>Records                                    | Interview | Particl-<br>pant Obs. | Survey |  |
| 4. To what extent are alternative strategies sought and used when efforts do not appear sufficient to reach target groups? | X                  |                                                        | X         | X                     |        |  |
| Effectiveness                                                                                                              |                    |                                                        |           |                       |        |  |
| 5. To what extent are the intended target groups represented in each county's network?                                     | X                  |                                                        |           | X                     |        |  |
| 6. To what extent have contacts resulted in positive working relationships among target groups in each county?             |                    |                                                        | X         | X                     |        |  |
| 7. What are the opinions of the intended beneficiaries regarding the reasons why contacts are or are not made?             |                    |                                                        | X         |                       |        |  |

Continuation of Program Contact Stage

| Evaluation Objectives/Questions                                                                                                                                                                             |               | Evaluation Strategies/Methods**<br>Case Study Strategy |           |                  |        |  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------------------|--------|--|
| Efficiency                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Documentation | Archival Records                                       | Interview | Participant Obs. | Survey |  |
| 8. What are the relative results of using different means for contacting potential participants (letters, group meetings, liaison persons)?                                                                 | X             |                                                        |           | X                |        |  |
| 9. Are liaison functions and roles structured to maximize consistency in each county so project goals can be achieved?                                                                                      |               |                                                        | X         |                  |        |  |
| 10. Are certain attributes of participants more related to successful project contacts than others, i.e., membership in NASW? membership in ELAN? holding multiple roles in network? other characteristics? | X             | X                                                      |           | X                | X      |  |

\*Based on format developed by Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978.

\*\* Methods are defined in Case Study Research Section of chapter. Note: An "X" indicates that the method in a particular column can be used to answer the evaluation question in the same row.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND STRATEGIES  
PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION STAGE\*

| Evaluation Objectives/questions |                                                                                                                                                          | Evaluation Strategies/Methods** |                     |           |                       |        |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------|
|                                 |                                                                                                                                                          | Case Study Strategy             |                     |           |                       |        |
|                                 |                                                                                                                                                          | Documenta-<br>tion              | Archival<br>Records | Interview | Particl-<br>pant Obs. | Survey |
| Effort                          |                                                                                                                                                          |                                 |                     |           |                       |        |
| 1.                              | How much time and effort are devoted to a review of project's objectives and goals?                                                                      | X                               |                     |           |                       |        |
| 2.                              | What staff efforts are involved in the respecification of goals and in the location of additional resources judged necessary to achieve project results? | X                               |                     |           |                       |        |
| 3.                              | How much time and activity are devoted to procuring follow-up information from program participants?                                                     | X                               |                     |           |                       |        |

## Continuation of Program Implementation Stage

| Evaluation Objectives/Questions |                                                                                                                                                                                 | Evaluation Strategies/Methods**<br>Case Study Strategy |                  |           |                  |        |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------|-----------|------------------|--------|
| Effectiveness                   |                                                                                                                                                                                 | Documentation                                          | Archival Records | Interview | Participant Obs. | Survey |
| 4.                              | Has the program made a beginning place for itself -- in the two major social work organizations that participated in the block grant project? in the social services community? | X                                                      | X                | X         | X                |        |
| 5.                              | What benefits have accrued for individuals and institutions?                                                                                                                    |                                                        |                  |           |                  | X      |
| 6.                              | Are there any unplanned outcomes, either desirable or undesirable, that could be attributed to the project?                                                                     |                                                        |                  | X         | X                |        |
| 7.                              | How effective is the collaborative model used to engage and educate members to they would be able to influence SSBG policy implementation at the local level?                   | X                                                      | X                | X         | X                | X      |



Continuation of Program Implementation Stage

| Evaluation Objectives/Questions |                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Evaluation Strategies/Methods**<br>Case Study Strategy |                     |           |                       |        |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------|
| Effectiveness (Con't)           |                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Documenta-<br>tion                                     | Archival<br>Records | Interview | Particl-<br>pant Obs. | Survey |
| 8.                              | What results have been achieved that could be attributed to the project? Are there changes in the knowledge, attitudes and/or behavior on the part of project-related individuals or organization? |                                                        |                     | X         | X                     | X      |
| Efficiency                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                                                        |                     |           |                       |        |
| 9.                              | What are the relative results of different approaches used to achieve similar results?                                                                                                             | X                                                      |                     |           |                       |        |
| 10.                             | Could the same results be achieved with a reduction in the project director's efforts?                                                                                                             | X                                                      |                     | X         | X                     |        |

Continuation of Program Implementation Stage

| Evaluation Objectives/Questions |                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Evaluation Strategies/Methods**<br>Case Study Strategy |                     |           |                       |        |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------|
| Efficiency (Con't)              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Documenta-<br>tion                                     | Archival<br>Records | Interview | Particl-<br>pant Obs. | Survey |
| 11.                             | How do the participating county networks compare on items such as level of participation, interest of participants in becoming involved in social action efforts, strength or relationships among groups in local network? | X                                                      |                     | X         | X                     | X      |

\*Based on format developed by Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978.

\*\* Methods are defined in Case Study Research Section of chapter. Note: An "X" indicates that the method in a particular column can be used to answer the evaluation question in the same row.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND STRATEGIES  
PROGRAM STABILIZATION STAGE\*

| Evaluation Objectives/Questions |                                                                                                                                                  | Evaluation Strategies/Methods** |                     |           |                       |        |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------|
|                                 |                                                                                                                                                  | Documenta-<br>tion              | Archival<br>Records | Interview | Partici-<br>pant Obs. | Survey |
| Effort                          |                                                                                                                                                  |                                 |                     |           |                       |        |
| 1.                              | What is the extent and type of activities devoted to developing alternative sources of needed inputs?                                            | X                               |                     |           | X                     |        |
| 2.                              | What efforts are devoted to keeping volunteer leadership and staff current with changes in state and county block grant policies and procedures? | X                               | X                   |           | X                     |        |
| 3.                              | What is the extent and type of activity designed to involve members in influencing governmental block grant implementation processes?            | X                               |                     |           | X                     |        |

## Continuation of Program Stabilization Stage

| Evaluation Objectives/Questions |                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Evaluation Strategies/Methods* |                  |           |                  |        |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------|------------------|--------|
| Effort (Con't)                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                       | Documentation                  | Archival Records | Interview | Participant Obs. | Survey |
| 4.                              | What efforts are made by key members of the organization to communicate and convey the organization's official positions on block grant issues to staff, committees, sections, task forces and units? | X                              |                  |           | X                |        |
| <b>Effectiveness</b>            |                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                |                  |           |                  |        |
| 5.                              | To what extent has the program developed diversified sources of key resources?                                                                                                                        | X                              |                  | X         | X                |        |
| 6.                              | Has the program maintained a place for itself -- in the two major social work organizations that participated in the block grant project? in the social service community?                            | X                              |                  |           | X                |        |

Continuation of Stabilization Stage

| Evaluation Objectives/Questions |                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Evaluation Strategies/Methods*<br>Case Study Strategy |                     |           |                       |        |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------|
| Effectiveness (con't)           |                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Documenta-<br>tion                                    | Archival<br>Records | Interview | Partici-<br>pant Obs. | Survey |
| 7.                              | Have adaptations been made in the original project objectives? If so, on what basis were these adaptations made? What results have been achieved that could be attributed to these adaptations? |                                                       |                     | X         | X                     |        |
| 8.                              | Are there any unplanned outcomes that could be attributed to the program (either desirable or undesirable)?                                                                                     |                                                       |                     |           | X                     |        |
| Efficiency                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                                                       |                     |           |                       |        |
| 9.                              | What are the relative results of using a different approach to achieve similar results?                                                                                                         | X                                                     |                     |           | X                     |        |

\* Based on format developed by Tripodi, Fellin and Epstein 1978.

\* Methods are defined in Case Study Research Section of chapter. Note: An "X" indicates that the method in a particular column can be used to answer the evaluation question in the same row.

**APPENDIX B**

**Continuing Education Program Evaluation Forms**

**B.1 County Meeting Evaluation Form**

**B.2 Spring Forum Evaluation Form**

**UPDATE ON SOCIAL SERVICES  
BLOCK GRANT/HUMAN SERVICES  
PLANNING IN CHESTER COUNTY**

**January Meeting of the NASW/XX  
Chester County Unit  
Thursday, January 26, 1984**

**Hosted by Coyle College, Chester, XX**

**B.1 County Meeting Evaluation Form**

(Please complete this form and place it in box at registration table as you leave. Thank you.)

1. In general, how would you rate the content presented at this meeting?

Excellent\_\_\_ Very Good\_\_\_ Satisfactory\_\_\_ Fair\_\_\_ Poor\_\_\_

Comments:

2. In general, how would you rate the meeting arrangements (location, facilities, refreshments)?

Excellent\_\_\_ Very Good\_\_\_ Satisfactory\_\_\_ Fair\_\_\_ Poor\_\_\_

Comments:

3. How would you rate the panel presentation?

Excellent\_\_\_ Very Good\_\_\_ Satisfactory\_\_\_ Fair\_\_\_ Poor\_\_\_

Comments:

4. How effective was the presentation in helping you to understand issues related to human services planning in Chester County?

Very Useful\_\_\_ Useful\_\_\_ Somewhat Useful\_\_\_ Not Useful\_\_\_

Comments:

Meeting Evaluation Form  
Page 2

5. How useful do you think the meeting was in helping you become a more effective advocate for an equitable allocation of human service funds in your county?

Very Useful\_\_\_ Useful\_\_\_ Somewhat Useful\_\_\_ Not Useful\_\_\_

Comments:

6. Do you think the panelists should have addressed other issues?

Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_ If yes, please comment.

7. Do you think other participants should have been asked to make presentations?

Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_

If yes, please list your suggestions, including person's organizational affiliation.

8. We are interested in knowing who this presentation is reaching. Please check all the categories that apply to you.

|                  |       |                 |     |
|------------------|-------|-----------------|-----|
| Staff/field      |       | Student         |     |
| placement agency | ___   | NASW member     | ___ |
| Faculty          | ___   | "ELANer"        | ___ |
| CHSAC member     | ___   | Agency employee | ___ |
| Other (Specify)  | _____ |                 |     |

9. What prompted you to attend this meeting?

10. How often do you attend the monthly meeting of the Chester County NASW Unit?

Frequently\_\_\_ Occasionally\_\_\_ Rarely\_\_\_ Never\_\_\_

I am not a member of the Chester NASW Unit. \_\_\_



Meeting Evaluation Form  
Page 3

**Please detach this sheet and turn it in separately  
if you want your evaluation to be anonymous.**

If you would like more information about ways in which you can work toward greater support for human services funding, for an equitable allocation of human services funds in your county, and against deregulation that weakens protection for clients, please fill out the following:

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

CITY \_\_\_\_\_ STATE \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP \_\_\_\_\_

HOME PHONE (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_

BUSINESS PHONE (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_

AGENCY AFFILIATION, IF ANY \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for completing this evaluation form.

**NASW/XX Chapter  
Administration Section and Block Grant Project**

**B.2 Spring Forum Evaluation Form**

**HUMAN SERVICES PLANNING ISSUES CONFRONTING  
LOCAL DECISION-MAKERS**

**Forum Evaluation Form**

(Please complete this form and place it in box at registration desk as you leave. Thank you.)

1. In general, how would you rate the content presented at this forum?

Excellent\_\_\_ Very Good\_\_\_ Satisfactory\_\_\_ Fair\_\_\_ Poor\_\_\_

Comments:

2. In general, how would you rate the conference arrangements (location, facilities, refreshments)?

Excellent\_\_\_ Very Good\_\_\_ Satisfactory\_\_\_ Fair\_\_\_ Poor\_\_\_

Comments:

3. How would you rate the keynote presentation?

Excellent\_\_\_ Very Good\_\_\_ Satisfactory\_\_\_ Fair\_\_\_ Poor\_\_\_

Comments:

4. How effective was the presentation in helping you to understand issues related to human services planning on the local level?

Very Useful\_\_\_ Useful\_\_\_ Somewhat Useful\_\_\_ Not Useful\_\_\_

Comments:

Forum Evaluation Form  
Page 2

5. I attended the following workshop:

Service Coordination\_\_\_\_\_ Purchase-of-Service\_\_\_\_\_

Expanding Local Planning Capacity\_\_\_\_\_

6. Did the workshop add to your knowledge about the issue?

Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_\_

Comments:

7. In what ways will you be able to use the information obtained at the workshop?

8. In what ways do you think the Forum could have been improved?

Any other issues that should have been addressed?

Any suggestions for speakers to cover recommended issues?

Other ideas or comments?

9. What prompted you to attend this Forum?

Forum Evaluation Form  
Page 3

10. We are interested in knowing who this presentation is reaching. Please check all categories that apply to you.

|                                            |                                      |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| CHSAC member_____                          | Faculty member_____                  |
| CHSAC staff person_____                    | Student_____                         |
| State Government<br>official_____          | Local Government<br>official_____    |
| Social Service agency<br>staff member_____ | Planning agency staff<br>member_____ |
| Social worker_____                         | NASW member_____                     |
| Administration Section<br>member_____      | "ELANer"_____                        |
| Other (Specify) _____                      |                                      |

Please detach this sheet and turn it in separately if you want your evaluation to be anonymous.

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

BUSINESS PHONE (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_

HOME PHONE(\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_

AGENCY AFFILIATION, If Any \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_ I would like to be notified about other meetings related to the block grant implementation process on the local level.

\_\_\_\_ I would like to be notified about other Administration Section activities.

The following activities and topics would be of interest to me:

\_\_\_\_ A second forum on the local planning process with an emphasis on \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_ Administrative skills workshop on \_\_\_\_\_

Forum Evaluation Form  
Page 4

\_\_\_\_ Forum on the following governmental issues \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_ Discussion groups for agency administrators on the  
following topics \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Thank you for taking the time to complete this  
evaluation.**

**Planning Committee Members:**

**Chair, NASW/XX Administration Section**

**Chair, Administration Sequence, Eliot**

**University Graduate School of**

**Social Work**

**Executive Director, Ewell County Department  
of Human Services**

**Project Director**

## **Appendix C**

### **NASW Delegate Assembly Priorities for 1982-84**

## APPENDIX C

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS  
PROGRAM ADVANCEMENT FUND  
Special Project Application for FY 1983/1984

## DELEGATE ASSEMBLY MAXIMUM PRIORITIES FOR 1982-1984

Professional Advancement

PA 2. Improve social work practice through direct provision of continuing education programs of assured quality and support the development and promulgation of standards for the provision of continuing education.

Practice Standards

PS 1. Promote public recognition and sanction of social work to include securing, maintaining, improving and evaluating legal regulation of social work practice.

PS 2. Develop and refine practice standards for significant practice areas. Promote the adoption and utilization of NASW standards by human service delivery systems, programs of social work education, and other standard setting bodies.

Social Policy and Action

SP 1. Advocate for adequate allocation of public/private financing for health and human services and income maintenance with recognition of the proper responsibility at every level of government, and work toward reduction in military expenditures. Work to prevent cutbacks in human service programs in local, state and federal government budgets.

SP 5. Press for the maintenance and enforcement of Affirmative Action programs to protect the rights of and provide opportunities for women, minority persons of color, and handicapped persons.

SP 5. Combat discrimination and its effects, and promote human rights and unimpeded access to service for all residents of the United States.

SP 9. Develop and mobilize the political potential of the membership in order to impact local, state and federal government policy decisions by the direct involvement of social workers in political (including legislative) processes.

Membership and Organization

MQ 3. Improve the functioning and capacity of Chapters and the National Organization to include an accounting of NASW programs to NASW members by continuing implementation of the Association-wide Program Accountability System.

**Appendix D.**

**NASW Areas of Concentration for 1983-84 Program,  
Adopted by the Board of Directors**



## APPENDIX D

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS  
PROGRAM ADVANCEMENT FUND  
Special Project Application for FY 1983/1984

AREAS OF CONCENTRATION FOR 1983-1984 PROGRAM  
ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

(from the Progress Report of the NASW Audit Task Force)

...the Board adopted four areas of programmatic concentration for the 1983-84 program year as implementation strategies to achieve the priorities. These are strategic emphases, which may be very different for the 1984-85 program year. ...The areas of concentration...are:

- a. Data/Information Management System - the use of resources to move ahead in developing a technologically-advanced data/information management system for the Association (system design and computer hardware). The Board viewed an improved system as being essential to effectiveness in virtually all facets of the program of the Association. (Note: The PAF Subcommittee has determined that this area of concentration will not apply to PAF special project grants.)
- b. Legislative/Political Action - increased staffing, training, and coordination and mobilization for maximum effectiveness in political and legislative action.
- c. Public Recognition - includes 1) intensified, targeted effort to expand the legal recognition and regulation of social work, and 2) a variety of approaches to image - and influence-building.
- d. Fund Raising - major effort to raise funds in addition to membership dues.

**Appendix E**

**[State Chapter's] Action Plan Program Fiscal Year 84**

## APPENDIX E

## [STATE] Chapter's Action Plan PFY 84

## PROGRAM GOAL I: Legal regulation of social work in [STATE] through licensure

| OBJECTIVES                                                         |  | ACTIVITIES                                                                                                                                                  |  | RESPONSIBLE GROUPS                                        | TIMETABLE  |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| A.<br>To oppose<br>declassification of<br>social work<br>positions |  | A 1<br>Monitor efforts to<br>declassify (collect<br>information) in<br>respective areas; refer<br>to Professional<br>Standards and<br>Utilization Committee |  | All Groups                                                | By 6/30/84 |
|                                                                    |  | A 2<br>Facilitating role                                                                                                                                    |  | Professional<br>Standards and<br>Utilization<br>Committee | By 6/30/84 |
| B.<br>To have a bill<br>licensing social<br>workers in [State]     |  | B 1<br>For each group to have<br>at least one program on<br>licensure in their<br>respective areas.                                                         |  | All Groups                                                | By 6/30/84 |
|                                                                    |  | B 2<br>To coordinate efforts<br>by offering help to all<br>groups-program<br>development, strategy,<br>etc.                                                 |  | Licensure<br>Committee                                    | By 6/30/84 |

**APPENDIX E (Con't) - Program Goal I**

| <b>OBJECTIVES</b>                                                                                                                                                                       | <b>ACTIVITIES</b>                                                       | <b>RESPONSIBLE GROUPS</b>                                                                        | <b>TIMETABLE</b> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| <b>C.</b> To promote public understanding of the value of social work services and of the professional skills of social workers in ameliorating social problems (merge with E)          |                                                                         |                                                                                                  | By 6/30/84       |
| <b>D.</b> To develop a public campaign in support of legislation to meet these needs                                                                                                    | <b>D</b> See B.                                                         |                                                                                                  | By 6/30/84       |
| <b>E.</b> To promote the recognition of the skills of social workers both in aiding victims of social problems and in the design and administration of programs towards these purposes. | <b>E 1</b> Use program (events) to promote the roles of social workers. | All Groups, especially:<br>Social Worker as Psycho-therapist<br>Institute<br>Social Workers' Day | By 6/30/84       |
|                                                                                                                                                                                         | <b>E 2</b> Facilitate                                                   | Public Relations Committee                                                                       | By 6/30/84       |

## APPENDIX E

**PROGRAM GOAL II: To promote adequate and equitable support and funding for health, income maintenance and human services**

| OBJECTIVES                                                                                                                                                                                                      | ACTIVITIES                                                                                                                   | RESPONSIBLE GROUPS               | TIMETABLE         |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| <p><b>A. To enhance public awareness of the extent of need for various human services and to enhance public support for their adequate funding</b></p>                                                          | <p>(The following three activities refer to all three objectives.)</p>                                                       |                                  |                   |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <p>1. Each special sector group should select one priority item in relation to the goal and its interest and support it.</p> | <p>All Groups (except Units)</p> | <p>By 6/30/84</p> |
|                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <p>2. Facilitating role</p>                                                                                                  | <p>Administrative Section</p>    | <p>By 6/30/84</p> |
| <p>3. Each Unit is encouraged to have at least one program in relation to the overall goal and in cooperation with a special sector group. Link local agenda with special sector's interest and broad goal.</p> |                                                                                                                              |                                  | <p>By 6/30/84</p> |

**APPENDIX E (Con't) - Program Goal II**

| <b>OBJECTIVES</b>                                                                                                                                                                       | <b>ACTIVITIES</b>                                        | <b>RESPONSIBLE GROUPS</b> | <b>TIMETABLE</b> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|
| <b>B.</b> To forge coalitions and cooperative links with other organizations concerned with support of human services                                                                   |                                                          |                           | By 6/30/84       |
| <b>C.</b> To assure an open procedure by which allocational decisions are to be made, in particular in the division of block grants.                                                    |                                                          |                           | By 6/30/84       |
| <b>D.</b> To assure an equitable division of resources among the various human service needs on a basis that forestalls internecline fighting and strives for enhanced funding instead. | <b>PAF Grant directly addresses goal and objectives.</b> |                           | By 6/30/84       |

APPENDIX E

PROGRAM GOAL III: To strengthen the chapter

| OBJECTIVES                                                                                           | ACTIVITIES                                                                         | RESPONSIBLE GROUPS   | TIMEFRAME  |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|------------|
| A. To recruit new members                                                                            | A 1 To identify news about new members                                             | Membership Committee | By 6/30/84 |
|                                                                                                      | A 2 To re-form committee composed of membership coordinators from all groups       | Membership Committee | By 6/30/84 |
|                                                                                                      | B 1 To hold a "Fair" at annual meeting - special invitation to new/passive members | All Groups           | By 6/30/84 |
| B. To promote the involvement of new or individual members in units, task forces or other activities | B 2 To bring 10 uninvolved members from each unit                                  | All Groups           | By 6/30/84 |
|                                                                                                      | B 3 To form new Council of Past Presidents                                         | President-Elect      | By 6/30/84 |

**APPENDIX E (Cont) - Program Goal III**

| <b>OBJECTIVES</b>                                                                                                 | <b>ACTIVITIES</b>                                          | <b>RESPONSIBLE GROUPS</b>                                                    | <b>TIMETABLE</b> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| C. To promote the involvement of members in various human service coalitions on the local, county and state level | C 1 To coordinate NASW members on Coalition                | ELAN and PACE in consultation with all groups                                | By 6/30/84       |
|                                                                                                                   | C 2 To reach out, recruit and assign official liaison      | ELAN and PACE in consultation with all groups                                | By 6/30/84       |
|                                                                                                                   | C 3 To do appointment letters                              | President                                                                    | By 6/30/84       |
| D. To assist units in developing programs, activities and functions in order to enhance member participation      | D See Goals I and II Above                                 |                                                                              | By 6/30/84       |
| E. To assist any group in the Chapter with programmatic or fund-raising activities.                               | To employ new Special Development Project Consultant       | Personnel Committee/Executive Director                                       | By 6/30/84       |
| F. To develop more effective means of leadership identification and training.                                     | To review and devise procedures for leadership recruitment | Nominations and Leadership Identification Committee/Past Presidents' Council | By 6/30/84       |



APPENDIX E

**PROGRAM GOAL IV:      To promote the end of discrimination against minorities  
and disadvantaged groups with the state**

| OBJECTIVES                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |  | ACTIVITIES | RESPONSIBLE GROUPS | TIMETABLE  |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|------------|--------------------|------------|
| A. To enhance sensitivity in all groups within the chapter to their own action regarding patterns of discrimination or inclusion of minorities, women and other disadvantaged groups; to influence public officials at the state, county and local levels regarding steps to reduce or combat discriminatory practices |  |            | All Groups         | By 6/30/84 |

**APPENDIX E (Cont) - Program Goal IV**

| <b>OBJECTIVES</b>                                                                                                                                                                                    | <b>ACTIVITIES</b>                                                                                                      | <b>RESPONSIBLE GROUPS</b>                                     | <b>TIMETABLE</b>             |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>B.</b> To influence social agencies regarding any policies or practices that have discriminatory effect on staff, clients or others who are members of minorities, disadvantaged groups or women. |                                                                                                                        | All Groups<br>Affirmative Action Unit<br>Committee on Inquiry | By 6/30/84<br><br>By 6/30/84 |
| <b>C.</b> To join or help to form coalitions which are combating discriminatory practices.                                                                                                           | C 1 To identify coalitions and organizations dedicated to this goal.<br><br>C 2 To assign members as official liaisons | ELAN/PACE<br><br>ELAN/PACE                                    | By 6/30/84                   |

**Appendix E (Cont) - Program Goal IV**

| <b>OBJECTIVES</b>                                                                                                                                | <b>ACTIVITIES</b>                                                            | <b>RESPONSIBLE GROUPS</b>                          | <b>TIMEFRAME</b> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| D. To help those of our clients who are victims of discrimination based on minority status or membership in disadvantaged groups to find redress | D 1 To write newsletter stories                                              | All members                                        | By 6/30/84       |
|                                                                                                                                                  | D2 To identify issues and refer to appropriate bodies, internal and external | All members                                        | By 6/30/84       |
|                                                                                                                                                  | D3 To proclaim NASW's contract                                               | Affirmative Action Unit/Public Relations Committee | By 6/30/84       |

## Appendix F

### Summary of Selected Block-Grant Features

FROM: The Reagan Block Grants (pp. 8-11) by Peterson, G. et. al. 1986. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press. Reprinted by permission.

TABLE 2  
SUMMARY OF SELECTED BLOCK-GRANT FEATURES

| Block Grant                            | Relation to Previous Categorical Grant Programs                                                                                                                                              | Funding Levels (Budget Authority)                                                                                                                                       | Transition Provisions                                                                                                                                                                            | Special Provisions                                                                                                                                                  | Transferability                                                                                   |
|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Social Services                        | Replaces XX and XX training and child day care monies                                                                                                                                        | Fiscal 1982: 2.40 billion (19.3 percent less than in fiscal 1981). No match required.<br>Fiscal 1984: 2.70 billion                                                      | States must assume on October 1, 1981, or money lapses                                                                                                                                           | Eliminates requirement that half of the federal monies go to welfare recipients                                                                                     | Up to 10 percent can be transferred to health or energy block grants                              |
| Low-income home energy assistance      | Replaces low-income energy assistance                                                                                                                                                        | Fiscal 1982: 1.87 billion (1.3 percent increase from fiscal 1981). No match required. Fiscal 1984: 2.10 billion                                                         | States must assume on October 1, 1981, or money lapses                                                                                                                                           | Up to 15 percent may be used for weatherization<br>"Reasonable amount for energy crisis" services                                                                   | Up to 10 percent can be transferred to health, community services or social services block grants |
| Community services                     | Replaces Community Services Administration programs, directed toward governments and agencies                                                                                                | Fiscal 1982: 348 million (32.8 percent less than in fiscal 1981). No match required.<br>Fiscal 1984: 348 million                                                        | State may assume at the beginning of any quarter beginning October 1, 1981, through October 1, 1982. After October 1982, money lapses if the state does not assume administrative responsibility | For fiscal 1982 and fiscal 1983: 90 percent of resources must go to previous grantees                                                                               | 5 percent may be transferred to Head Start, energy, or programs for older Americans               |
| Alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health | Consolidates ten categorical programs: drug abuse community services, alcoholism treatment and rehabilitation, alcohol formula grants, drug abuse formula grants, grants to community mental | Fiscal 1982: 432 million (26.2 percent less than in fiscal 1981). No match required; federal funds must not supplant state and local funds.<br>Fiscal 1984: 469 million | Same as community services                                                                                                                                                                       | CMHCs funded in 1980 and categorically eligible in block-grant year to be funded. Mental health and substance abuse funds to be split according to pre-block shares | 7 percent may be transferred to other health block grants                                         |



Head Start, energy, or programs for older Americans

cent of resources must go to previous grantees

quarter beginning October 1, 1981, through October 1, 1982. After October 1982, money lapses if the state does not assume administrative responsibility

fiscal 1981). No match required. Fiscal 1984: 348 million

programs, directed toward governments and agencies

7 percent may be transferred to other health block grants

CMHCs funded in 1980 and categorically eligible in block-grant year to be funded. Mental health and substance abuse funds to be split according to pre-block shares

Alcohol and drug programs each to get 35 percent of substance abuse "mini block," with remaining 30 percent split at state discretion

7 percent may be transferred to other health block grants

Hypertension function must be funded in 1982 at 75 percent of 1981 level, lower thereafter

Rape prevention funding is earmarked as not real-locable to other functions

Same as community services

Fiscal 1982: 432 million (26.2 percent less than in fiscal 1981). No match required; federal funds must not supplant state and local funds. Fiscal 1984: 469 million

Consolidates ten categorical programs: drug abuse community services, alcoholism treatment and rehabilitation, alcohol formula grants, drug abuse formula grants, grants to community mental health centers (CHMCs)

Alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health

Same as community services

Fiscal 1982: 81.6 million (12.4 percent less than in fiscal 1981). No match required; federal funds must not supplant state and local funds. Fiscal 1984: 88.2 million

Consolidates one block grant and six categorical programs: Health Incentive Grant, Rape Crisis Centers, Urban Rodent Control, Fluoridation, Health Education and Risk Reduction, Emergency Medical Services, Home Health

Preventive health and health services





TABLE 2 (Continued)

| Block Grant                                       | Relation to Previous Categorical Grant Programs                                                                                                                                                                                                     | Funding Levels (Budget Authority)                                                                                                                             | Transition Provisions                                                                                                                                                                              | Special Provisions                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Transferability                                  |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| Preventive health and health services (continued) |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Emergency Medical Services projects funded in fiscal 1981 must be funded under the block grant in fiscal 1982                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                                  |
| Maternal and child health                         | Consolidates eight categorical programs:<br>Crippled Children's Services, Disabled Children (SSI), Sudden Infant Death Syndrome, Hemophilia Centers, Lead-Based Paint Prevention, Genetic Diseases, Adolescent Pregnancy, Maternal and Child Health | Fiscal 1982: 373.7 million (17.8 percent less than in fiscal 1982).<br>States must spend \$3 of own funds for every \$4 received.<br>Fiscal 1984: 399 million | Same as community services                                                                                                                                                                         | Based on previous allocations, "reasonable proportion" of funds must go to each function<br><br>Federal set-aside of 15 percent for fiscal 1982 use to fund genetic disease, hemophilia, research training, special projects of regional and national significance<br><br>"Special consideration to existing projects | No funds may be transferred to other block grant |
| Elementary and secondary education                | Consolidates twenty-three categorical programs, including:<br>Emergency School Aid, School Libraries, Improving Local Educational Practice, Strengthening State Agency Management, Basic                                                            | Fiscal 1982: 437 million (13.7 percent less than in fiscal 1981)<br>Fiscal 1984: 500 million                                                                  | 80 percent passed through local education agencies<br><br>Government must appoint State Advisory Committee<br><br>Local education agencies must provide funds to private as well as public schools | No transfers                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                  |



case, noncompetitive,  
research training,  
special projects of  
regional and na-  
tional significance  
"Special considera-  
tion to existing  
projects

Diseases, Adoles-  
cent Pregnancy,  
Maternal and Child  
Health

|                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |              |
|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| Elementary<br>and secondary<br>education | Consolidates<br>twenty-three cate-<br>gorical programs,<br>including:<br>Emergency School<br>Aid, School Librar-<br>ies, Improving Lo-<br>cal Educational<br>Practice, Strengthen-<br>ing State Agency<br>Management, Basic<br>Skills Improvement | Fiscal 1982: 437<br>million (13.7 per-<br>cent less than in<br>fiscal 1981)<br>Fiscal 1984: 500<br>million                                                                                                                   | 80 percent passed<br>through local educa-<br>tion agencies<br>Government must<br>appoint State Advi-<br>sory Committee<br>Local education<br>agencies must pro-<br>vide funds to private<br>as well as public<br>schools                                   | No transfers |
|                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |              |
| Community<br>development                 | Restructures exist-<br>ing community de-<br>velopment block<br>grant<br>Shifts control over<br>small cities portion<br>of block grant from<br>federal government<br>to states                                                                     | Fiscal 1982: 3,400<br>million<br>Small cities—<br>1,020 million<br>(+ 10 percent<br>from fiscal 1981)<br>Entitlement<br>cities—2,380 mil-<br>lion (- 10.7 per-<br>cent from fiscal<br>1981)<br>Fiscal 1984: 3,468<br>million | Administration pro-<br>posed relaxing regu-<br>latory requirement<br>that funds be tar-<br>geted on a low- and<br>moderate-income<br>population; Congress<br>eventually reimposed<br>targeting<br>Local governments<br>apply to states on<br>project basis | No transfers |
|                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |              |

SOURCES: Funding from Office of Management and Budget Special Analysis H, *Budget of the United States Government*, fiscal years 1983 and 1986 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office); and Office of Management and Budget, unpublished disaggregation of Special Analysis H tables. Other information from *Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act 1981*.



**Appendix G**  
**Characteristics of Selected Stage-Related**  
**Evaluation Questions**

| <b>Appendix G</b><br><b>Characteristics of Selected Stage-Related</b><br><b>Evaluation Questions</b> |                                                                        |                                |                                            |                                                                            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Chapter<br/>&amp;<br/>Program<br/>Stage</b>                                                       | <b>Unit of<br/>Analysis</b>                                            | <b>Evaluation<br/>Criteria</b> | <b>Data<br/>Collection<br/>Method(s) *</b> | <b>Question</b>                                                            |
| 5<br>Initia-<br>tion                                                                                 | Main Unit                                                              | Effective-<br>ness             | DOC                                        | Project's<br>Operating<br>Plan<br><br>Question 7                           |
| 5                                                                                                    | Main Unit                                                              | Effort                         | DOC<br>PO                                  | Acquiring<br>Strategic<br>and<br>Tactical<br>Information<br><br>Question 3 |
| 5                                                                                                    | Participa<br>ting<br>Organizat<br>ions and<br>their<br>Sudivisio<br>ns | Efficiency                     | SINT<br>PO                                 | Congruence<br>of Partici-<br>pants'<br>Perceptions<br><br>Question 11      |
| 5                                                                                                    | County<br>Networks                                                     | Effective-<br>ness             | INT<br>PO                                  | Network<br>Formation<br><br>Question 9                                     |

| <b>Appendix G</b><br><b>Characteristics of Selected Stage-Related</b><br><b>Evaluation Questions</b> |                                                                                                        |                                |                                            |                                                       |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Chapter<br/>&amp;<br/>Program<br/>Stage</b>                                                       | <b>Unit of<br/>Analysis</b>                                                                            | <b>Evaluation<br/>Criteria</b> | <b>Data<br/>Collection<br/>Method(s) *</b> | <b>Question</b>                                       |
| 6<br><br>Contact                                                                                     | Main<br>Unit,<br><br>County<br>Networks,<br>their<br>Subdivi-<br>sions,<br>and Key<br>Indivi-<br>duals | Effort                         | PO<br><br>DOC                              | Recruiting<br>Target<br>Populations<br><br>Question 1 |
| 6                                                                                                    | Partici-<br>pating<br>Organiza-<br>tions and<br>their<br>Subdivi-<br>sions                             | Effort                         | DOC<br><br>INT<br><br>PO                   | Engaging<br>Partici-<br>pants<br><br>Question 4       |
| 6                                                                                                    | County<br>Networks                                                                                     | Effective-<br>ness             | INT<br><br>PO                              | Maintaining<br>Relation-<br>ships<br><br>Question 6   |

| <b>Appendix G</b><br><b>Characteristics of Selected Stage-Related</b><br><b>Evaluation Questions</b> |                                                                                                                                    |                                |                                            |                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Chapter<br/>&amp;<br/>Program<br/>Stage</b>                                                       | <b>Unit of<br/>Analysis</b>                                                                                                        | <b>Evaluation<br/>Criteria</b> | <b>Data<br/>Collection<br/>Method(s) *</b> | <b>Question</b>                                                                         |
| 6                                                                                                    | Main Unit<br><br>County<br>and State<br>Networks<br><br>Partici-<br>pating<br>Organi-<br>zations<br>and their<br>Subdivi-<br>sions | Efficiency                     | ARCH<br><br>DOC<br><br>PO<br><br>SUR       | Attributes<br>of Partici-<br>pants<br><br>Question 10                                   |
| 7<br>Imple-<br>menta-<br>tion                                                                        | Main Unit                                                                                                                          | Effort                         | DOC                                        | Developing<br>and<br>Maintaining<br>Staff/<br>Volunteer<br>Capability<br><br>Question 2 |
| 7                                                                                                    | Main Unit<br><br>Organiza-<br>tions,<br>their<br>Subdivi-<br>sions,<br>and Key<br>Indivi-<br>duals                                 | Effective-<br>ness             | INFINT<br><br>PO<br><br>SUR                | Service<br>Effective-<br>ness<br><br>Question 8                                         |



| <b>Appendix G</b><br><b>Characteristics of Selected Stage-Related</b><br><b>Evaluation Questions</b> |                             |                                |                                            |                                                                                                            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Chapter<br/>&amp;<br/>Program<br/>Stage</b>                                                       | <b>Unit of<br/>Analysis</b> | <b>Evaluation<br/>Criteria</b> | <b>Data<br/>Collection<br/>Method(s) *</b> | <b>Question</b>                                                                                            |
| 7                                                                                                    | Main Unit                   |                                | DOC<br>ARC<br>INT<br>PO                    | Establish-<br>ing Service<br>Domain<br><br>Question 4                                                      |
| 7                                                                                                    | Main Unit                   | Effective-<br>ness             | DOC<br>ARC<br>INT<br>PO<br>SUR             | Feasibility<br>of<br>Collabor-<br>ative Model<br><br>Question 7                                            |
| 8<br>Stabil-<br>ization                                                                              | Main Unit                   | Effort                         | DOC<br>PO                                  | Extent,<br>type of<br>activities<br>devoted to<br>developing<br>alternative<br>resources<br><br>Question 1 |

| <b>Appendix G</b><br><b>Characteristics of Selected Stage-Related</b><br><b>Evaluation Questions</b> |                                                             |                                |                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Chapter<br/>&amp;<br/>Program<br/>Stage</b>                                                       | <b>Unit of<br/>Analysis</b>                                 | <b>Evaluation<br/>Criteria</b> | <b>Data<br/>Collection<br/>Method(s) *</b> | <b>Question</b>                                                                                                                                                                        |
| 8                                                                                                    | Main Unit<br><br>Organizations and<br>Their<br>Subdivisions | Effective-<br>ness             | DOC<br><br>PO                              | Has program<br>maintained<br>place for<br>itself--in<br>units? in<br>participating<br>schools?<br>in state<br>chapter?<br><br>Question 6                                               |
| 8                                                                                                    | Main Unit                                                   | Effective-<br>ness             | INT<br><br>PO                              | Have<br>adaptations<br>been made<br>in original<br>project<br>objectives?<br>If so, on<br>what basis<br>were they<br>made? What<br>results<br>have been<br>achieved?<br><br>Question 7 |

- \* DOC = Documentation  
 PO = Participant Observation  
 SINT = Structured Interview  
 INFINT = Informal Interview  
 ARCH = Archival Records  
 SUR = Survey/Questionnaire

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

The bibliography has two sections. The first section is an alphabetical listing of references cited in this study. The second section is a chronological listing of materials in the case study data base (documents, correspondence, interviews, etc.). There is some overlap in the lists, particularly in reference to documents.

To protect the privacy of individuals and organizations that participated in the study, references that include names of persons, organizations, or places in the study state have been changed. These changes are indicated by [brackets]. Readers can contact the author for additional information if they need access to a specific reference.

### References Cited in Study

#### (Alphabetical Listing)

- Abrams, H., and S. Goldstein. 1982. A State's Comprehensive Political Program. In Practical Politics: Social Work and Political Responsibility, eds. M. Mahaffey and J. Hanks, 241- 260. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of Social Workers.
- Albert, R. 1983. Social Work Advocacy in the Regulatory Process. Social Casework. 64 (October):473-481.
- Alexander, C. A. 1982. Professional Social Workers and Political Responsibility. In Practical Politics: Social Work and Political Responsibility, eds. M. Mahaffey and J. Hanks, 15-31. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of Social Workers.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1983. National Association of Social Workers. In Encyclopedia of Social Work, 17th ed., 1983-84 Suppl., 87-95. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of Social Workers.
- Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas Advisory Committees to the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. 1983. Block Grants and You: A Citizen's Handbook. Washington, DC: U. S. Commission on Civil Rights.
- Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988, Public Law 100-297, Statute 130.

- Bailey, D. and K. McNally Koney. 1997. Interorganizational Community-Based Collaboratives: A Strategic Response to Shape the Social Work Agenda. In Social Policy: Reform, Research and Practice, eds. P. Ewalt, E. Freeman, S. Kirk, and D. Poole, 72-83. Washington, DC: NASW Press..
- Barker, R. L. 1991. The Social Work Dictionary. 2nd ed., Silver Spring, MD: NASW Press.
- Battle, M. 1987. Professional Associations: National Association of Social Workers. In Encyclopedia of Social Work, vol. 2, 18th ed., Ed.-in-Chief. Anne Minahan, 333-341. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of Social Workers.
- Bernard, S. E. 1975. Why Service Delivery Programs Fail. Social Work 20: 206-212.
- Bielawski, B. 1976. Personnel in Residential Facilities Project: Descriptive Study. Prepared for the Social and Rehabilitation Service, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Photocopied.
- Bielawski, B., and I. Epstein. 1984. Assessing Program Stabilization: An Extension of the "Differential Evaluation" Model. Administration in Social Work 8 (Winter): 13-23.
- Biggerstaff, M. 1995. Licensing, Regulation, and Certification. In Encyclopedia of Social Work, vol. 2, 19th ed., Ed.-in-Chief. R. Edwards, 1616-1624. Washington, DC: NASW Press.
- Brager, G. 1968. Advocacy and Political Behavior. Social Work. 13 (April): 5-15.
- Bucher, R., and A. Strauss. 1961. Professions in Process. American Journal of Sociology. 66: 325-334.
- Children's Defense Fund. 1983. A Children's Defense Budget: An Analysis of the President's FY 1984 Budget and Children. Washington, DC: Author.
- Chommie, P. W., and J. Hudson. 1974. Evaluation of Outcome and Process. Social Work. (November): 682-687.
- Chubb, J. E., and P. E. Peterson, eds. 1985. The New Directions in American Politics. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987. Public Law 100-259, Statute 28.

- Clements, J. 1988. [State] Facts. Dallas: Clements Research II, Inc.
- Coleman, R., and M. Barton. 1982. Solving the Effectiveness Dilemma: How Can an Informal Network Create Change? Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare. (March): 72-87.
- Conlan, T. 1988. New Federalism: Intergovernmental Reform from Nixon to Reagan. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Council on Social Work Education. 1982. Curriculum Policy for the Master's Degree and Baccalaureate Degree Programs in Social Work Education. New York: Author.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1992. Curriculum Policy Statement for Master's Degree Programs in Social Work Education. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Dear, R., and R. Patti. 1981. Legislative Advocacy: Seven Effective Tactics. Social Work (July): 289-296.
- Dempsey, D. J. 1982. Establishing ELAN in a State Chapter. In Practical Politics: Social Work and Political Responsibility, Eds. M. Mahaffey and J. Hanks, 227-240. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of Social Workers.
- Dinerman, M. 1981. Social Work Curriculum at the Baccalaureate and Masters Levels. NY: The Lois and Samuel Silberman Fund.
- Dinerman, M., ed. 1983. Social Work in a Turbulent World. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of Social Workers.
- Epstein, I. 1968. Social Workers and Social Action: Attitudes Toward Social Action Strategies. Social Work. 13 (April): 101-108.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1969. Professionalization and Social Work Activism. Ph.D. diss., Columbia University.
- Etzioni, A. 1964. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Ezell, P. 1993. The Political Activity of Social Workers: a Post-Reagan Update. Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare. 4 (December): 81-97.

- Fulton, R. 1981. Federal Budget Making in 1981: A Watershed in Federal Domestic Policy. New England Journal of Human Services. 1 (Fall): 21-32.
- Geismar, S., T. Fagan, and P. Deignan. 1983. Through the Safety Net: A Citizen's Report on [State's] Children and Families in Need. [City], XX: Association for Children of [State].
- Gibelman, M., and P. Schervish. 1993. Who We Are: The Social Work Labor Force as Reflected in the NASW Membership. Washington, D.C.: NASW Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1997. Who We Are: A Second Look. Washington, DC: NASW Press.
- Gilgun, J. 1994. A Case for Case Studies in Social Work Research. Social Work. 39 (July): 371-380.
- Gilman, E. 1990. Master Class: Prevent Your Ship from Sinking: State and Local Activism in Tough Times. Paper presented at National Association of Social Workers' Professional Symposium, Boston, MA. November 14-17.
- Ginsberg, L. 1983. Federal Social Welfare Programs: Recent Trends. In 1983-84 Supplement to the Encyclopedia of Social Work, 31-44. Washington, DC: National Association of Social Workers.
- Gonzalez, A., S. Rees, R. Kavanaugh, and D. Hampton. 1983. Lobbying for Social Programs: NASW 1983 Legislative Agenda. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of Social Workers.
- Hage, J., and M. Aiken. 1970. Social Change in Complex Organizations. New York: Random House.
- Haynes, K., and J. Mickelson. 1986. Affecting Change: Social Workers in the Political Arena. NY: Longman, Inc.
- Higher Education Amendments of 1992, Public Law 102-325, Statute 448.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1992. Social Work and the Reagan Era: Challenges to the Profession. Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare. XIX (March): 169-183.
- Jirovec, R. 1983. Reaganomics and Social Welfare: A Policy Analysis. Paper presented at Eighth National Association of Social Workers' Professional Symposium, Washington, D. C. November 19-22.

- Katz, A. 1983. Council on Social Work Education. In 1983-84 Supplement to the Encyclopedia of Social Work, 84-87. Washington, DC: National Association of Social Workers.
- Kidder, L. 1981. Research Methods in Social Relations. 4th ed., NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Kimberly, J. R., R. H. Miles, and Associates. 1980. The Organizational Life Cycle. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kushner, H., ed. 1978. [State] Spotlight on Government. 3rd ed., [City], XX: [Eliot] University Press (for the League of Women Voters of [State]).
- Laumann, E., P. Marsden, and D. Prensky. 1983. The Boundary Specification Problem in Network Analysis. In Applied Network Analysis, eds. R. S. Burt, M. J. Minor and Associates, 18-34. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lause, T. 1979. Professional Social Work Associations and Legislative Action 1974 to 1977. Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare. 6 (March): 265-273.
- League of Women Voters of [State]. 1984. 1984 [State] Citizen's Handbook and Calendar. [Capital City, XX]: Author.
- Lofland, J., and L. Lofland. 1984. Analyzing Social Settings. 2nd ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Lubove, R. 1972. The Professional Altruist: The Emergence of Social Work as a Career, 1880-1930. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Magill, R. 1986. Social Welfare Politics in Urban America. Social Work. (September-October): 397-400.
- Maguire, L. 1983. Understanding Social Networks. Human Services Guide 32. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mahaffey, M. 1982. Lobbying and Social Work. In Practical Politics: Social Work and Political Responsibility, eds. M. Mahaffey and J. Hanks, 15-31. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of Social Workers.
- Mahaffey, M., and J. Hanks, eds. 1982. Practical Politics: Social Work and Political Responsibility. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of Social Workers.
- Mathews, G. 1983. Social Workers and Political Influence. Social Service Review. 56 (December): 616-628.

- Minahan, A., ed. 1987. Encyclopedia of Social Work. 18th ed., Silver Spring, MD: National Association of Social Workers.
- Miringoff, M. L. 1980. Management in Human Service Organizations. NY: MacMillan Publishing Co.
- Midgley, J. 1992. Society, Social Policy and the Ideology of Reaganism. Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare. XIX (March): 13-28.
- Mizrahi, T., and J. D. Morrison. 1993. Community Organization and Social Administration: Advances, Trends, and Emerging Principles. Bingham, NY: The Haworth Press, Inc.
- Mondros, J., and S. M. Wilson. 1993. Building High Access Community Organizations: Structures as Strategy. In Community Organization and Social Administration: Advances, Trends, and Emerging Principles, eds. T. Mizrahi and J. D. Morrison, 69-84. Bingham, NY: Haworth Press.
- Morell, B. Brown. 1982. ABC's of Block Grants. Social Work. 27 (March): 126-128.
- Mott, P. E. 1976. Meeting Human Needs: The Social and Political History of Title XX. Columbus, OH: National Conference on Social Welfare.
- NASW/[State] Ad Hoc Unit Study Committee Status Report. 1983. [Capital City, XX]: Author. Photocopied.
- NASW/[State] Chapter PAF Proposal, Developing a Practice/Education Network to Increase Social Action on the Local Level Regarding Block Grants, February 18, 1983.
- NASW/[State] Leadership Handbook. 1985-1986. [Capital City, XX]: National Association of Social Workers/[State]. Photocopied.
- National Association of Social Workers/[State]. 1979. By-Laws. [Capital City, XX]: Author. Photocopied.
- National Center for Social Policy and Practice. 1988. NASW Chapters' Legislative Agenda Report. Silver Spring, MD: Author.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1989. NASW Chapters' 1989 Legislative Agendas. Silver Spring, MD: Author.



- Neugeboren, B. 1985. Organization, Policy, and Practice in the Human Services. NY: Longman, Inc. New York Times, The. August 14, 1981. A-10.
- O'Connor, G. 1983. Raising Social Work's I. Q. (Influence Quotient). Paper Presented at the Eighth National Association of Social Workers' Professional Symposium, Washington, D. C. November 19-22.
- Olson, M. 1965. The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, Public Law No. 97-35, Statute 357.
- Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, Public Law No. 101-502, Statute 1289.
- Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, Public Law No. 103-66, Statute 31.
- Patti, R. 1978. Toward a Paradigm of Middle-Management Practice in Social Welfare Programs. In The Management of Human Services, eds. Rosemary Sarri and Yeheskel Hasenfeld, 262-288. NY: Columbia University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1983a. Political Action. In Encyclopedia of Social Work, 17th ed., 1983-84 Suppl, 96-105. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of Social Workers.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1983b. Social Welfare Administration: Managing Social Programs in a Developmental Context. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Patti, R. J. and R. B. Dear. 1975. Legislative Advocacy: A Path to Social Change. Social Work. 20 (March): 108-114.
- Pawlak, E., and J. Flynn. 1990. Executive Directors' Political Activities. Social Work. 35 (July): 307-312.
- Perlmutter, F. D. 1969. A Theoretical Model of Social Agency Development. Social Casework 50 (October): 467-73.
- Peterson, G. E., R. R. Bovbjerg, B. A. Davis, W. G. Davis, E. C. Durman, and T. A. Gullo. 1986. The Reagan Block Grants: What Have We Learned?. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Phillips, K. 1990. The Politics of Rich and Poor. NY: Harper Perennial; first published Random House, 1990.
- Pomper, G. M., ed. 1986. The Political State of [State]. [City, XX]: [Eliot] University Press.

- Prabhu, B. Williams. 1992. Spotlight on [State] Government, 6th ed. [City, XX]: [Eliot] University Press (for the League of Women Voters of [State]).
- Rand McNally Contemporary World Atlas. 1986. NY: Rand McNally and Company.
- Reeser, L. Cherrey. 1992. Professional Role Orientation and Social Activism. Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare XIX (June): 79-94.
- Reeser, L. Cherrey, and I. Epstein. 1987. Social Workers' Attitudes toward Poverty and Social Action: 1968-1984. Social Service Review 61 (December): 610-622.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1990. Professionalization and Activism in Social Work. NY: Columbia University Press.
- Ribicoff, A. 1962. Politics and Social Workers. Social Work. 7 (April): 3-6.
- Richan, W. C. 1988. Beyond Altruism: Social Welfare Policy in American Society. NY: Haworth Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1981. Social Service Politics in the United States and Britain. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Roberts-DeGennaro, M. 1986. Building Coalitions for Political Advocacy. Social Work 31 (July-August): 308-311.
- Salcido, R. and E. T. Seck. 1992. Political Participation Among Social Work Chapters. Social Work 37 (November): 563-564.
- Salmore, S. A. 1986. Voting, Elections, and Campaigns. In The Political State of [State], ed. G. M. Pomper, 66-90. [City, XX]: [Eliot] University Press.
- Sarason, S. B., C. F. Carroll, K. Maton, S. Cohen, and E. Lorentz. 1977. Human Services and Resource Networks: Rationale, Possibilities, and Public Policy. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schacter, R. S. 1992. Political Activities of Social Work Membership Organizations: An Historical Study of the New York City Chapter of the National Association of Social Work. D.S.W. diss. City University of New York.
- Schoenberger, E., and J. Williamson. 1977. Deciding on Priorities and Specific Programs. In Managing Human Services, eds. W. F. Anderson, B. J. Frieden, and M. J. Murphy, 166. Washington, DC: International City Managers Association.

- Schreiber, M., and M. Botsko. 1983. Block Grants and Human/Community Services: A Challenge and Opportunity for Innovation and Service. [Capital City, XX]: [State] Association of Counties.
- Scott, J. 1991. Social Network Analysis. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Selznick, P. 1957. Leadership in Administration. Evanston, IL: Row Peterson.
- Smith, C. O. 1991. Training for Social Workers Participating in Political Practice. D.S.W. diss. City University of New York.
- Sosin, M. R. 1990. Decentralizing the Social Service System: A Reassessment. Social Service Review. (December): 617-636.
- [State] Department of Human Services. 1982. County Human Service Advisory Councils Background, Purpose, Composition, and Activities. [Capital City, XX]: [State] Department of Human Services, Office of Policy, Planning and Advocacy. Photocopied.
- [State] Legislature. Senate. 1984. An Act establishing an Interdisciplinary Advisory Council on Block Grants. Prefiled for Introduction in the 1984 Session, [#S-X0].
- State of [State] County and Municipal Government Study Commission. 1968. Creative Localism: A Prospectus. [Capital City, XX]: Author.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1979. The Organization and Dynamics of Social Services in [State]. [Capital City, XX]: Author.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1986. The Structure of County Government: Current Status and Needs. [Capital City, XX]: Author.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1990. The Delivery of Human Services Within [State]. [Capital City, XX]: Author.
- Stoesz, D. 1981. A Wake for the Welfare State: Social Welfare and the Neoconservative Challenge. Social Service Review 55 (September): 398-410.
- Teare, R. J. 1983. Reclassification and Licensing. In Encyclopedia of Social Work, 17th ed., 1983-84 Suppl, 120-127. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of Social Workers.
- Thursz, D. 1966. Social Action as a Professional Responsibility. Social Work. 11 (July): 12-21.

- Tripodi, T., P. Fellin and I. Epstein. 1978. Differential Social Program Evaluation. Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock Publishers.
- Verhovek, S. H. 1997. Legislators Meet, Surprised at Limit on Shift of Power. The New York Times. (January 12): pp.1, 22.
- Vosburgh, W. W., and F. Davidson Perlmutter. 1984. The Demonstration Project: Politics Amid Professionalism. In Human Services at Risk, ed. F. Davidson Perlmutter, 109-126. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Weil, M. 1997. Community Building: Building Community Practice. In Social Policy: Reform, Research and Practice, eds. P. Ewalt, E. Freeman, S. Kirk, and D. Poole, 35-61. Washington, DC: NASW Press.
- Weirich, T. 1980. The Design of Information Systems. In Leadership in Social Administration, eds. F. Perlmutter and S. Slavin, 142-156. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Weismiller, T., and S. Harris Rome. 1995. Social Workers in Politics. In Encyclopedia of Social Work, 19th ed. Ed.-in-Chief. R. L. Edwards, 2305-2313. Washington, DC: National Association of Social Workers.
- Weller, S., and A. Kimball Romney. 1988. Systematic Data Collection. Qualitative Research Methods Series, Vol. 10. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Wills, G.. 1996. It's His Party. The New York Times Magazine. (August 11): 30-37, 52, 55, 57-59.
- Wolk, J. 1981. Are Social Workers Politically Active? Social Work 26 (July): 283-288.
- Woodward, J. and E. Roper. (1950). Political Activity of American Citizens. American Political Science Review 44 (December): 872-875.
- Yin, R. K. 1989. Case Study Research: Design and Methods. rev. ed. Applied Social Research Methods Series, Vol. 5. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Zinn, D. and B. Rivard. 1983. Who Owns Title XX? In Social Work in a Turbulent World, ed. Miriam Dinerman, 32-42. Silver Spring, MD: National Association of Social Workers.
- Zukin, C. 1986. Political Culture and Public Opinion. In The Political State of [State], ed. G. M. Pomper, 2-26. [City, XX]: [Eliot] University Press.

## Materials from Case Study Data Base Cited in Study

### (Chronological Listing)

#### Prior to 1982

National Association of Social Workers/XX. By-Laws.  
[Capital City, XX]: Author, 1979. Photocopied.

Chapter President. Letter to Author re: Appointment to Continuing Education Committee, January 30, 1981.

Social Work Department. "The Reagan Federal Budget: What Can I Do?" [Altmeyer-Buell University], [City, XX]: March 23, 1981. Photocopied.

#### 1982

Secretary of the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Board of Directors, February 10, 1982.

Executive Director. Example of ELAN Reappointment Letters to [Austin-Bedford] Unit "ELANers," March 22, 1982.

ELAN Responsibilities, Legislative Districts, 1982-83. April 26, 1982.

Executive Director. ELAN ALERT, May 19, 1982.

Executive Director. ELAN Alert to Selected Legislative Districts May 19, 1982.

Executive Director. Memorandum to Unit ELAN Coordinators, May 19, 1982.

ELAN/[State] Roster, May, 1982.

ELAN Roles, May, 1982.

NASW/[State] Policy Review Process, May, 1982.

NASW/[State] Range of Possible Action Strategies, May, 1982.

Executive Director. ELAN Alert, Fall, 1982 (no specific date).

Chapter Executive Director. Memo to ELAN Unit Coordinators, Fall, 1982 (no specific date).

NASW Special Project Grant Application and Instructions, December, 1982.

Chair, PAF Subcommittee. Memorandum to Chapter Presidents and Staff, National Unit Chairpersons, National Staff, December 14, 1982.

Chapter Executive Director and Chair of the Program Committee. Memo to Leadership of all volunteer structures (Soliciting PAF Grant Proposals), December 28, 1982.

[State] Department of Human Services. County Human Service Advisory Councils: Background, Purpose, Activities, and Composition. [Capital City, XX]: Author, 1982.

### 1983

Program Committee Minutes, January, 1983.

Case study notes. Meeting with Chapter President-Elect and Program Chair, Chapter First Vice President, and author at [Eliot] University Graduate School of Social Work, [City, XX], February 9, 1983.

Secretary of the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Board of Directors, February 10, 1983.

Author. Letter to Chapter Executive Director, February 14, 1983.

NASW/[State] Chapter PAF Proposal, Developing a Practice/Education Network to Increase Social Action on the Local Level Regarding Block Grants, February 18, 1983.

Author. Letter to Director, Social Work Program, [Dunham Falls] University, February 25, 1983.

Chair. Program Committee Minutes, February 28, 1983.

[State] Department of Human Services. Outlook '84, Guide for Citizen Participation. [Capital City, XX]: Department of Human Services, April 4, 1983.

Chair, NASW PAF Subcommittee. Letter to [NASW/XX] Chapter President, April 5, 1983.

Secretary of the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Board of Directors, April 7, 1983.

Executive Director. ELAN Alert, April 19, 1983.

NASW PROJECT BLOCK GRANT Skills-Building Workshop. "Workshop Packet with Information from Nine Project States," May 14-15, 1983.

[Dover] County Human Services Advisory Council, Proposed Membership, May, 1983.

NASW/[State] Action Plan for PFY [Program Fiscal Year] '84, May, 1983.

PAF Subcommittee Sets Special Projects, NASW News, May, 1983.

Case study notes. Telephone conversation between project director and [Austin County] CHSAC staff member, June 7, 1983.

Action minutes. Project Planning Committee, June 15, 1983.

Case study notes. Congressman's remarks re: block grants at Breakfast Meeting of the [Austin] County Child Protection Coalition, June 17, 1983.

Case study notes. Telephone conversation with faculty liaison from graduate school's [Dover] County branch campus, June 22, 1983.

NASW/[State] Awarded PAF Grant, NASW [State] NEWS, July/August, 1983.

Project Director. Memorandum to Planning Committee Members, August 15, 1983.

Fair Budget [Action Campaign]. Report of a Conference: Human Needs in [State]. [Capital City, XX]: Author. August, 1983.

Social Workers' Day Workshop Coordinator. Memorandum to NASW/[State] Leadership, September 10, 1983.

Board of Directors. 29th Annual Meeting Brochure. Exercise Your Power: Participation Makes it Happen: Sharpen Your Skills. September 11, 1983.

Block Grants--Identifying the Players, NASW [State] NEWS, September, 1983.

[Austin-Bedford] Unit Chairperson. Memorandum to "ELANers" in Unit, September 21, 1983.

[Austin-Bedford] Unit Chairperson and Unit ELAN Coordinator. Memorandum to Social Work Students at [Altmeyer-Buell] University, September 21, 1983.

NASW/[State] Project Block Grant Selected Bibliography, September 30, 1983.

Schreiber, Meyer, and Michael Botsko. Block Grants and Human/Community Services: A Challenge and Opportunity for Innovation and Service. [Capital City, XX]: [State] Association of Counties. September, 1983.

Action minutes, [Austin-Bedford] Pilot Meeting, October 5, 1983.

Annual Meeting, NASW [State] NEWS, October, 1983.

Bulletin Board Announcement of Administration Section's October 19th meeting on "Human Services Planning on the County Level: Impact on Social Work Administrators," NASW [State] NEWS, October, 1983.

Chapter Executive Director. Memorandum to [Austin] County Members, October, 1983.

Chapter Executive Director. Monthly Report, October, 1983.

Chapter Executive Director. Memorandum to [Austin-Bedford] Unit Members re: the Human SERVE Fund "kick off" meeting on November 17, 1983 at [Altmeyer-Buell] University. November 1, 1983.

Chair, Ad Hoc Unit Study Committee. Memorandum to Board President, November 2, 1983.

Secretary of the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Board of Directors, November 10, 1983.

National Association of Social Workers. 1983 NASW Professional Symposium, Celebrating the Future, Final Program, November 19-22, 1983.

Block Grant Project Holds Local Meetings, NASW [State] NEWS, November/December, 1983.

[Special Projects and Development Coordinator] Joins Staff, NASW [State] NEWS, November/December, 1983.

NASW/[State] Action Plan for PFY [Program Fiscal Year] '85, December, 1983.

#### 1984

League of Women Voters of [State]. 1984. 1984 [State] Citizen's Handbook and Calendar. [Capital City, XX]: Author.

Executive Director. 1983 Year End Operating Report, January 6, 1984.

Chair, [Henderson-Ipswich-Kearny] Unit. Letter to project director re: efforts to secure copies of Human Service Advisory Council Membership Lists for the three counties encompassed by Unit, January 10, 1984.

Chair, PACE-New Jersey. Letter to Board President. January 23, 1984.

Action minutes, [Chester] Network Meeting, January 26, 1984.



Unit Center Announcement--[Chester] Unit Meeting, How Social Services Block Grant is Being Implemented in [Chester] County, NASW [State] NEWS, January, 1984.

Project Director, Program Advancement Fund Project FY1983-84, Progress Report, NASW [State] Chapter. February 1, 1984.

Acting Secretary of the Board of Directors. Minutes of the Board of Directors, February 9, 1984.

Chapter PAF Proposal, Developing Unit-based Committees to Work on Licensure and give skills for other group efforts. February 9, 1984.

Student Coordinator. Minutes of Meeting for Student Liaisons. February, 19, 1984.

Action minutes, [Dover] Network Meeting, February 23, 1984.

Newsletter of [Dover] County Government. Winter, 1984. Focus on [Dover].

32, 33. . .48, 49, 50, NASW [State] NEWS, February, 1984.

Continuing Education Protocol (revised), March 1, 1984.

[Austin] County Human Services Planning Council: Narrative Description and Membership List, March 7, 1984.

[NASW/XX] Chapter President. Memo to Committee and Task Force Chairpersons, March 8, 1984.

Chair, Department of Social Work, [Dunham Falls] University. Letter to "colleagues who attended our block grant project meeting" regarding upcoming continuing education events and courses of interest to practitioners, March 19, 1984.

Coordinator of Field Work, Social Work Program, [Altmeyer-Buell] University. Minutes of March 23rd meeting for field instructors, March 30, 1984.

[Chester] County Block Grant Process Examined, NASW [State] NEWS, March, 1984.

Chair, Chapter Administrative Section and Professor of Administration, [Eliot] University School of Social Work. Memorandum re: draft of Joint Appropriation Committee Testimony on the State Budget as it Impacts on Human Services in [State], April 9, 1984.

Secretary of the Board of Directors, Minutes of the Board of Directors, April 12, 1984.

[NASW/XX] President's Report 1982-1984, May 2, 1984.

Committee of Concerned Social Workers. Letter to Board of Directors, May 10, 1984.

Secretary of the Board of Directors, Minutes of the Board of Directors, May 10, 1984.

State Budget Impacts on Human Services in [State], NASW [State] News, May, 1984.

Spring Forum, "Human Services Planning Issues Confronting Local Decision-Makers," Selected Bibliography, June 6, 1984.

Announcement--Spring Forum, "Human Services Planning: Issues Confronting Local Decision-Makers," NASW [State] NEWS, June, 1984.

Spring Forum Workshop, Service Coordination vs. Service Integration at Local Level, "Services Integration and Services Coordination: Some Innovative Models Handout," June 6, 1984.

Spring Forum Workshop, Purchase-of-Service vs. Public Agency Developing Capacity to Deliver Services, "Purchase of Service Decision-Making: Identifying Issues and Criteria Handout," June 6, 1984.

Decade of Growth. NASW [State] News, June, 1984.

Forum Serves to Initiate Annual Institute, NASW [State] NEWS, July/August, 1984.

Project Director. Program Advancement Fund Project FY1983-84, Final Report, NASW [State] Chapter, August 22, 1984.

NASW-[XX] Appoints New Executive Director. NASW Focus, September, 1984.

Unit Center Announcement, NASW Focus, October, 1984.

[State] Legislature. Senate. An Act establishing an Interdisciplinary Advisory Council on Block Grants. Prefiled for Introduction in the 1984 Session, [S-X0].

#### 1985 - 1996

NASW-[State] Leadership Handbook. [Capital City, XX]: National Association of Social Workers/[State], 1985-1986.

NASW President. Memo to Licensure Committee, February 13, 1985.

Center for Non-Profit Corporations. (1985). Amended Block Grant Improvement Bills Receive Action in [Capital City]. Update. (February).

Hot News from the Licensure Front, NASW Focus, March 1985.

Unit Center Announcement, NASW Focus, March 1985.

Case study notes, March 29, 1985.

Chairperson, ELAN. Letter to "ELANers," April 17, 1985.

Human Services Management Institute: Networking for Administrators brochure. April 19, 1985.

Social Workers' Day Program Draws "Who's Who" List of Social Workers, Legislators, Bureaucratic and Municipal Executives, NASW Focus, May 1985.

Case study notes, May, 17, 1985.

Unit Center Annoiuncement, NASW Focus, May, 1985.

Executive Director's [Annual] Report, June 1985.

Center for Non-Profit Corporations. 1985. #S-XO. Update. July-August.

Unit Center Announcement, NASW Focus, September, 1985.

Coalition to Advance Social Work Standards, NASW Focus, October 1985.

Chair, Licensing Fund Raising Committee. Memorandum to Board of Directors, March 14, 1986.

[State] Department of Human Services. State Human Services Advisory Council: Organization and Activities. July, 1986.

[State] Register, Monday, January 5, 1987, Human Services.

Unit Center Announcement, NASW Focus, May, 1987.

Budget Reduction Options, [Austin County] HSAC, February 8, 1989.

The Convention: Responding to Human Needs in [State], Brochure, October 6, 1989.

People Count Coalition, Rally for Community Services, Brochure, May 15, 1991.

Donnelly, J. [Capital City] rally for needy, disabled. [Austin] Record, May 17, 1991.

Governor. . .Signs Social Work Licensure Act. NASW. . .NEWS. [date].

Applause--Applause. NASW. . .NEWS.[date].

Licensure Update. NASW. . .NEWS. [date].

Case study notes. Interview with chair of the People Count Coalition, June, 1994.

Report of the NASW/XX Restructuring Task Force, February 16, 1995.

Case study notes. Interview with administrator of local HSAC, February 28, 1997.

#### No Date

[Bedford] County Human Services Advisory Council Membership List--1983-84, no date.

[Chester] County Human Service Planning Advisory Council: Narrative Description and Membership List, no date.

Fair Budget [Action Campaign] and [State] Block Grant Coalition. Block Grant Descriptions, Responsible [State] Department, and Key Contact Persons. no date.

[Grant] County Human Service Advisory Council Membership List, no date.

Human Services Advisory Council of [Lancaster] County Membership List, no date.

[Johnson] County Human Services Advisory Council: Membership List, no date.

[NASW/XX's] Administration Section and Block Grant Project invite you to a Spring Forum on "Human Services Planning Issues Confronting Local Decision-Makers." Flyer, no date.

[State] Department of Human Services, Office of Intergovernmental Relations. Block Grants in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, [State's] Federal Allotment, FFY82. no date.