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This study presents an intensive case report on an Organization Development (OD) consulting model that utilizes a training and action-research mode of intervention. The OD program described includes data relating to fifteen major and secondary interventions made by the consultant over a period of seven months in a community action (anti-poverty) agency.

The study describes in detail the effect of the consultant's style of operation upon the agency, as well as presenting the results of creating and training an internal consulting team. Central to the consultant's style of operation was the training of a team of agency staff persons who would at first work alongside the external consultant and then eventually function independent of him within the agency.

The study shows that the internal training-consulting team was able to overcome agency resistance to training and to facilitate some important problem-solving with-
in the agency. Five subsystems within the agency are shown to have had some positive change take place as a result of the interventions.

Among the structural changes documented that took place as a result of the training-consultant interventions are: (1) the creation of an employees' organization, (2) the expansion of the internal training team from five to twelve members, (3) the establishment of program directors (persons who head components within the agency) staff meetings.

Findings regarding the consultant's style of intervention and the development of the internal training team include: (1) the acceptance of internal consultants based on ability to utilize newly learned skills, (2) development of a working style between external consultant and internal training team that was able to avoid a dependent relationship.

The case report relates directly to three areas of concern in the field of Organization Development. It contributes to the clarification of the field of OD, it provides more knowledge about the process of change within an organization, and is a presentation of data regarding a real-life application of OD techniques and approaches to planned change in a non-industrial setting.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background

Robert H. Guest, in reflecting on organizational change observes:

At this stage of development [of change theory] what is needed most is more empirical material, more real life studies in ongoing organizations (1962, p. 2).

And Seymour B. Sarason adds:

The fact is that we simply do not have adequate descriptive data on the ways in which change is conceived, formulated and executed...Obviously, there are many different ways in which it comes about, with differing degrees of success and failure, but it has hardly been studied (1971, p. 20).

This does not mean that change has not been accepted as a way of life. Indeed it has. Toffler (1970) reminds us that:

Western society for the past 300 years has been caught in a fire storm of change. This storm, far from abating, now appears to be gathering force. Change sweeps through the highly industrialized countries with waves of ever accelerating speed and unprecedented impact. It spawns in its wake all sorts of curious social flow -- from psychedelic churches and 'free universities' to science cities in the arctic and wife-swap clubs in California (p. 11).

In the face of this constant and accelerating change, organizations as well as individuals have found themselves in crisis, and in their attempt to weather the fire storm
of change have selected what seems to many the only feasible alternative, planned change. Lippitt (1958) has given it a generally accepted definition:

A conscious, deliberate, and collaborative effort to improve the operations of a human system, whether it be a self-system, social system, or cultural system, through the utilization of scientific knowledge (p. 7).

And although our ability to bridge the gap between the theory of what scientific knowledge can do for planned change and the actual utilization of the knowledge is limited, the application of such knowledge is operationally desirable and apparently conceptually sound. A whole new field of planned change called Organization Development (OD) has emerged in the last decade to deal with the impact of change upon organizational life. Even though there is still no specific agreement regarding Organization Development, there is some general agreement. Sherwood (1971) has summarized that general agreement as the new way of looking at the human side of organizational life, including:

(a) A long-range effort to introduce planned change based on a diagnosis which is shared by the members of an organization.

(b) An OD program involves an entire organization, or a coherent "system" or part thereof.

(c) Its goal is to increase organizational effectiveness and enhance organizational choice and self-renewal.
(d) The major strategy of OD is to intervene in the ongoing activities of the organization to facilitate learning and to make choices about alternative ways to proceed (p. 1).

OD has thus emerged as a way of helping organizations self-renew, develop the kind of health necessary for survival in a constantly changing environment, and to renew again, as necessary in a continuous process of change. OD "participates" in the constant change cycle of western civilization and is itself affected by the change process.

In fact, at one session of the OD Network meeting of the NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, Burke, Tannenbaum and Schmidt were talking about the future of Organization Development. They were struck with the fact that persons involved in OD for the past five years, 1966-71, were still asking the question, "Just what is OD?". They were also concerned with how new knowledge and power issues fit into OD; "a feeling that some different things must happen in the future for OD to be viable in the next ten years" (Burke, 1971, p. 5).

Burke said that what he saw as one of the fundamental missing things in the OD process was the management of the change process. "We've got to be more clear about that. In other words, I don't believe that in the future the one external, charismatic consultant coming in to change that big system is really going to make it. I think it is going to have to be more of a consulting team approach. But we don't
know much about how to manage that kind of concept, particularly when that consulting team is composed of not only three or four external types, but also some internal consultants" (Burke, 1971, p. 5).

Tannenbaum added his concern around reliance on technology. "Now I don't want to down-grade technology, and I support the idea that we need to develop better methods, but what I think is important is for us to have the wisdom to relate our techniques to the people in the system...I think we are facing the real danger of becoming plumbers rather than humanists" (Tannenbaum, 1971, p. 12).

Three issues appear quite clearly:

1) The need for the continued clarification of the field of OD.

2) The need for more knowledge of the "process" of OD.

3) The need for systematic presentation of data regarding real-life application of OD techniques and approaches to planned change.

Case Study Rationale

Because the case study is a way of ordering social data with the view toward preserving the unitary character of whatever is being studied (McKinney, 1967), it is ideal
for the presentation of material in a new field such as OD. The cycle of complementary steps in case study preserve that unitary character which is so essential to an understanding of intervention process and the management of change in OD. Good and Scates (1954) list that cycle as:

1. Recognition and determination of the status of the phenomenon to be investigated...

2. Collection of data relating to the factors or circumstances associated with the given phenomenon.

3. Diagnosis or identification of causal factors as a basis for remedial or developmental treatment.

4. Application of remedial or adjustment measures.

5. Subsequent follow-up to determine the effectiveness of the corrective or developmental measures applied.

The case study method was thus chosen for the presentation of this study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to present an intensive case study of an OD consulting model that utilizes a training and action-research mode of intervention.
There are a number of articles and books which outline theoretical notions of "how to do" OD, (Walton, 1969; Bennis, 1969; Davis, 1967; Blake and Mouton, 1964, 1968 and 1969; Argyris, 1962) and some studies looking at discrete parts of an OD program such as lab sessions (Miles, 1965; Bunker, 1965; Bunker and Knowles, 1967). However, as Friedlander points out, "For the most part, previous studies have focused upon sensitivity training sessions rather than upon organization development programs, and thus have contributed less to our knowledge of organizational improvement...They have focused entirely upon outcomes with little or no specification or description of the processes and have provided us with little information about how to utilize or improve the processes. Or they have described the processes with no systematic evaluation of the impact and have left us with no data on their usefulness" (1968, p. 380).

It is the assumption of the investigator in presenting this model that an actual case study will contribute to meeting the need for a delineation of effective intervention processes. The study will describe as fully as possible specific consultant behaviors as these behaviors relate to a series of training programs, as well as to pre-planning and post-evaluative meetings, with the client system. The client-consultant
relationship was made possible by a contract negotiated between the Springfield Human Development Center, Inc. (SHDC), and a community action agency whose code name in this study is the Dumont Community Action Commission, Inc. (DCAC).

Definitions

A number of definitions are necessary for an understanding of this case presentation.

Organization Development as used in this study follows the general definition presented by Sherwood earlier in this chapter. One purpose of this study, of course, is to make some contribution to a more specific definition of the processes that now are called OD.

The Primary Consultant (PC) in this study is the writer and principal investigator in this presentation.

The Secondary Consultant (SC) is another staff member of SHDC who worked with the PC in the development and execution of the DCAC-SHDC contract. The SC is also writing a companion study to this presentation that presents an overview of the consultant client system relationship (Westcott, 1972).

Major Interventions (MI's) are those actual training programs called for in the DCAC-SHDC contract.

Secondary Interventions (SI's) are all those interventions related to MI's that were necessary for the develop-
Action-research, as used in this study, is best summarized by Good (1963):

1. Usually stemming from an urgent practical or felt need, with a goal of application of results and improvement of practice in the particular setting where the group or investigator works, through processes of group planning, execution, and evaluation (by both specialist and volunteers or lay participants).

2. Interest in the particular subjects investigated rather than in the total theoretical population represented by the sample under study.

3. A developmental design, with the hypothesis and method subject to modification during the course of the action program, and with due consideration of all interdependent groups concerned in any changes to be made.

4. Desirability of training in concepts of group dynamics as background for cooperative study of practical problems, with the guiding theory that of human interaction by which change is either facilitated or resisted... The specialists in their role of democratic leaders stimulate and develop the talents of the group, and train and supervise the participants in the project.

5. Determination of the value of the action project in terms of the extent to which methods and findings make possible improvements in practice in a particular situation and realization of social and educational purposes (p. 324).

Limitations of the Study

Although the use of the case study method for evaluative purpose is widespread in clinical research, it has been viewed with less favor by those who would emphasize only non-evaluat-
tive research, where the crucial methodological question hinges around the validity of this method, not for understanding (or evaluating) the individual case, but for generalizing about the effectiveness of a particular approach or program. Just as the single case cannot furnish proof of the existence of a cause and effect relationship, in a world that so desires proof, it is often overlooked for what it can offer, a whole in terms of the particularities that are observable.

Also, the primary consultant was one of the observers, thus adding to the difficulty of retaining objectivity. However, being the principal consultant as well as one of the observers added much data that often is unavailable, data regarding the feelings and developing perceptions of the consultant.

The study is also time bounded. The period of consulting was limited to the period between December, 1971 and July, 1972.

Because of the extensive nature of the DCAC under study, the DCAC was not the primary focus of this study. Indeed, the case at hand was limited to the contracted interventions and planning sessions, and the development of the inside training team.
Outline of Presentation

Chapter II presents a review of literature as it relates to OD models, styles of intervention, and the impact of OD Theory and processes on modern organizations.

Chapter III presents the methods and procedures surrounding the MI’s and SI’s, methods of data collection and evaluation.

Chapter IV presents the complete case review of the four MI’s and SI’s and relates the systematic observation of the consultant’s style (PC) and the development of the inside training team.

Chapter V presents data related to an assessment of the consequences of the consultant interventions and training team development, conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

General Background

Bennis (1969) reminds us that:

The environment now is busy, clogged, and dense
with opportunities and threats; it is turbulent, uncer¬
tain, and dynamic. The people who work for or¬
ganizations are more complicated than ever before.
They have needs, motives, anxieties, and to make mat¬
ters even more complicated, they bring higher expec¬
tations than ever before to our institutions. The
institutions themselves are changing, through the
press of environmental challenges and the internal
demands of its people. Organization development is
a response to these complex challenges, an educa¬
tional strategy which aims to bring about a better
fit between the human beings who work in and expect
things from organizations and the busy, unrelenting
environment with its insistence on adapting to chang¬
ing times (p. 77).

If indeed OD is a response to these complex challenges,
an educational strategy, then what are its roots in the pro¬
fessional literature and from where do its major influences
come?

Beckhard (1969, p. 9) has defined OD in general as an
effort (1) planned, (2) organization-wide, and (3) managed
from the top, to (4) increase organization effectiveness and
health through (5) planned interventions in the organization's
"processes", using behavior-science knowledge. It is the lat¬
ter phrase, using behavior-science knowledge, that gives OD
its context (background). Whether one goes back to the 1930's
presentation of the Western Electric study at Hawthorne, Illinois dealing with a series of experiments with work groups in industry (Mayo, 1933) or even further back to Simmel (1922), who at the turn of the century was writing about groups of two or three persons, the roots of OD are diffuse and diverse. Although OD has been influenced greatly by research and practice clustered around what is often called "scientific management" its main emphasis has always been the improvement of the system rather than the improvement of the manager.

Thus, while scientific management has exerted influence, the laboratory method of learning (especially the T-group) has had a greater influence. This has added, however, to the present status of lack of specificity, mainly because of the variety of influences the T-group has exerted.

For example, in the late 1940's, the laboratory movement, as exemplified by National Training Laboratories (NTL), focused on a method of teaching American communities techniques for participatory democracy. Group process and task-oriented group function dominated the scene until the mid-1950's. The concern shifted to individual growth, to self-knowledge, to maturation and to the attainment of self-actualization. The emphasis moved from education to a therapeutic
goal. From about mid-1960 on, there appears to be considerable renewed interest in the original aims of the laboratory method. Throughout, however, there has been a human relations emphasis in the T-group and laboratory method that nurtures human growth and which has been incorporated into the OD process primarily as a counterbalance to many of the dehumanizing elements of the culture.

Another important influence upon OD has been action research. There are three processes in an action-research approach, all of which involve extensive collaboration between a consultant and the organization: data gathering from individuals and groups, feedback to key client or client groups in the organization, and joint action planning based on the feedback. Action-research, the threads of which in OD run directly back to its original proponent, Kurt Lewin, is designed in OD to make data available from the entire system and then to use that information to make further plans for the growth (renewal) of that system (Sherwood, 1971).

Thus, the foundations of Organization Development are based much on the works of Lewin, who developed a social psychological theory of human behavior and accordingly focused his theory and research (1948), McGregor, whose strategy for change emphasized the modification of organizational systems based on his studies of individual motivation and
reward (1960), Mayo, who emphasized an individual strategy of change but focused on "human relations" approaches to formal organizations in industry (1945) and Roethlesberger, who, along with Homans and Dickson (1939) is noted for his work at the Hawthorne Works of Western Electric.

Blake, Mouton, and Argyris are, of course, recognized as significant contributors to the theory and practice of OD, with the latter placing more emphasis on interpersonal competence (1962) and the former two on team approach and the nature of collaboration (1964, 1967). Shepard (1964), Schein (1965) and Beckhard (1969) are practitioners who have contributed to the theory of OD, while Likert (1967) is a "concept maker" who additionally has developed diagnostic instruments for studying organizations.

OD at present, then, is an approach toward training and development which takes into account a broad range of system considerations and is well-grounded in the Western civilization concept of rapid, ever present change. But as used here, change is defined in terms of a planned, controlled activity. And, in general, since 1933 the focus of that change has been turned from time and motion analysis toward more human factors. Coch and French (1948) demonstrated the power of group discussion in changing organiza-
tional norms and productivity and Jacques (1952) in his *The Changing Culture of a Factory* provided a classic case study of consultation that was to influence the field for at least a decade. McGregor (1961) laid the foundation for managers and OD specialists to view change with a new light and, indeed, even a new hope. His "Theory Y", which presented man as inherently curious, capable of growth, trustworthy, and initiating, contrasted with the old-line "Theory X", which viewed man as indolent, self-protective, more passive than aggressive in the world of work, thus needing some sort of managerial control. Bennis (1963) completed the picture by his application of organizational change as a new and exciting frontier for the application of behavioral science. A "planned change movement" was on its way.

During the middle and late 1960's, OD techniques and theories expanded with economic support primarily from companies interested in function improvement. Although lagging far behind industry in the application of planned organizational change, schools and community organizations began to participate in the spreading use of OD. The first systematic testing of OD approaches in schools was begun by Miles (1963).

This does not mean that a few schools were not experimenting previously with planned change. In the mid-1950's, Seattle schools were using T-groups, and in 1961 NTL began offering annual T-group laboratories designed especially for
teachers, but neither of these really involved OD. In the early 1960's, NTL stimulated educational interest in OD, and it was natural for some of this interest to splash over into other community programs; some as a result of the new anti-poverty program that was in full swing. There are several studies (Bowers and Soan, 1961; Clark and Miles, 1954; Khanna, 1968; Schmuck, 1968) that report on work directed toward modification of an educational system. But to date, schools, to a lesser degree, and community organizations, to a greater degree, lag behind the utilization of OD in industry.

Much of the literature on planned organizational change is focused on the use of the "change agent." Buchanan (1967) found that most of the six organizations whose change strategies he studied relied on change agents who led group discussions and facilitated T-groups.

Lippitt, Watson, and Westley (1958) viewed planned change as a deliberate and collective process involving a change agent and a client system. They deal, in detail, with the training and role of the change agent in developing a firm change relationship.

One thing is clear in the literature. Most presentations treat the implementation of organizational change as an event rather than a process.
Although the OD literature around community based organizations is meager, there have been some notable exceptions to the general emphasis upon business and industry. For example, Zurcher (1969) using a team of participant observers studied stages of committee development of 12 poverty program neighborhood action committees to demonstrate the unique dynamics of a set of neighborhood action groups and to urge practitioners to consider and test the notion that neighborhood action committees can, in themselves, be vital social processes. An example of the possible use of action research in an OD setting can be seen, also, in the work of Teele, Jackson, and Mayo (1967). They studied the motivations and experiences of black parents who joined together in an organized endeavor called Exodus, that bussed children from overcrowded, racially imbalanced schools near their homes in the Roxbury section of Boston to predominantly white schools.

Participation in Decision Making

The importance of subordinate participation in initiating innovations and being involved throughout the change process, is given great emphasis in the literature. Benne and Birnbaum (1960), Dufay (1966), Oliver (1965) and Trump (1967) make strong cases for the necessity of participation
throughout the total planned change process. The educational literature related to OD stresses that participation leads to higher staff morale and that this is necessary for successful implementation (Bennis, 1966). Participation leads to greater commitment, which is a prerequisite for effective change (Mann and Hoffman, 1960; Goodlad and Anderson, 1963; Oliver, 1965). Since much of the literature stresses that clarity is necessary for implementation, the literature also puts an emphasis on participation in order to assure this clarity (Anderson, 1964; Gale, 1967).

Argyris adds another reason for participation by all those who are to be affected by any proposed change; participation decreases resistance to change (1962). This view is supported in the literature by Argyle (1967), Oliver (1965), and Peterson (1966). This does not mean that these views are unchallenged in the literature. Herzberg, Mausner, and Synderman (1959) have questioned whether such a view is realistic and Leavett (1965) questions the effectiveness of participation in connection with an outside change agent. One thing is clear, however, and that is that there is a paucity of research evidence to support either view. There are at least ten studies, however, that report significant trends, following training (principally T-group) towards less authoritarian, more democratic and participative attitudes (Argyris, 1962; Blake and Mouton, 1966; Bowers and Soar, 1961; Dietterich, 1961; Gassner, Gold and Snadowsky,

OD Studies

Seashore and Bowers (1963) reported on efforts in changing the structure and functioning of an organization and used the case method approach. Again, this was an industrial setting and had as its major purpose to study four propositions that are central to organizational theory. In brief, the study at least gave added weight, if not conclusive evidence, that an organization is likely to achieve its purposes better: 1) if there is an emphasis on the work group rather than primarily on the individual, 2) if there is a high rate of interaction and mutual influence among work group members, 3) if there is a high degree of participation in decision-making and 4) if supervisors provide to subordinates a high degree of supportiveness.

Buchanan and Brunstetter (1959) found that three to seven months after working with persons from within the same organization, but drawn from different departments and organizational components, those managers who had participated in the program perceived greater improvements in the departmental functions which they supervised than did those in a control division. But this study, like many
(Boyd and Ellis, 1962; Valiquet, 1968; Underwood, 1965; Blake and Mouton, 1966), focused on laboratory training rather than on organization-wide interventions that are more likely to result in real organization change.

OD efforts of late have thus broadened the contact with organizational structure. The emphasis runs the gamut from team training, such as Harrison (1962), who found that the members of a managerial team, after training, described each other in more "human", emotional terms, but did not describe other associates who had not attended the training with such terms. Friedlander (1967, 1968) found that managers who had attended team training, unlike those who had not attended training, reported a higher degree of effectiveness, and, indeed, that the team which had the most contact, pre and post, with the outside trainer, showed the most change.

Morton (1965) reported that, in a study of three organizational training laboratories, of 396 critical incidents, 47% were related to improved working relationships, improved organizational climate and conflict reduction. This on top of an original review of the data (Morton and Wight, 1964) that showed team-trained managers versus cousin groups reported more events in areas involving im-
proved team functioning.

In a study in which the data are very incompletely presented and thus limit the value for the field of OD in general, Golembiewski and Blumberg (1967, 1968 and 1969) give us at least a view of an intervention style that involved clarifying relationships and conflicts between work groups of an organization. The data show that the intervention improved the attitudes of the members of nine groups toward other groups. Also, this effect was far greater in three groups which had been more intensively involved or represented in the designed intervention. Blake, Mouton, and Sloma (1965) in addition present a case study that claims improved conflict management and realistic collaboration as a result of an intergroup intervention.

The professional literature is meager with regard to studies that present a comprehensive OD strategy using several interventions over a period of considerable length, however. Perhaps the best known in the field of industry is the study by Blake, Mouton, Barnes and Greiner (1964) that assessed the effect of a Grid OD program run by line managers within a petroleum refining organization of 4000 employees over a one-year period. The participants reported a 23 per cent improvement in work group performance, a 31 per cent increase in meetings, a 52 per cent increase in
transfers, more frequent promotion of younger line managers, improved working relationships and more success in solving organizational problems. Profits also went up 78 per cent over the preceding 3 years with the OD intervention being given credit for 44 per cent of the increase.

Marrow, Bowers and Seashore (1967) report in their study of a garment manufacturing firm in poor financial condition on the processes and outcomes of a planned change effort aimed at applying Likett's concepts on participative management. Seashore and Bowers (1970) collected four-year follow-up data. The findings show that management style was clearly seen to have moved in a participative direction and the influence, goal emphasis and work facilitation of supervisors was seen by workers to have increased.

Schmuck and Runkel (1970) in their study-intervention of the Highland Park school present another OD intervention that is more extensive and represents a variety of interventions. In this study they found that OD efforts resulted in improved communication and group problem-solving without changing the formal hierarchy of responsibility for giving and receiving directions. Training also affected the number of effective communication links on the Highland Park staff. A wider use of staff resources and the emergence of more team-teaching groups was linked to the staff becoming more
accurate about existing communication channels. These find-
ings were made in 1967 and 1968 and two years later they per-
sisted, which the authors state is testimony to real organi-
zational effects having been produced by their intervention.

The quantitatively based studies, meager and faulty as
they may be (see Campbell and Dunnett, 1968) generally sup-
port many of the claims of OD, as do a number of case studies,
Beckhard, 1966; Crockett, 1970; Davis, 1967; Greiner, 1967;
Winn, 1966; and Zand, Miles and Lytle, 1970. Both the quan-
titative based studies and the case studies give testimony
that OD can accomplish its hopes of creating self-renewing
systems that reflect the values of "Theory Y", if there is
clear commitment from the top and a sufficient, if as yet
undefined amount, of time and energy in OD work.

The literature is thus quite clear. OD is still young
enough to be hard to define; it is diverse enough to be
vague in its origins; it is successful enough to give hope
to its development. The study reported in this presentation
is heir to all of OD's diverseness, but as seen in Chapter
IV and V, also participates in its hope.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present a rationale for the use of the case study method for this particular study and to specifically present the methodology and procedures used in compiling the data for presentation.

As was pointed out in the introduction, the case study is a way of ordering social data with the view toward preserving the unitary character of whatever is being studied, and is ideal for the presentation of material in a new field such as Organization Development. Also, as Walton (1972) reminds us, the case study can attend to aspects of a change program which other methodologies cannot: namely, processes of change and of change interventions. When one is presenting a case regarding consultant style, the case study has even greater advantage.

A tendency toward depersonalization is reflected in most statements of theory, technique, and experimental results. This tendency is almost inherent in the abstraction process. A potential advantage of the case study is that the role of personal styles (preferences, strengths, weaknesses, and biases) of the actors in a system of planned change can be appreciated, even if the role of these factors does not appear sufficiently systematic to generalize and incorporate in a theory of intervention. The primary attribute of a case study which takes advantage of this possibility is obvious: It includes sensitive descriptive material about particular human beings who were central to the change process...The case
study can help take the mystery out of the behavioral scientist's role in change programs (Walton, 1972, p. 77).

Even Good's description of case study sounds very much like a general presentation of the OD process:

From the point of view of research, case study means intensive investigation of the case unit, especially with respect to initial status or symptoms, collection of explanatory data, and diagnosis or identification of causal factors, looking toward remedial or developmental treatment (1963, p. 389).

Thus, for the presentation of an OD intervention, the case study appears to be one of the most effective means of presentation at a researcher's disposal. However, the methods used for that case presentation may vary and methods must be selected relative to the data that are to be presented. Hillway (1961) has identified some primary data sources that are available to the case study, i.e., records made by recording of direct observation, records made by interviewing or administering a questionnaire, and past experiences and historical information available through agency on-going records. This study utilizes all of these plus the critical incident method for each major intervention (MI).

Data Collection

Specifically, systematic observation of the consultant's style and its effect on observable outcomes were made by the
secondary consultant (SC) and the primary consultant (PC). The field technique of participant observation was used. The participant observation was similar to Gold's (1958) typology "observer-as-participant" which includes minimal participation, low profile, and inconspicuous recording of data. The PC thus attended fifteen separate planning, training and evaluation meetings over a period of eight months from December, 1971 through July, 1972. The PC sat with participants but with the exception of one MI, the Programmatic Training Conference, did not take an active part and remained as inconspicuous as possible during the actual workshops.

A very active role was assumed in the SI's (secondary or Training Team training sessions), however, and major data for this portion was secured by the SC functioning according to Gold's typology. Notes were taken at the discretion of the observers (PC and SC), but not when they seemed to provide a distraction. Because of the training aspect of the intervention, other persons found it appropriate to take notes and thus note taking by the PC and SC were seldom deemed a distraction.

An extensive log evolved. Not more than 24 hours later, both observers shared their observations, which were then cross-checked and with few exceptions only areas of close
similarity were used in the presentation of the case data. This method was used on four MI's and three of the SI's. Systematic observations based on the SC's log are also included covering areas that the PC was unable to record because of the particular active role he was assuming at certain points of the interventions.

A final interview was held on July 20, 1972 of one and one-half hours duration with each member of the Training Team. This interview was conducted by the PC and SC, using a questionnaire as the starting point for the interview. (See Appendix A.) The purpose of this interview was to ascertain the perceptions of the Training Team regarding the PC's style of consulting and to elicit their feelings regarding their participation on the Training Team.

As a further effort to describe the consulting style of the PC, the writer also utilized a critical incident technique following each MI. The critical incident technique consists of a set of procedures for collecting direct observations of human behavior in such a way as to facilitate their potential usefulness in solving practical problems and developing broad psychological principles. By an incident is meant any observable human activity that is sufficiently complete in itself to permit inferences and predictions to be made about the person performing the act.
It is ideal in looking at a particular way of behaving (consulting style). To be critical by these standards means, however, that the incident must occur in a situation where the purpose or intent of the act seems fairly clear to the observer, and where its consequences are sufficiently definite to leave little doubt concerning its effects (Flanagan, 1954).

No more than 24 hours after each MI, the SC interviewed the PC to gather data regarding his perception of critical incidents. The SC used the following basic questions to gather the information from the PC:

Think of your experience at the training session and describe the incident in which you were involved that had the most impact on you, either positive or negative. What was that incident? Respond in terms of:

a. Situation; background or activity that led up to or influenced the behavior.

b. Describe exactly what you did.

c. Outcome; analysis of how your behavior influenced or affected the situation, people in it, and how you felt about it.

In order to round out the presentation, background information was utilized from the 1971 DCAC Annual Report. Limited use was made of Postmeeting Reactions (PMR) in order to assess feelings of participants and get some systematic feedback about participants' perceptions of the training efforts. These PMR's were collected only for those ses-
sessions involving the entire DCAC staff, MI-1a and MI-1b. Other MI's had few enough participants, all less than ten persons, so that the data could be gathered directly as part of the training sessions.

In addition to the systematic cross-checking of log entries, the use of the above instruments assures a much greater degree of objectivity and maximizes the reliability of the data presented. These data are assembled in Chapter IV, resulting in a presentation of the case study and the presentation of the important elements of a consulting style as made explicit in a real-life situation.
CHAPTER IV

THE CASE STUDY

Introduction

The following case study is a description of an action-research model for Organization Development which guided the consultants' efforts as OD practitioners in working within a community-action agency setting. The OD program described here includes data relating to all phases of the client-consultant relationship from December 21, 1971 through July 20, 1972. The OD program consisted of a series of training events and related planning and evaluation sessions.

The four major training events are referred to in the case study as major interventions (MI's) and the planning and evaluation sessions are referred to as secondary interventions (SI's). All interventions are reported in the sequence in which they occurred. A summary of all interventions is presented in Table I.

There are some particulars about the organization in this study, The Dumont Community Action Commission, which need to be considered in generalizing the results obtained in this study to other organizations. First of these is the maximum feasible participation of the poor stipulation in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which directs com-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 21, 1971</td>
<td>(SI-1 and SI-2) Planning First Action Steps</td>
<td>Training Director and Executive Director,</td>
<td>Clarify contractual agreement, define problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 12, 1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training Committee</td>
<td>Planning and Skill Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 25, 1972</td>
<td>(SI-3) Training Team Development</td>
<td>Training Team Members</td>
<td>Planning and Skill Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 6, 1972</td>
<td>MI-1a - Orientation and Goal Setting</td>
<td>All DCAC Staff</td>
<td>Clarify goals, problems and develop skills for problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 17, 1972</td>
<td>MI-2a - Programmatic Training Conference</td>
<td>Program Directors and Training Team</td>
<td>Improvement of personnel practices within each component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, 1972</td>
<td>MI-3 - Board of Directors Intervention</td>
<td>Board Members and Program Directors</td>
<td>Diagnosis Board's Attitude Toward Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7, 1972</td>
<td>SI-5 Planning for Final Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop</td>
<td>Training Team</td>
<td>Develop Training Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15, 1972</td>
<td>MI-1b - Orientation and Goal Setting Evaluation Session</td>
<td>All DCAC Staff</td>
<td>Follow-up and Progress Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 27, 1972</td>
<td>MI-2b - Programmatic Training Conference (Second Day)</td>
<td>Program Directors and Training Team</td>
<td>Development of Diagnostic and Planning Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 12, 1972</td>
<td>SI-6 - Training Team Planning</td>
<td>Training Team</td>
<td>Learn Lab Design by Designing Training Committee Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 12, 1972</td>
<td>MI-4 - Training Committee Workshop</td>
<td>Training Committee and Training Team</td>
<td>Evaluate and Clarify Future Training Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 20, 1972</td>
<td>SI-7 - Evaluation of Training</td>
<td>Training Team</td>
<td>Design of Final Agency Evaluation and Feedback to Primary Consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
munity action agencies to hire as many low income staff as possible. A first concern in hiring, then, is economic status rather than some measure of past experience and competency, although the latter are also considered. Also, the major source of financial support for DCAC came from Federal government funding sources, rather than agency clientele. The availability of funds also reflected the changing political climate toward program priorities. For example, during the time period of this study a major agency component, Health Start, ended its pilot project year and was not refunded, while a new component, Foster Grandparents, was funded for over $100,000. Finally, DCAC's client population is both defined and limited, by Federal guidelines, to low income residents of the county. Federal guidelines also defined goals for each of the agency components as well as for the over-all agency.

The Consulting Model

The consulting firm, Springfield Human Development Center, is incorporated under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, "...to conduct a center for family and individual counseling; to provide psychotherapy to individuals and groups; to provide psychological and educational services and in general to offer services in the area of hu-
man psychological development" (Articles of Incorporation). Past work of the Center has included: counseling for individuals, families and groups, educational testing and tutoring and provision of consulting services to businesses, educational and service agencies in the areas of organizational development, leadership and communication problems.

The consulting model verbalized by SHDC in general and the Primary Consultant (PC) for the DCAC Training Program, in particular, defines OD according to Sherwood's definition as presented in Chapter I, and works from an action research orientation, which may be summarized as follows:

1. Usually stemming from an urgent practical or felt need, with a goal of application of results and improvement of practice in execution and evaluation....

2. Interest in the particular subjects...rather than in the total theoretical population represented by the sample....

3. A developmental design, with the hypotheses and method subject to modification during the course of the action program, and with due consideration of all interdependent groups concerned in any changes....

4. Desirability of training in concepts of group dynamics as background for cooperative study of practical problems, with the guiding theory being one of human interaction by which change is either facilitated or resisted...The consultants, in their role as democratic leaders, stimulate and develop the talents of the group....
5. Determination of the value of the action project in terms of the extent to which methods and findings make possible improvements in practice in a particular situation and realization of social and educational purposes (Good, 1963, p. 324).

The value orientation of SHDC is broadly defined as humanistic with persons viewed as having the right to participate in all decisions that directly affect them.

History and Background of DCAC

The Dumont Community Action Commission, Inc. is a private, non-profit corporation chartered in Massachusetts and incorporated in October, 1965. "This agency was created in an attempt to coordinate local, state, federal and private resources into a more effective attack on the problems or conditions which keep approximately 13 per cent of the County residents living in poverty." (Annual Report, DCAC, 1971). Major programs which operated to meet the above goal included: Central Administration, Neighborhood Centers, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Head Start, Day Care, Alcoholism Prevention Program and Health Start. DCAC's main office is located in Dumont, the County seat. Component programs with offices also in Dumont included Head Start, Day Care, Health Start, Alcoholism Prevention Program, Neighborhood Centers and Neighborhood Youth Corps. Head Start and Day Care centers are located in two other towns within the County. The geo-
graphical spread to agency affiliated programs meant that many of the organization's staffs had not had opportunities to know one another and were relatively unfamiliar with activities of programs other than their own.

Each of the programs had its own director who reported to DCAC's Executive Director, who in turn reported to an agency Board of Directors. That Board of Directors was composed of equal numbers of representatives from three sectors of the economy: low income, private and public sectors. The Board was ostensibly the policy making body for DCAC. In actuality, agency policies were largely determined by Federal guidelines and the Executive Director's view of how the organization ought to function. The organization was bureaucratic in nature, with power at the top and most communication originating there and being directed downward.

DCAC's Executive Director had held his position since the agency was incorporated in October, 1965 and was instrumental in the creation of the agency. The Associate Director had been with the agency, in that position, for four and one-half years. While a number of DCAC employees had been staff since the early days of the agency's existence, a number of new staff had been recently added as agency pro-
grams and staff doubled in number within the past two years. Longer term employees noted with regret (mixed with excitement over growth), the passing of a small, family-like atmosphere that once characterized the agency. The agency Training Director noted the agency's rapid growth and lack of parallel changes in organizational decision making structures and communications channels.

Initial Client Contact

In the summer of 1971, the Associate Director and Training Director at DCAC became aware of the availability of Federal Training and Technical Assistance Grants. In hopes of securing such a grant for DCAC, the Associate Director assumed major responsibility for the development of a training proposal. He was concerned with what he determined was the agency's relative ineffectiveness in dealing with the consequences of rapid growth and change. Also, he was concerned with the agency's seeming inability to utilize the wealth of human resources available within DCAC. In writing the Training Proposal, the Associate Director attempted to include Program Directors' input via a "Needs Assessment Questionnaire".

The proposal was completed after numerous revisions (in order to meet Federal grant criteria) and submitted to Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). Tentative approval
for the granting of Training and Technical Assistance funds was given in December, 1971. At that time, the DCAC Training Director assumed major responsibility for inviting a number of consulting firms to submit bids for the implementation of an agency-wide training program based on the Training Program Proposal - "Work Statement" (Appendix B). Among the consulting firms contacted and the firm finally awarded the training contract was Springfield Human Development Center, Inc. According to DCAC's Executive Director, a primary reason SHDC received the training contract was the recommendation of SHDC's staff representative that the development of an "internal" (agency staff) Training Team be considered a major part of any consulting agreement.

Problem Definition and Establishment of Client-Consultant Relationship

December 21, 1971
SI-1, Planning and First Action Steps
Participants: Training Director and Executive Director
Goals: Clarification of Contractual Agreement and Definition of Problem.
Location: DCAC Central Office

The concerns of DCAC's Training Director and Executive Director expressed at this meeting were to clarify the terms of the contract, including duration of contract and budget considerations, and to get some sense of what SHDC consultants
had planned as a result of reading the Training Proposal. SHDC consultants responded that planning from this moment on would be a joint SHDC-DCAC effort. The Training Director and Executive Director seemed receptive to that idea and then stated that the Training Proposal had been written primarily with an eye to meeting Federal Grant criteria in order to secure training funds. They assured the consultants, however, that the training proposal had some flexibility.

As discussion continued, DCAC staff made frequent reference to the agency's past experiences with training. The consultants were told that DCAC staff were highly resistant to training, especially training that might focus on interpersonal conflict. Staff also reported that there had been no follow-up on problems and issues dealt with during training.

The following specific problems were identified at this meeting as a result of the consultant's repeated request for more explicit statements of agency's problems:

1. Organization functioning relatively ineffectively as a result of a 50 per cent increase in staff and programs in the past two years.
2. No related increase in physical facilities and no change in communication channels and decision making structures.

3. Administrative function of Associate Director being under utilized as Executive Director dealt directly with Component Directors.

4. Low morale evidenced by high number of recent resignations.

5. Staff meetings held to discuss and deal with numerous agency problems, but action decisions rarely made.

6. Agency staff relatively unaware of resources and programs other than within their own component.

7. Lack of ability to effectively utilize staff resources already available within DCAC.

8. Minimal support for training from Executive Director.

Consultant observations. The consultants left this meeting with some awareness of agency problems but also aware that more information was necessary from a variety of levels within the agency. Thus a meeting was proposed and arranged with the agency's training committee, which was composed of staff and a representative from the Board of Directors. The consultants were concerned with the Training Director's high expectations of training, which was expressed as "training will
fix everything." In spite of past unsatisfactory experiences with training, the Training Director continued to express hope that the outside consultants would solve the agency's problems. The consultants felt that a great deal of work would have to be done to move toward a collaborative effort related to the training program.

January 12, 1972
SI-2, Planning and First Action Steps
Participants: Training Committee, Associate Director and Executive Director
Goals: Continue Clarification of Contractual Agreement and Definition of Problem.
Location: DCAC Central Office

Discussion during this meeting restated staff concerns over the low use of staff resources, poor communications within the agency, and low participation of staff in all agency activities. A great deal of time was spent discussing potential training days and means to assure staff participation. The PC indicated that he felt the responsibility for assuring participation rested with the agency and expressed concern about the relative ineffectiveness of a training program that did not include agency-wide participation. The Executive Director informed the consultants that DCAC had assumed this responsibility and had made attendance mandatory. The consultants suggested then that training sessions be held during normal working hours.

The Executive Director left the meeting early, and following his departure the Associate Director expressed
his hopes that training would help to increase the influence of the training committee on agency decision-making. Although the training committee had a variety of roles, it had been originally formed to bring pressure on the Executive Director for changes in agency personnel policies and make grievance procedures more available to staff. Other attempts to increase staff influence on agency decision-making had failed.

The consultants restated their desire to work with an internal training team. The training committee enthusiastically supported this idea and named five members, including the Associate Director, to this team. Dates were set for the first MI, Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop, and for the first meeting of the training team for February 25, 1972.

Consultant observation. The PC and SC shared the perception that a primary agency concern was low staff influence in decision-making, confirmed by the way in which this meeting evolved, i.e., the Executive Director made decisions, left the meeting, and then the staff began to talk about power.
The meeting began with the PC presenting a tentative design for the orientation and Goal Setting Workshop. In proposing a design for those two days of agency-wide training, the PC had attempted to respond to training needs as described in the initial interventions, SI-1 and SI-2. Agency concerns as understood by the consultants included lack of intercomponent communication and awareness of total agency program and resources, low morale related to a number of loosely defined problems which staff seemed unable to solve, and relative inability of staff to influence planning and decision making within DCAC. This one-half day training session included training in the use of Force Field Analysis as a problem-solving technique, training in carrying out a Problem Census, and minimal skills in group facilitation. Operating under an assumption that learning is more likely to take place if it is experience-based and related to real life, the consultant taught Force Field Analysis to Training Team members by asking them to use it. That is, the PC gave an initial verbal description of the
technique and then asked the Training Team to use the technique in dealing with problems they identified. As a second part of the day's training, Training Team members were asked to carry out their own Problem Census, i.e., what issues were keeping their components from reaching goals. The final input of this training session was a lecture and discussion of group facilitation skills. Highlights of that section included identifying a few facilitative behaviors, e.g. encouraging, supporting, being non-judgmental, and not pressuring for participation.

Consultant observations. The work with the Training Team was seen as being a developmental process in which the Training Team would be given support and experience-based training to better enable them to accept increasing responsibility for all aspects of the training program. The consultants were pleased with the high involvement of the Training Team members, but also aware of their questions about their abilities to carry out roles as trainers.

In responding to those concerns, the PC assured Training Team members that consultant help would be available throughout the two day workshop. For the consultants it seemed essential to have Training Team members in high visibility roles for this agency-wide workshop, so that a process of building an awareness of the Training Team as
inside experts and resources could begin. This could hopefully make the training program more effective, less threatening and assure more likelihood of follow-up.

March 6, 7, 1972
MI-la, Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop
Participants: All DCAC Staff
Goals: Clarify agency's goals, problems and develop skills for problem solving.
Location: All Saints Church, Dumont

Arrangements for the workshop were made by the Training Team. The meeting started late because the Training Team waited for the Executive Director to arrive. Plans for the day included a high degree of structure, including a decision to give each Program Director no more than seven minutes to present his program's goals, as defined by national guidelines. The opening session was designed to provide a general framework in which staff members could function at a low threat level, i.e., reaffirming or looking anew at individual component goals. This also provided a simple way for staff to get a general understanding of the overall nature and goals of DCAC as well as some specific information regarding each component and its activities. It was felt that the lack of awareness of other agency programs could be dealt with initially. It was also hoped that staff would become aware of the similarity of goals and populations served, and through this, a beginning atmosphere of agency and component interdependence could be created. As goals
were articulated, that first morning, the staff expressed a new awareness of the significance of their component in DCAC operations.

During the morning component groups met to identify and prioritize local program goals as they saw them, and then to carry out a Problem Census. The technique of Problem Census was used in each component group to find out what were the blocks to reaching the agreed upon goals. Problem Census, as used here, was a simple technique whereby the trainer facilitated the group efforts to articulate, in brainstorming fashion, "Those problems that keep you from doing your job, that something can be done about." In other words, the focus was to be on real problems. An attempt was made to avoid such general problems as, "No one in Washington understands us", and to keep the problems that were articulated out of the general gripe category. Once an opening statement was made by the trainer, no attempt was made to censor the free-flowing listing of problems, however.

The number of problems articulated via the Problem Census varied from group to group. In order for a problem to be listed, only one person needed to see it as a problem. Therefore, a large number of problems generated within a group possibly said more about high group participation than
it said about the extent of component difficulties.

Once the problems were listed on newsprint, the groups moved to a clarification session, which the PC referred to as, "Setting the record straight." In this session, administrative staff were available to answer questions, give information and to dispel rumors. An attempt was made to sort out problems that did not actually exist, i.e., were the result of rumor or misinformation. Problems were not removed from a list, even if staff were told "It's just a rumor", unless there was consensus among group members to remove that problem statement. It was the trainer's responsibility to facilitate this process and to ascertain whether or not there was consensus for removing a problem. Following the clarification session, the problems remaining on lists were ones with which the component members felt they really needed to contend.

In a general session that afternoon, each component presented the goals and problems it had identified. The purpose here was to share information and identify common elements within DCAC that cut across components. The identification of common problems seemed to give participants some sense of "We're in this together" and to highlight those issues which might be worked on across component lines. At the end of this session, fourteen common problems had been
identified. All fell within the general category of structural or organizational concerns, e.g., transportation, space, public relations, more staff. Organizational staff seemed at once overwhelmed, "Wow, we really do have a lot of problems", and relieved to know that many of the problems were shared and seemingly less suggestive of, "We're a bad program." The Associate and Executive Director remarks, near the end of this general session, defended the present organizational structure but agreed that, "These problems do exist."

An agenda setting session (for the second day of workshop) was held at 4:30 p.m. Participants were invited to observe and participate. It was made clear that the Training Team would set the agenda for Tuesday, but that participant input would be valued in planning the agenda to meet workshop goals as initially stated. Seven participants joined the Training Team, and the PC and SC, in exploring alternatives for the second day. Agreement was reached to rank order problems within each component.

In planning for the problem solving activities for the second day, the PC frequently helped Training Team members focus on problem solving as a process. As lists were briefly reviewed and commented on during this session, there began to be a move toward solving these problems now. The
Associate Director was especially interested in moving toward solutions for fear the day's work would end up as "just another session where problems were identified and nothing done about them". The PC suggested that there was more mileage to be gained in working on learning a process. The idea was to learn the skill, and then to practice it using a real problem for the practice, but placing emphasis on developing a useful tool that would be available to staff in a variety of settings. The group accepted this and the session ended.

The second day began with a general session in which some attempt was made to rank order agency problems. The emphasis for this second day was placed on problem solving within each component. Each group met with the Training Team member they had worked with on the previous day. Trainers gave theoretical input and presented steps for problem solving via Force Field Analysis. Component groups had the opportunity to practice the problem solving technique as it related to problems within their own components and also as it related to organizational changes that could be made without any policy decisions by the Board of Directors.

In the afternoon recommendations regarding solutions to problems that had been worked on in component groups were presented at a general session. It was assumed that this would enable the entire staff to participate on some level
In decisions which might be made regarding organizational changes. It was also assumed that if there was general agreement on changes to be made, implementation of the changes would be facilitated.

Of all the recommendations presented in this final general session, the proposal for establishment of a Sounding Board elicited the most discussion and staff support. As presented at this meeting, the Sounding Board was to be an employee association which hoped to improve communications within DCAC and to give staff greater influence in decisions which related to them. Each component agreed to participate in creation of a Sounding Board and volunteers were recruited from each group. Two basic guidelines for the Sounding Board were accepted: 1) that each component be represented by two persons and that 2) no one from the Central Staff should be a member of the Board. Six other recommendations were accepted by participants.

The day ended with participants being asked to complete Postmeeting Reaction Forms (PMR's). In general the answers to questions on that form expressed optimism about progress made and a feeling that the problem solving skills would be put to use during the months ahead. In specifying what they liked most, participants listed: working with people, collaboration, participation and meeting within component groups.
Consultant observations. The consultants were pleased with the first two days of training. One of the initial concerns of the PC had been a tendency on the part of DCAC staff to see themselves as unable to affect things in their environment, i.e., to solve problems. The optimism, expressed verbally by participants, and responses on the PMR's suggested that that negative perception was beginning to change.

The creation of a Sounding Board was seen as a positive step because it gave opportunity for increased participation and had the potential for increasing staff influence on agency decision-making.

The Training Team was also optimistic about the workshop. They frequently had looked to the consultants for support and input, but felt good about their ability to function as facilitators of the Problem Census and problem-solving process.

March 15, 1972
Participants: Training Team and Program Directors
Goals: To continue involvement of staff in planning and evaluation.
Location: DCAC Central Office

The meeting opened with an announcement that one of the Training Team members was now Acting Training Director. This change was necessitated by the original Training Director taking pregnancy leave. An additional Training Team member was
As a part of evaluating the Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop, Training Team members reviewed the PMR's. They were pleased and felt progress had been made. They felt, however, real evaluation would have to take place two months later during the final session of the Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop (MI-1b).

The PC and SC spent some time commenting on the Training Team's role and reviewing the areas in which the PC and SC felt the Training Team had given real assistance to the learning process during the Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop.

The second major agenda item was to plan the Programmatic Training Conference. That conference (MI-2a) was originally conceived as a means of developing career ladders (specification of steps related to training and experiences which enable para-professional staff to advance within the organization). The Training Team members, however, felt that this was not a good way to use scarce training time. Consequently they proposed that MI-2a should deal with: 1) human relations problems within components; 2) how to deal with personnel issues; 3) how to function effectively within DCAC structure; and 4) how to effectively diagnose the needs of each component and what to do with
such a diagnosis. The original plan had also been for Training Team members to be instrumental in planning and implementation of this training segment. However, due to the fact that all but one of the four Training Team members was also a Program Director, it was decided that the Training Team members would assist with planning but function as participants in the workshop.

March 17, 1972
MI-2a, Programmatic Training Conference
Participants: Training Team Members and Program Directors.
Goals: Improvement of Personnel Practices within each Program Component.
Location: SHDC Training Center

This training session began with the PC's outline of a proposed day's agenda. The agenda was accepted without comment. The PC made an additional comment regarding a definition of training. For him, as he saw it, training was the learning of skills and not just the creation of an experience that made people feel good. He expressed hope that the learning of skills by the Training Team would enable them to become sensitive to and able to respond to training needs within DCAC.

The first agenda item for this workshop was a theoretical, cognitive presentation. The topic was the concept of meaningful work; the idea that in order for work to have meaning and be valued by persons doing it, those persons
needed to be included in all aspects of that work, i.e., planning, implementation, and evaluation. That concept was discussed and led to an exploration of how such a concept could be implemented in a community action agency. The discussion then turned to a consideration of personnel functions that workshop participants needed to fulfill as Program Directors. Participants agreed that DCAC lacked a coherent or consistent system for dealing with personnel issues. There was also consensus that poor communication was both symptom and cause of many personnel problems and other problems within components.

Following this discussion participants were asked to explore one way of looking at communication problems; that is, to consider differing consequences of one-way and two-way communication and to consider the notion that communication takes place on two levels, content and feeling. To illustrate this idea, a role play was undertaken in which a supervisor was asked to talk with an employee who had just received a negative evaluation. During that role play, the role player in the supervisory role undertook to "fix" the situation and talked only to the content level of what was being said.

Next a second role play situation was undertaken. Discussion related to that role playing, as well as the
previous one, suggested that participants were fearful of responding to feelings. They seemed to see feelings only from a negative perspective, i.e., feelings meant anger, hurt and frustration. Discussion focused on these concerns through lunch time. The session seemed productive. At least one participant commented, "I really need to learn to listen better. I've been missing a lot."

After lunch, time was used for PC input and staff practice related to giving effective feedback. The Associate Director saw a direct application of the learnings from this session for the improvement of staff meetings.

From there the discussion moved to a look at a variety of communications problems within DCAC. One discussed, and partially dealt with, related to the Executive Director's Secretary interpreting memos she was asked to write. For example, in being told to send out a memo announcing a Senior Staff meeting, she was likely to add, "attendance is mandatory". The PC noted the effect that sort of miscommunication could have on climate within the organization. One Program Director nodded in agreement and noted that because of limited physical facilities, his clientele needed to go through two secretaries, including the one referred to above, in order to see him. The group supported his view that this was detrimental to his particular clien-
tele (low income youth). As a result, he resolved to actively seek new facilities for his component.

Discussion about communications problems continued. The PC noted frustrations being expressed and people wanting to act, but wondered why no action was taken. The PC pushed further, asking, "Where is it that decisions get made within this organization?" The Associate Director said that he did not know. One Program Director said, "We don't have the power." A second Program Director said that she did not know where to go when she needed decisions to be made or help with her component. The Associate Director commented about his new awareness of his past lack of response to this Director. "I guess it looks as if I'm giving you the cold shoulder," he said, "but I mean it as a message, as encouragement for you to assume more responsibility, autonomy in operating your program. I have a lot of confidence in your ability to do that." The Program Director responded, "I'm glad to know that. That's really helpful."

The PC intervened at this point to ask, "Why is this discussion going on here? What's been going on at staff meetings?" One response was, "I don't feel free to say what I need to at staff meetings. There's no way I can
risk being fired at this point." The PC asked, "Is the Executive Director the issue? It seems as if his absence today is the only observable difference between today's meeting and a regular staff meeting." From there discussion continued regarding what obstacles staff perceived to their assuming more power within the agency. As a result of that discussion, Program Directors realized that there was no need for their staff meetings to include the Executive Director since all were accountable, on the organizational chart, to the Associate Director. At that point, participants began to talk about the difficulties to which their present lack of power led. Directors had no control of their components' budgets and, in fact, did not even know the total amount of their budgets. As a consequence, they felt unable to plan effectively. As an action step toward more effectively planning, the Program Directors decided to meet weekly, on their own, to start exploring budget and other component concerns. They also decided that their Friday staff meetings suggested a past orientation, and thus changed their meeting day to Monday, to be more future oriented.

After the decision was made to meet without the Executive Director, the PC responded to comments from the participants which suggested that they were feeling guilty about the decision to meet only with the Associate Director.
He pointed out that what they were doing was completely within the organizational structure and that in being concerned about the Executive Director's possible negative response, they were not considering the possibility that the Executive Director's involvement in their staff meetings might be motivated by his wish to show them his interest in them.

Consultant observations. One of the major objectives of the consultants in this workshop was to increase the skill level of Program Directors and emphasis was placed on the development of skills in two areas, listening and effective feedback. The consultants made the assumption that these two skills were essential in dealing with personnel issues and therefore necessary for Program Directors. A secondary objective of the workshop was Training Team development.

Therefore, the PC made comments regarding his use of certain tools. For example, the PC suggested that role playing had the potential for creating a low threat, experience based learning situation and in addition had merit as a relatively simple training tool. It relies on observation rather than sophisticated interpretation.

The PC had been aware throughout the session that Training Team members had frequently directed their comments to him rather than to the group, and noted that this apparent dependency would have to be considered in future contacts with the Training Team.
The meeting was felt by the consultants to have been productive as evidenced by the Program Directors' decision to work together and seek additional responsibilities. The fact that Program Directors did not even know about their budgets further suggested to the consultants that the agency was indeed not utilizing the potential resources of its Program Directors.

The meeting was also seen as positive because the consultants observed an increasing openness and lack of defensiveness on the part of the Associate Director, which had previously been exhibited and functioned as one of the blocks to training.

May 3, 1972
MI-3, Board of Directors Intervention
Participants: Board Members and Selected Staff at Annual Meeting.
Goal: Diagnose Board Attitude toward Training.
Place: Holiday Inn, Dumont

For six weeks there had been incidental contact with DCAC staff because of staff's increased involvement with clientele as program year was drawing to a close. On May 1st, the Executive Director of DCAC phoned and invited SHDC consultants to the agency's Board of Director's annual meeting. He requested that SHDC staff get some reading of the Board's attitude toward training since he had been unable to get the Board to set a date for their phase of training, which was a part of the original training contract. He
hoped, also, that the PC would make some comment regarding this because it was an item on the Board's agenda for discussion.

The Board meeting was attended by the PC and SC. Initial Board agenda items included farewell to old members, approval of two new members, a financial report, approval of the appointment of an educational specialist to Head Start, and welcome to the newly appointed Day Care-Head Start Director. Business was carried out in a perfunctory manner, i.e., presentation, request from Chairman for comments, no comments forthcoming, and move to approve whatever motion was on the floor. After about forty-five minutes, the Chairman asked for a Training Committee report.

The Board member who was the representative to the Training Committee gave a positive picture of training to date and expressed regret that Board training had not yet taken place. Two or three comments were made about training and a move made to go on to other business. A new Board member noted the lack of response to the report about training and the possible involvement of Board members in training. She followed her initial statement with, "I'm new on the Board and I'd like to know what's happening. It seems as if that was a hot issue." A few Board members, in response, reopened a discussion related to Board training. A quick polarization took place. Those "for" training and
those "against" training were the sides taken.

At that point, the Board member who had been Acting Head Start-Day Care Director got up to speak. She indicated that previously she had been opposed to training. She then made a brief presentation of what the training experience had included, e.g., learning problem solving skills, which she had since used several times in her work, working together and seeing agency talent being used more effectively. She noted, also, that the training experience seemed to have renewed the agency staff's commitment and enthusiasm for the work they were doing. At the conclusion of her remarks she sat down. A Board member, a Superintendent of Schools, responded, "What's that got to do with the organization? That's just an emotional response. I'm against training. What I need is orientation. I move we adjourn." His motion was defeated by only a two vote margin. Five of the Board members continued the discussion about training. At this time, the Chairman invited the PC to make some remarks regarding training.

The PC expressed concern over the way the word "training" was being used and responded to, without being given a definition. He was quite sure that no one there was opposed to learning or growing. Therefore, for Board members
to take sides for or against training seemed an unproductive activity. He suggested, instead, that the Board look at its previous concern about orientation for its members and that it might also consider other needs for skills or knowledge, as those needs related to their expressed desire to accomplish goals related to roles as Board members. There appeared to be tentative agreement with such a proposal. The Superintendent of Schools who had earlier moved to adjourn announced his disagreement. The possibility of Board training at this time was left in the hands of the two Chairmen of the Membership and Training Committees. The new Board member, who had spoken previously, indicated she would follow this up because of her concerns about how uninformed current Board members seemed to be about the real issues facing the poor in the county. The meeting adjourned.

Consultant observations. The consultants were aware that during this meeting none of the Board Members representing low income residents participated or was invited to contribute to the discussion, even though this is the population the agency is chartered to serve.

The PC and SC agreed that at this point there was little to be gained in pushing for a date for Board training. It was decided to deal with this issue at the next Training
Committee session.

May 8, 9, 1972
SI-5. Planning for Final Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop
Participants: Training Team
Goal: Develop Training Design
Location: Associate Director's Apartment, DCAC Office

The PC and SC met with the Training Team in order to plan the third day of the Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop. A member of the Sounding Board, the employee group that had been established as an outgrowth of MI-la, had asked the Training Director for permission to attend the planning session.

The meeting was held in the Associate Director's apartment and began at 2:30 with the Training Director introducing the visitor and his reason for being at the planning session. The Sounding Board member proposed that training time be used for a Sounding Board meeting. A considerable time was spent discussing the merits and implications of having Sounding Board business as an agenda item. The Training Team's assessment of staff expectations for the workshop was unclear. There was some indication that follow-up to MI-la was a primary concern and that a business meeting might thwart this. Discussion ran beyond 5:00 p.m. and plans were made to continue the next day.

The meeting began at 1:00 p.m. the following day in the DCAC offices with all but one of the Training Team
members present. The Executive Director had sent word via his Associate Director that he wanted to talk with the Training Team about the plans for the upcoming workshop. After he arrived he made some comments about the hectic time in the agency and announced that a new project seemed to have good prospects of funding, the Foster Grandparents Program.

The Executive Director assured Training Team members that he was enthusiastic and hopefully supportive of efforts to improve communications within DCAC. He felt that the work of the Sounding Board was an important part of that change effort. However, he felt it was important for the Training Team to know that he could not allow, nor would the Board of Directors condone, use of training funds to have a Sounding Board business meeting. Although such a meeting was important, it could not be considered "training".

The Training Director reviewed the content of the previous day's meeting. The Training Team shared the Director's concern that the Orientation and Goal Setting workshop should be used for additional training, e.g., continued development of problem solving skills. After some additional discussion, a proposal was made, and agreed upon, that the Sounding Board be given time to report on its progress and current status. That amount of Sounding Board input seemed appro-
appropriate to the Training Team as follow-up to MI-16.

After that decision was made, additional planning for the Orientation and Goal Setting workshop continued. An agenda was developed and Training Team roles for the day were decided.

Consultant observations. The PC and SC were in agreement that the Executive Director was concerned about the use of training time and other resources, but seemed to be over-reacting from the data available.

The consultants were impressed with the Training Team's ability to plan for the final day of the Orientation and Goal Setting workshop. An agenda was agreed upon after exploration of various alternatives, and there was skill exhibited in the allocation of staff resources to conduct the different sessions of the workshop. The PC and SC were aware of the difference between this planning session and the original one for the Orientation and Goal Setting workshop. The Training Team seemed confident, planned the major portion of the day, and looked to the PC for minimal assurance.

May 15, 1972
MI-1b, Orientation and Goal Setting Evaluation Session,
Participants: All DCAC Staff
Goals: Follow-up and Progress Reports
Location: All Saints Church, Dumont
The meeting began forty-five minutes late because of a number of late arrivals and a seemingly strong desire, on the part of staff, to socialize. The general session opened with component directors introducing their component's staff. The Executive Director gave a few introductory comments in which he shared his optimism about the training program to date.

After the introductions and welcoming comments, the Training Director distributed Work Sheets (Appendix C) to all participants. (These Work Sheets were typewritten pages of each component's goals and problems as listed two months earlier, during Mi-la.) Room assignments for component meetings were announced, participants obtained coffee, and began work with their component groups. The task for each group was to begin looking at which problems had been solved, which seemed no longer to be problems, and which remained as unsolved problems. A second task was to explore, with the help of the facilitator, what had been the process by which problems had been solved.

The Training Director functioned as facilitator for the Head Start-Health Start group. Participants began to give positive responses to the facilitator regarding a number of improvements that had occurred over the past two
months in their components. Examples of how some problems had been solved showed a broader understanding of staff and agency resources.

One staff member told about involving parents for the first time in pre-registration with the result that the process was far ahead of last year.

The sharing of success stories resulted in general agreement to encourage more collaboration between those who had solved problems and those who still had similar problems.

The Day Care group started slowly but after reviewing the present status of the problems which they had identified earlier (in MI-la), became excited and enthusiastic over the changes that had occurred. The facilitator from the Training Team helped the group explore how their own initiative had started action that resulted in most of the positive outcomes they were now viewing. There were several spontaneous plaudits awarded training and two examples given of the use of Force Field Analysis in solving problems that confronted Day Care staff.

One group was composed of four smaller components in DCAC. Although the extent of problem solving varied among the four components, there was agreement that progress was being made. The staff morale had improved, and some aspects
of very difficult problems were being solved. An example of this was the senior citizens group which had finally been able to make some headway on the transportation problem that seemed to plague the entire agency. They had obtained money for a mini-bus and had negotiated for a Youth Corps driver. Other ways of problem solving were shared within the group, but because of the diverse nature of the components, there seemed to be limited enthusiasm as compared with the other work groups.

At 11:15 the general session was held. The Sounding Board report was made by a staff representative. He reported on the problems which had been encountered including meeting times and regular participation. He explained that the Sounding Board saw itself as an interim group until, as an organization, it had gotten under way. Now he felt it ought to have elected members.

The interim Sounding Board members had decided to draft by-laws, establish priorities, and to limit its meetings to a sixty minute time period in order to keep themselves on track with a specified agenda. There were some questions from the floor regarding left over items from the last OGS, such as "What has the Sounding Board done on speakers bureau and resource book?" The speaker responded that the Sounding Board had decided that to work on these two issues right
away was too much to undertake. Creation of a speaker's bureau and resource book had much lower priority than the development of a Sounding Board structure.

The PC briefly pointed out, using the Sounding Board as a positive example, the process of organizational change, i.e., that there was a commitment to change, structure had been agreed upon, leadership was forthcoming from a number of sources, and original goals were kept clear.

After lunch, the general session continued with Head Start and Day Care reporting on their plans to work together. The arrangement was essentially for Day Care to be relieved by Head Start staff on Mondays in order that Day Care staff could devote time to planning and training.

Each component group reported on what had taken place in the morning work session, and then the groups reassembled. (The PC and SC had the opportunity to observe only one group because of the limited time in the afternoon agenda for component meetings.)

In the afternoon session, Day Care staff reassembled in a smaller circle than in the morning and after exploring options suggested by the Training Team facilitator, decided to focus on specific problems affecting their day-to-day operation, i.e., storage problems and outside observers coming into centers. Using problem clarification and brain-
storming, participants began to develop a strategy for solving their problems, designating areas of responsibility and follow-up, rather than just talking about the problems as they had done two months before.

At 3:30 a brief general session was held for final evaluation, component feedback to total groups, and to give participants an opportunity to complete PMR's. Head Start reported that it had begun to get into planning for fall, and to plan staff meetings as workshops. They further agreed to put a calendar of events in the Central Office to aid communication and decrease the possibility of meetings conflicting. The other group reported it had explored ways of better using the agency newspaper.

Following the general session the Sounding Board held a brief meeting to elect new representatives, adopt by-laws, and set a next meeting date.

Answers to questions on the PMR's were quite positive and reflected a growing optimism within the agency for meeting its goals. People were enthusiastic about the increased participation and collaboration within their component groups.

Consultant observations. The consultants observed a definite change in the agency staff between MI-1a and MI-1b. They observed that staff were more sociable, more responsive to humorous comments, more active participants in discussions,
and more aware of each other as resources in problem solving. The consultants felt that these changes indicated more positive morale. A number of DCAC staff also verbalized a new awareness of their own effectiveness in getting work done.

Results of the workshop suggested that the agency was more effectively reaching its goals, particularly with regard to increased involvement of the client population in program efforts.

The consultants also were aware of the beginning of real structural change in basic decision making, through the development and acceptance of the Sounding Board.

The Training Team functioned almost exclusively on its own, independent of the PC. Observations of Training Team facilitators in component groups indicated growing skill on the part of Training Team members. DCAC staff acceptance and positive response to the Training Team was indicated by the verbal encouragement and thanks expressed to Training Team members. The consultants felt pleased that the data generated by the workshop was being utilized by staff in true action-research manner, and that, indeed, the PC and SC were now definitely in the background.

The PC and SC were aware, however, that not all evidence pointed to positive change. Although component groups
May 27, 1972  
MI-2b, Programmatic Training Conference  
Goal: Development of Diagnostic and Planning Skills.  
Participants: Training Team and Program Directors.  
Location: SHDC Training Center

The meeting began with a report by the Training Director that the Health-Start project had just received word that the project would not be refunded. This meant that the Health-Start Director, who was in attendance at this session, would no longer be employed by DCAC.

The PC outlined a tentative agenda and received minimal response and no changes. The agenda included: 1) diagnostic skills, 2) how to translate diagnosis into training needs, 3) how to plan for components, and 4) how to evaluate.

The PC used newsprint notes and verbal commentary to present a model diagnostic inventory (Havelock, 1970). Questions included in that inventory were:

1. What are the system's goals?
2. Is the structure adequate for achieving those goals?
3. Is there open communication throughout the system?
4. Does the system have capacities for working toward stated goals?
5. Does the system reward members for working toward stated goals?
Following the PC's presentation, participants discussed the relationship of that inventory to DCAC. There was a great deal of discussion regarding the rewards system at DCAC. Staff began to question whether negative rewards really work. The PC commented and referred the participants to the concepts of Theory X and Theory Y. The next step in this session was for Program Directors to carry out a diagnostic inventory for their own component. Individuals worked alone, using component outlines of goals and problems from Mi-la for about forty-five minutes.

An open discussion followed related to the inventories that had just been completed. Most questions focused on how to involve staff and the concepts around the delegation of authority. The PC gave theoretical input on the concept that increased responsibility and authority for an individual within an organization is a developmental process.

At this point the discussion shifted abruptly to the question of what to do with staff members who are resistant to training. Finally the discussion focused on one individual who presumably resisted training but was retained as a staff member, while at the same time, all staff members in Health Start were being released for lack of funds. The Director of Health-Start shared some self doubts with the group, but was also concerned that she was not being re-
tained. She felt the Associate Director did not regard her very highly as an employee. For once the program staff began to deal with feelings and the session ended with the Associate Director and others giving the Health-Start Director positive feedback regarding her directorship.

In the afternoon session, which was brief because the morning session ran two hours over lunch time, the Program Directors expressed some desire to return to work on component diagnostic inventories. However, discussion continued in a general fashion and before participants realized it, the time for the session to end was near.

One of the participants suggested that staff share with the consultants the results of the first Programmatic Training Conference. The following information was shared with the consultants:

1) Neighborhood Youth Corps staff had been able to find new office facilities. (During MI-2a, that component director had realized the importance of moving out of the DCAC main office. He had not been optimistic about the chances of finding new facilities.)

2) A secretary who had been the source of many miscommunications within the organization (see MI-2a), was no longer with the agency. (Consultants had no information regarding the reasons for that de-
parture.)

3) Program Directors had been meeting regularly at each other's homes. They agreed that those meetings were more relaxed and that more work was being done. "We're acting like friends," was one director's comment. They had been able to work together more effectively and also had been able to obtain information, previously unavailable, about their component budgets.

This day of work ended with a decision not to deal with the results of the morning diagnostic inventory in the short time remaining. The Program Directors agreed that the inventory results could be fruitfully discussed during regular staff meeting time.

Consultant observations. The consultants were pleased about the session because of the ability of the program staff to work together, as partly evidenced by the fact they dealt with the feelings and content which grew out of their working relationships.

This session, however, did not focus on the expressed goal of this MI, which was skill development related to diagnosing agency needs. Both the PC and SC agreed, however, that the course of action chosen by the participants, i.e., the decision to deal with a number of present issues, was a good one.
June 12, 1972
SI-6, Training Team Planning
Participants: Training Team
Goal: Learn Lab Design by Designing Training Committee Workshop.
Location: SHDC Training Center

All members of the Training Team participated in this planning session for the Training Committee workshop, although two of the members arrived forty-five minutes late. There continued to be a delay regarding the task because Training Team members engaged in casual conversation for twenty-five to thirty minutes. Much of the conversation related to feelings about the Board of Directors Annual meeting. Training Team members expressed concern about the Board's negative response to training as indicated by their refusal, thus far, to take part in Board Training. Training Team members feared that the lack of Board support for training would have a negative effect on the possibilities for future staff training.

Finally, the group began work on the morning agenda. They agreed that the agenda had two major parts. First, a look at training designs in general was important and second, a need to plan the afternoon session with the Training Committee. The PC gave a short lecture about training designs and the Training Team participated in relating that information to the task ahead, planning the afternoon session.
After some discussion, the Training Director took over the session. In leading this part of the session, she made use of the PC's input on lab design, and his proposal that the Training Team might want to share roles as needed for the afternoon session. This was agreed to by the Training Team. Even the most reticent member of the Training Team agreed to the idea of Team members taking a clear role in the afternoon session.

The Training Team saw the Training Committee as the key to the possibility of Board Training taking place. Consequently, a major objective of the session was to have the Training Committee know more of the role of training in DCAC, their role in that training and the advantages of agency and Board training. The afternoon was planned as follows:

1:30  Share Goals, find out expectations
2:00  Role Clarification--What does Training Committee understand about function of Training Team
2:30  Assessment of Present Training Situation
3:30  What can Training Committee and Training Team do in the future to foster training
4:00  General evaluation
In the afternoon session four members of the Training Committee arrived for the workshop.

Participation around the first two items on the agenda, Goals and Role Clarification, was limited with facilitators doing most of the talking. There was some clarification regarding a distinction between Training Committee, a policy making group, and Training Team, an implementation group. As a result of further discussion and the realization that Training Team members have major full-time duties within the agency, other than their Training Team memberships, the participants made a recommendation to expand the Training Team to twelve members. It was hoped that the increase in Training Team memberships would spread the availability of skills and resources and also respond to the present Training Team concern that there was too much for them to do in heading all training efforts as well as doing their full-time jobs.

An assessment of the present training situation dealt with how to get more money for training. The Associate Director talked about future training needs and his present writing of a Training and Technical Assistance Grant proposal. At the request of workshop participants, he gave
assurances that a needs assessment would be requested and used in developing that proposal.

Following a brief discussion about what the Training Committee could do to foster training, the committee members recommended that training be looked upon as a year round effort and not a "period of training". There was general agreement that the first group to be included in any expansion of training should be teachers and teacher aides in Head Start and Day Care.

Evaluation was brief but a feeling of high enthusiasm prevailed. Training Committee members expressed the view that the afternoon had been profitable, due specifically to the clarification of function and roles and the potentiality that the Training Team would be expanded.

Consultant observation. The PC and SC did not view this MI as really a training session. However, it appears that some important steps had been taken regarding the place of training in DCAC and the responsible role the Training Committee would play.

July 20, 1972
SI-7, Evaluation of Training
Participants: Training Team
Goals: Design of Final Agency Evaluation and Feedback to Primary Consultant
Location: DCAC offices

On July 20th, the PC and SC met with three of the Training Team members (others were unable to attend because of
their need to attend an out-of-State meeting). The purpose of this meeting was to devise a means of evaluating training that had taken place during the contract period, collect data for future training, and to provide feedback to the PC regarding his consulting style.

In advance of the meeting, the Training Director had prepared a draft of an evaluation interview. Before development of interview questions was undertaken, the SC gave input on evaluation and the advantages of interviews for an evaluation of the type of training program which had recently been completed.

Plans for interviewing were made by the Training Team, taking into account their time schedule, time needed for each interview, and staff members available at that time of year (mid-July). A decision was made by the group to have each of three persons on the Training Team interview five persons plus themselves for a total of eighteen interviews. The Training Team decided to try to make the population as representative of each component and levels of staff structure within each component as possible. The Training Team, along with the SC, then worked from the Training Director's draft interview schedule, to develop a final form. After extensive work on developing questions, the interview schedule was completed. At their own initiation, the training
members then spent about forty-five minutes role playing and practicing interviewing.

As an additional part of the evaluation process, Training team members were asked to participate in a feedback session related to the PC's consulting style. In order for that feedback to be systematic, the three Training Team members were asked to complete a short data sheet which contained questions relating to the PC's consulting style and to the Training Team development. (Appendix A) These forms were completed. (Absent Training Team members filled out the forms later.) For purposes of maintaining the informal, personal style the PC had attempted to model, the SC and PC used the data sheet responses as a takeoff point for a group interview and discussion. From the data sheets and verbal responses, the view of the Training Team was that the PC's style was supportive, encouraging, and showed that he respected their ideas. Training Team members felt a need for additional skills, particularly skills related to design of training. They also felt confident and more aware of their abilities as "trainers". (Detailed responses are reported in Chapter V of this study.)

Consultant observations. The consultants felt this session was an important part of the Training Team development. Training Team members had been involved in the evaluation of the Training Program, as well as in the planning
and implementation phases of that program. This workshop had also contributed to their skill repertoire, by adding to their interviewing and evaluation skills.

Four days later, the evaluation interviews had been completed. Staff felt that the Training Program had helped them to solve work related problems and had increased their awareness and communications with other programs. All but three of those interviewed expressed strong positive feelings about their experiences in the Training Program and about training in general (of the remaining three responses, one was negative and two did not give a direct response to the question). Positive changes in attitudes about training were attributed to seeing themselves as more effective and having found new ways of accomplishing work tasks.

C.O. Training – an additional intervention. Although not included in the original design of this study, SHDC also conducted a series of community organizers training sessions for DCAC. These sessions were originally planned as a more traditional, classroom type course. The course was to deal with interviewing skills, listening skills, agenda development, needs assessment for community workers, and community organization skill development. The PC and SC
did not have a major role in this intervention, nor were plans made to observe this course. The SHDC staff member responsible for teaching these sessions did not use a traditional approach and, in fact, used a style similar to the PC's. For this reason, persons from DCAC who participated in the course, nine in number, did not make any distinction between this course and the training interventions of the four MI's. Thus, many saw this experience as part of the total intervention. Because no systematic observations of this course were made, it has not been included in the case presentation, however.

This course appeared to be of real value to DCAC, however, and especially because it tended to model in depth the values that the PC exhibited. For example, it dealt with community organization as a process, and contrasted that process with establishment organization. The former places emphasis on persons identifying their own needs and participating directly in decision making, while the latter tells the community what its needs are, and makes the decisions for them about how to meet these needs. The influence of these sessions on DCAC's modes of operation cannot be measured, but it is assumed that the community organizer's course was an important factor (variable) which this study can only surmise had some influence on the data collected.
CHAPTER V
FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The purpose of an OD intervention is always some form of planned change, but often it is difficult to specifically relate to an outsider that change, or document the process that resulted in the change taking place. Perhaps for this reason so much of the change literature relates change as an event rather than a process. Because the main objective of this presentation was to present the style of a change consultant, it is important that the PC's values and behaviors be made explicit and related to the change that took place as a result of his interventions.

This chapter presents the findings and conclusions related to the PC's style of intervention, including findings and conclusions related to the Training Team development, and relates this to the change process that is evident in the case report. Recommendations and implications for further research round out the chapter.

Case Study Review

It is clear from the data in the case study that the series of interventions made by the PC are indeed a part of what is generally accepted as an OD process. The case study
fits Sherwood's (1971, p. 1) definition of OD:

A. A long range effort to introduce change based on a diagnosis which is shared by the members of an organization.

This is evident in the development within DCAC of the Sounding Board, the creation of and expansion of the internal Training Team, and the development of regular component directors meetings separate from general staff meetings.

B. An OD program involves an entire organization or a coherent "system" or part thereof.

Every component of DCAC participated in the training provided by SHDC and the internal Training Team. Also, three days were designed and implemented to include all agency staff members from Executive Director to part-time employees.

C. Its goal is to increase organizational effectiveness and enhance organizational choice and self-renewal.

According to data presented in the case report, there was a beginning increase of organizational effectiveness, particularly in problem solving, but also in the utilization of client population resources and the use of internal staff resources. Self-renewal is much more long range in nature and will fall, no doubt, to some other researcher to evaluate.

D. The major strategy of OD is to intervene in the ongoing activities of the organization to facilitate learning and to make choices about alternative ways to proceed.
The case study clearly shows that the training-action research design of the interventions not only had this OD purpose in mind, but that the results for learning and expansion of choices were substantial. Increased skill levels in communication and problem solving speak well to the results of learning. The variety of ways components chose, for example, to solve some of their problems is sound support to the view that there was an expansion of alternative ways to behave.

The case study is, following the above guidelines, a real-life OD situation. It provides the context, therefore, to view the main purpose of this study, which was to present a model consulting style and to look at the results of that style.

General Consulting Style

The PC's style of consulting, first viewed here in general terms, as presented by the case study is related to two words, "process" and "developmental". As noted in the case description, the PC basically planned the first MI, developed the agenda for the diagnosis made at the initial SI's, and held fairly tight limits on the direction the Organization and Goal Setting Workshop intervention would go.
However, the Training Team was not by-passed.

The PC urged the participation and leadership of the Training Team in the major, visible consulting roles. Their function, as expressed to them by the PC, was to help create an atmosphere for the acceptance of training in a resistant environment, to provide a process for looking at goals, and to have the kind of high visibility that would begin to make their role acceptable and valued by fellow staff members. This was to be done by helping fellow staff members present and clarify problems in a low threat situation. The PC also assumed that with some skill training the Training Team members would be able to do much more than an adequate job, and thus begin to build their confidence. The PC functioned as an encourager to them, expressing openly to the Training Team members where he felt their strengths were and the areas that he felt needed work. He assured team members that SHDC staff would be prepared to step in if needed, but he realized that it would take some time and experience of that happening for them to "believe" that.

As the case report shows, the PC played much less of a role with the Training Team in the development of the agenda for training as time went on. By the end of the six month relationship with the team, the PC was playing a minimal role and team members were taking the initiative, such as
preparing the sample interview schedule, without any suggestion from the PC, which was worked on in late July. Here is where the word "developmental" is clear in the PC’s style. He saw his job to help the Training Team members move from a quite dependent stage ("You have the skills, we don't.") to a very independent stage.

A basic assumption was verbalized by the PC that governed this developmental phase. The PC expressed the view that skills, not just experience, were necessary if the Training Team was to gain the kind of confidence that seemed necessary to function in such an extensive and complex agency. Thus skills that could be quickly learned, Problem Census and Force Field Analysis, were chosen by the PC as the basic tools for the first training intervention by the Training Team. It was an attempt to wed the needs of the agency, the skill level of the Training Team, and the urgency to have training begin to succeed. It was an attempt to have the Training Team function honestly, not just as extensions of the PC who would be hiding in the wings ready to take the bows when they faltered.

Thus, basic to the style of the PC was a reliance on a way, process, of doing rather than at first coming up with solutions to problems. Secondly, to assist in the development of an internal team that could function on its own was central to the PC’s style.
The PC verbalized that his reason for encouraging the establishment of an internal Training Team was that it was a way of putting some basic values into practice. The purposes for having the inside consulting team were:

1. Utilization of existing skills and resources that existed in DCAC.

2. Carry-over value. The action research model always provides learnings for those who participate in it. By going one more step and formalizing this into a unit that also views itself as a training component, the more of this action-learning remains with the client system for utilization.

3. A way to counteract dependency that often develops on outside consultants. (This appeared to the PC as particularly important in an anti-poverty agency where on-going consultant and training funds may be unavailable or at least limited.)

4. In this particular case, where there was a low trust level with regard to training and outside consultants, and, indeed, outright resistance, the utilization of an internal Training Team seemed an appropriate way of gaining acceptance for training-consulting
without creating an even higher threat level. To overcome the latter would require more time and money if not considered in the initial intervention.

5. A way to more than double the mileage for each consulting dollar spent.

Response to Consulting Style

The case report indicates that the Training Team members were able to function quite adequately at the first two days of the Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop, and all observations substantiate that the basic goals of the intervention were realized. Training Team members exhibited different levels of skill in the use of Problem Census and Force Field Analysis, but were able to more than adequately lead their fellow workers through the processes. Participants did, indeed, begin to have more positive attitudes regarding training. The Training Team members were able to maintain a high degree of visibility and from the case report it appears that their confidence and skills grew. The support of the PC for their ability to function did not appear unfounded and began to impart to them his value base.

In fact, the Training Team Evaluation and Feedback session held late in July provided more data regarding how the
Training Team members viewed the values and style of consultation exhibited by the PC. In answer to the question, "How would you describe the consulting style you experienced in working with the PC?", the following replies were made:

Supportive. I felt the style was adopted to the needs of DCAC.

Extremely supportive, encouraging, showed respect for my ideas, requested input from me, was available for back-up whenever needed.

The PC had definite goals for training and definite convictions about work, organizations, etc., but the approach was such that the PC made it clear that he could only facilitate training for other people—he could not force someone to be trained.

Open—supportive—listened to a raw beginner but very supportive in ego-building.

I think he had a very pleasant way of explaining ways of dealing with problems and always left openings for questions.

In addition, when Training Team members were asked to list the major elements of the PC's consulting style, the responses were as follows:

Friendly...Able to draw people out...Help them to develop...Flexible.

Flexible, supportive, encouraging.

Transferring of Training skills to training team and director. Support of agency staff in providing skills and recognizing needs.

Eclectic, flexible, non-judgmental, supportive, expertise, functional.
Pleasant style of presenting self, good atmosphere to work under, open for questions, answered questions to my satisfaction.

Central to the PC's style was the development of the Training Team and a view of how the members felt about their participation on this team provides more data on the response and effects of this style.

Training Team Development

In order to ascertain if the Training Team had accomplished its goals, the researcher asked about the Training Team members' perception of their ability to work together, whether their input into the training program had been important in planning the program, and how comfortable (sure of their skills and abilities) they would be in planning a training program right now (at the end of their relationship with the PC). These questions were designed to develop further data on the consultant's style as well as to ascertain the results of his type of intervention with them.

All Training Team members expressed high optimism regarding the team's ability to work together. All Training Team members also indicated that their input into the training program had been important. Two members felt that their input was near very important and one very important. The other two members ranked themselves at a 3 on a scale of 1
to 6 (1 being very important and 6 being unimportant). The response to the question regarding their comfort level with regard to planning a training program right now ranged from one member who rated herself at a 4 on a scale of 1 to 6, indicating she was nearer the "not comfortable" than the comfortable range, to 2 indicating they felt quite comfortable (2 on a scale of 6) and the other two members placing themselves at a level of 3 on the scale.

The Training Team members in the final evaluation session were also asked the question, "What kind of things do you think you do better now as a result of your experience as a Training Team member?" The verbatim responses indicate quite clearly the kind of growth the members felt took place as a result of their experience, which is also substantiated in the case report:

Facilitate a group, understand force field analysis, know a little more about design, understand better that there are many facets to training, more comfortable in setting agenda—realize that they need to be flexible and need group input.

Understand different training approaches and techniques.

Terms used are clearer, able to articulate ideas—how—what—assess needs, a beginning use of force field analysis.

I'm a lot more aware of things that others want. I feel I'm more knowledgeable about other programs. I think I'm more helpful to other components.
I think I involve more people in meaningful work (planning, implementation, and evaluation) because I have been a part of that process as a member of the training team. I listen better because the importance of listening as a skill has been reinforced by my experiences.

Thus it appears in the development of the Training Team that both the value orientation of the PC and his process style of working provided at minimum an atmosphere for the Training Team to learn and grow, and in some cases to provide the opportunity to develop the specific skills that build confidence in the work situation of the Training Team members. The final area that must be explored is the effects the PC's style and the development of the Training Team had for the organization that experienced their interventions.

The Locus of DCAC's Change

Since the purpose of an OD intervention is always some form of planned change, then the organizational response to the PC's style of consulting provides the final data regarding the effectiveness of that style.

Udy (1965) has distinguished five subsystems of an organization that are a helpful set of distinctions for differentiating the locus of organizational change that are relevant to this analysis of the PC's consulting model:

a. The technology that an organization uses

b. The individuals within the organization and their attitudes
c. The group process

d. The administrative structure

e. The relationship between the organization and its environment

The technology that an organization uses. Two examples of the PC's style stand out in relationship to the change that took place in DCAC's use of technology. Prior to the OD intervention, the problem solving technology of DCAC was not evident, and whatever methods were used were located almost exclusively in the Executive Director's office. According to the case report, component groups felt unable to solve problems, component directors said they were unable to direct their own programs or deal with their own budgets with the one exception of the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Staff members were exposed to a very simple problem solving technique, Force Field Analysis, on the assumption that all staff could and should be involved in problem solving. This was also related to a second example of new knowledge, the concept of meaningful work. Program Directors were exposed to the concept that work has meaning to people primarily when they participate in planning, implementation, and evaluation. According to the case report and Training Team responses, these are but two examples of change regarding the technology that DCAC used.

The individuals within the organization and their attitudes. One thing that was made clear to the consultants was
the attitude of the Executive Director, some staff members, and some members of the Board of Directors toward training. It was quite negative and was reflected in the resistance to training. The case record, PMR's, and Training Team responses give strong evidence to a sharp change in attitude with regard to training. In fact, following the series of interventions by the PC and the Training Team, the training committee expanded the Training Team and the Executive Director and the Training Director requested that training be made a part of the on-going, year round program.

Although there was evidence of staff change in attitude toward training, through exposure to training, there was no comparable change in attitude on the part of the Board of Directors. As reported in the case presentation of MI-4, the Board of Directors' training which was a part of the original contract with SHDC never took place. Still, the case report substantiates considerable change in attitude, which was one of the objectives of the PC's interventions.

The group process. Here the picture is much clearer from the case report regarding change. One of the things that pleased the consultants the most was the documentation of real change with regard to the working relationships within the component groups. There is, indeed, little evidence of an improvement in inter-component working relationships,
with the exception of the new cooperation between Head Start and Day Care. However, given the data in the case report of MI-1b, the improvement within the components may well be enough to lead to some improvement across component lines. The development of the Training Team and its acceptance by the agency as a whole is further evidence of change within the group processes of DCAC.

The administrative structure. The locus of change within DCAC that has already been presented is that which occurred within the administrative structure. The Sounding Board is a somewhat dramatic example of a number of other administrative changes, including the instituting of program director staff meetings separate from central staff. It is too soon, however, to assess the value of these changes to the agency.

The relationship between the organization and its environment. Here the case report is less clear. Although there are examples of DCAC making better use of its client population, such as Head Start utilizing parents for pre-registration, the evidence is not clear regarding change because of the nature of this study, which was to focus through PC and SC observation upon the training interventions that directly related to staff working for DCAC rather than upon its client population.
Thus, using Udy's five subsystems, it appears that the PC's style and value system, and the nature of the planned interventions, has had some effect upon each subsystem and the data in the case report substantiates that the changes fall within the areas of increased participation, improvement of working relationships, skill development, and structural change that may lead to even more change that will benefit the agency by helping it more effectively meet its goals.

Effects on the Consultant

This case study reaffirmed for the consultant his value system as well as his style of consultation. However, this does not mean that the events that took place did not have an effect upon that style or that everything "worked".

The case report presents the outcomes that in many instances are traced directly to the behaviors of the PC separate from the Training Team. But the PC was also affected by these events. He was surprised how hard it was to avoid playing into the dependency needs of the Training Team and the subtle way in which his confidence in them and encouragement to be independent built a kind of dependence on his role as "encourager".

Secondly, he felt a real shortcoming of the set of in-
terventions presented in the case study was that they did not seem to contribute to the Board of Directors accepting training as a necessary ingredient in all components of the agency. The resistance of the Board, which was recognized from the beginning, did not diminish even though the staff interventions were designated by the participants as very successful. The PC learned from this event that more attention should have been given to communication between staff and Board. The PC had hoped that once the positive feedback had begun, the Board would hear it and move more positively on the training issue. They did some, but not enough to make possible Board of Directors' training, which was a part of the original contract. The PC was not as aware of the difference the Board apparently saw between themselves and the agency staff. The fact that training was good for the staff, but not for the Board, appeared to be the view that prevailed. The PC stated that he learned from this that he must be more aware of the inner-face between Board and staff.

The PC further learned that while skill development apparently contributed to the ability of the Training Team to become quite independent from him, the fact that he was the principle teacher of skills also worked against
this happening. More skill input should have come from the SC or others if the process of independence was to move more quickly.

Finally, the PC realized he underestimated the abilities that existed within DCAC when he did not urge a larger Training Team from the beginning. One result of his not doing this was that the present Training Team members had demands placed upon them that in a few cases detracted from their major job responsibilities within the agency. The PC felt this also encouraged him to take a more visible role at times and may have slowed to some extent the development of the Training Team.

Summary

As stated in Chapter I, the purpose of this study was to present an intensive case study of an OD consulting model that utilized a training and action-research mode of intervention. The underlying purpose for this, also, was to attempt to make a real contribution to a growing field, OD, in three of its areas of greatest need:

1. the need for the continued clarification of the field of OD

2. the need for more knowledge of the "process" of OD
3. the need for systematic presentation of data regarding real-life application of OD techniques and approaches to planned change.

Thus, using the case study method, which is the most meaningful way of systematic presentation of real-life situations, the researcher set out to present a style of consultation that could be viewed as a whole, including its values, behaviors and effects. The case report presents in detail just what happened. It appears from the presentation in this chapter that most of the goals of the PC were reached. What is most important, however, is that the effects of his values and behaviors on the organization in which the interventions occurred may be viewed and evaluated. They have been evaluated in Chapter V by the present researcher. One advantage of the case study method is that others may also make their evaluation based on the systematic presentation of events in the case. From a continuing re-working of the data may come an even greater contribution to the field. A beginning has been made here. One final thing appears clear, however. Many more case studies are needed to make possible an evaluative comparison of consulting styles.
Recommendations

In order for the above comparison to take place, then, it will be necessary for those who practice OD to take the time to write about what they did and why they did it. Lewin was correct when he talked about there being nothing more practical than a good theory. However, the field of OD has drawn so many different theories from so many different fields that it appears the field could profit from some systematic presentation of what the consultant did and what its effects were. This could clarify the theories that now exist, as well as test those theories for a change in the crucible of practice.

Finally, studies such as presented here need constant follow-up if the change process is to be evaluated honestly. What has been presented here has been the start of change, or even hints of change as a result of a particular consultant model. For the knowledge about change in the field of OD to expand, there must be more re-evaluation of effects following considerable time lapse. Then the goals of this study really can be reached and new knowledge regarding the change process and the effects of various consultants' behaviors will give clarification to what is now loosely called Organization Development.
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APPENDIX A

DCAC TRAINING TEAM EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK

I. Observations on Consulting Style

1. How would you describe the consulting style you experienced in working with the primary consultant (PC)?

Please list the major elements of that style as you see them:

In working with the PC would you say that...

2. Your input for the design of the training program was

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.

Actively Encouraged Not Accepted

3. The PC respected your views as "experts" on HCAC

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.

Definitely Not at all

4. In planning for the training program would you say the PC was

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.

Directive Non-directive

Supportive Non-supportive

Open Closed

Flexible Inflexible

5. In helping plan the training program would you say the PC's primary concern was with

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.

Structural change Improving interpersonal relationships
In working with the PC...

6. What did he do that you found most helpful?  
...least helpful?

II. Training Team Development

As a member of the training team would you say...

1. That you feel about the training team's ability to work together  

   1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.  
   Optimistic Pessimistic

2. That your input into the training program has been important in planning that program  

   1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.  
   Very Not at all

3. How comfortable (sure of your skills and abilities) do you feel right now in planning a training program?  

   1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.  
   Very Not at all

4. What kinds of things do you think you do better now as a result of your experiences as a training team member?  

   ...what other skills would you feel you need to know to do a better job next time?
APPENDIX B

WORK STATEMENT

The objectives of Dumont Community Action Commission's Training and Technical Assistance grant are to provide training to:

a. staff, volunteers and program policy chairmen in communication, goal setting, strategies, and evaluation

b. parent co-ordinators and program policy chairmen in appropriate parent involvement; board-staff-parent roles; planning, conducting and evaluation of parent meetings; and in communication, goal setting, strategies and evaluation as specifically applied to parent involvement

c. board of directors in board-staff-parent relationships, board responsibilities, formulation of policies, goals and plans

d. the training and career development committee in policies and procedures which are conducive to maximum individual advancement

e. central staff (e.g., executive and associate directors) program directors and program policy chairmen in identification of staff needs and in training techniques to conduct in-service training for their programs.

As an outgrowth to the development, implementation and evaluation of this training program, it is hoped that DCAC will realize the necessity of developing in-house capabilities for the continuation of general staff training.

PARTICIPANTS

The participants indicated above will include the following:

staff all DCAC paid staff including staff of all sponsored programs (approx. 40 persons)
volunteers

volunteers which are involved intimately with DCAC and its programs (approx. 10 persons)

program policy chairmen

chairmen of the following groups: Public Housing Tenants' Council, Head Start County Policy Council, Day Care Joint Policy Council, Spanish-American Citizens', NYC Youth Advisory Council, Senior Citizens (2), local tenant unions (2), local Head Start Parent Groups (3), local Day Care Parent Groups (2) and the Buying Co-op.

parent coordinators

community organizers for Head Start (2), day care (1), Neighborhood Youth Corps (1), Spanish-American Citizens (1), Community Services (2), and Health Start (1).

board of directors

24 members for all areas of County.

training and career development committee

representatives of board, program participants, field staff, senior staff and central staff. (7 persons)

central staff

executive and associate directors

program directors

directors of Head Start/Day Care, Health Start, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Alcoholism Prevention, Public Service Careers and Community Services.

PROGRAMS

The following training sessions will be offered in order to achieve those objectives as set out above:

1. Orientation and Goal Setting

   Participants: 30-40 DCAC staff, 5-10 volunteers and 6-12 program policy chairmen.

   Times: 3 all-day sessions; two consecutive days in September and one day in October.

   Objectives: To assist session participants in learning how to identify and use resources

       Improve intra-agency familiarity with component programs
1. Orientation and Goal Setting (cont.)

Objectives: Teach methods of developing strategy and plans from DCAC's goals and priorities

2. Community Involvement

Participants: 4-6 parent co-ordinators, 6-12 program policy chairmen

Time: Part a, Workshop; 3 hrs/wk for 10 weeks starting in October.
Part b, Practicum; 6 hrs/wk for 5 weeks starting in January.

Objectives: Part a - To provide skills in:
- Appropriate parent involvement and parent-staff-board role definitions
- Communication
- Planning, conducting and evaluation of parent meetings
- Development and evaluation of realistic, achievable goals

Part b - To provide practice of skills and techniques acquired in actual situations
to evaluate effectiveness of skill learning

3. Board of Director Training

Participants: 15-20 DCAC's Board members

Time: one full day in November

Objectives: Increase knowledge of:
- Specific relationship of board to staff
- Responsibilities of board to corporation
- Board's relationship to formulating policies, goals, and in development of overall plans and objectives
4. **Training Committee Workshop**

Participants: 7 Committee members  

Time: one full day in November  

Objectives: to evaluate agency personnel policies and procedures  

- develop recommendations to board for any revisions and implementation  
- review agency grievance procedures, career ladders, salaries, etc.

5. **Programmatic Training Conference**  

Participants: 2 central staff, 6-7 program directors and 6-12 program policy chairmen  

Time: one each in January and February  

Objectives: to apply general DCAC personnel policies and practices (i.e., career ladders) to specific programs.  

- identify specific program training needs  
- learn how to do generalized planning for future programmatic training of staff
APPENDIX C

DCAC—Orientation and Goal Setting Workshop

HEALTHSTART GOALS:

1. Provide adequate health services to low-income community. Avoid duplication.
2. Education of community about health practices and services (resources).
3. Coordinating various health agencies and efforts in community.
4. Gaining support of community agencies and practitioners.
5. Resource bank for comprehensive health services.
6. Serve as referral agency for community.
7. Provide some health in-service within agency—actual information-giving sessions.
8. Means of coordinating information with people involved... improve record keeping.

HEADSTART GOALS (*indicates both Health Start and Head Start)

1. Setting up some type of transportation network.*
2. Providing health services.*
3. Learning good health habits.*
4. Bridging gap between home and school.*
5. Creating and implementing some type of follow-through program.*
6. Involvement with public schools.*
7. Better physical education and movement goals.
8. In-service training...follow through with parents to get them involved in community after Head Start... really meeting individual needs of children.
9. Curriculum development...training for parents and staff in grant writing...recruitment

CENTRAL STAFF—LOCAL GOALS

1. Coordination of a. Program components, b. other agencies.
2. Program development and planning.
3. Fiscal management
4. Technical assistance to existing component programs.
5. Reporting a. financial, b. progress (periodic).
6. Information retrieval
7. Evaluation a. personnel, b. program.
9. Assist in the implementation of roles.
10. Supervision and administration of new program.
11. Delegation of programmatic responsibilities to consumers.
12. Public Relations.

DAYCARE—LOCAL GOALS

1. Community awareness— involvement
2. Expand facilities— budget
3. Increase staff
4. Sliding scale—tuition
5. Educate—welfare dept.
6. Coordinate with school dept.
7. Nutrition awareness
8. Efficient use of resources
9. Dedication—commitment to program and agency.
10. Time—effective use—for program planning
11. Assessing and meeting needs of children and parents.
12. More males!
13. Director
14. Education specialist
15. Developmental needs of children: 1. motor skills, 2. social adjustment, 3. emotional, 4. intellectual—creativity
16. Orientation of staff and volunteers to program and centers.
17. More parent involvement
18. Better staff communications between centers and office
19. Career development for parents and staff
20. Parent input on all aspects in program.

N.Y.C.—LOCAL GOALS

1. Meeting needs of all youth
   a. Employment—in school (57 openings
      out of school (10 openings)
   b. Need to increase NYC funds
      Jobs
      Staff
   c. Development of rehab. programs
      1. Drugs—$ Staff and community education
      2. Centers!! (Independent Location)
   d. Income for youth above poverty guidelines
   e. Youth, civic, and criminal legal aids
   f. Family counseling, foster home placement
   g. Job mobility training
   h. Ombudsman between agency and youth
APB—LOCAL GOALS

1. Establish 1/2 way house
2. A clinic and de-toxification unit
3. More Staff--volunteer staff
4. More funds
5. Area commission on alcohol abuse
   (Fund raising)
6. Transportation

SENIOR CENTER—GOALS

1. More people involved of a different age, other than
   59 young and old together
2. Transportation--amini-bus
3. Hot lunch program--could be done by people in center

NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS—GOALS

1. Counsel on aging
   A. Transportation for Aged
   B. Facilities planned and informal social programs.
   C. Discount Card--providing for discounts on medicine,
      hot lunch program, movies, social events.
   D. Expansion of all aspects of the program.

PROBLEMS

(Please note: This is a list of "problems" listed by various components during a "Problem Census"...In order to get on this list, an issue had to be seen as a problem by only one person, the person naming it as a problem. This may not mean that it is a real problem to the component. This was developed as a work list and not as something to circulate with the idea that this represents the problems facing DCAC. It may, but that is decided in work groups. With this in mind, this kind of list can be most helpful in focusing concern on issues.)

NYC PROBLEMS:

1. Space--centralized location
2. Making people in the community sensitive to the needs of the youth in our program--making job site supervisors sensitive to the needs of enrollees and getting them to meet those needs, (Change of attitudes.)
3. More beneficial job situations
4. (See goals)
5. New employees don't have a designated person to aid in orientation and clarification of all DCAC programs.
A.P.P.

1. Need for more dollars
2. Staff counselors (Meeting clients needs)
3. Clients living quarters
4. Job Placement
5. Public Relations
6. Clinic for Alcoholics
7. Access to Joe Paul, open door policy as promised in last year's training session.

NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER

1. Transportation--insurance coverage enabling others to drive.
2. Placing people who are "eligible" in fact but not according to guidelines.
3. Space—more slots
4. Communication (P.R.)

COUNCIL ON AGING

1. Transportation

DAYCARE (—* represents agreement as very important.)

1. Facilities*
2. Time—staff—overall planning*
3. Lack of educational specialist and director*
4. Storage
5. Equipment*
6. Food*
7. Wages*
8. Training*
9. Substitutes—back-up staff*
10. Communication—directives
11. Interaction between staff*
12. Volunteer orientation
14. Turnover in children
15. Working parents*
16. Toilet training*
17. Lack of understanding of agency and Daycare program.
18. Needs of welfare referrals*
19. Up-grading staff
20. Unity of centers and staff
21. Professional ethics
22. Poor image of Daycare in DCAC
23. DCAC ignorant of Daycare (daily program)
24. Evaluation of staff (two-way)
25. State and local guidelines and requirements*

(More internal problems.)
1. noise level--facilities
2. outside play area
3. moving facilities, i.e., furniture; children
4. lack of equipment
5. lack of staff time--utilize resources
6. communication between staff
7. bathroom facilities
8. lack of hot water
9. room dividers
10. demands from DCAC--center*
11. back-up for conferences*
12. advance notice and planning
13. time for internal training
14. accept inconvenience--within limits*
15. budgetary limits*
16. staff made to feel free to use own judgment
17. coverage of centers*
18. lack of time for coffee-tea breaks
19. breathers
20. more staff and parent meetings in Northampton*
21. more staff at parent meetings, aides, NYC*
22. staff in-put on decisions of enrollment of child, i.e., 30 day evaluation--trial period.
23. release time*
24. parent involvement*
25. job descriptions*
26. evaluation*
27. lack of goals*
28. confusion of goals
29. transportation--parents, children, staff*
30. lack of allowing decision making to staff
31. public relations--image of program*
32. problem children*
33. special needs of children*
34. available consultants with follow-through
35. follow-up after Day Care

HEAD START

1. Transportation network, a. money, b. lack of parent owned cars, c. lack of volunteers in community, d. lack of public transportation, e. lack of staff.
2. Setting up of priorities within classroom—a. too many responsibilities for teacher, b. lack of time for classroom responsibilities.

3. Follow-through with parents and children—a. not enough staff, b. not enough money, c. not enough training, d. not enough time, e. lack of awareness in community, f. lack of commitment.

4. Record keeping—a. lack of familiarity with forms (staff and parents), b. lack of consistency, c. more communication between staff and parents, d. recognition of importance of record keeping (for parents and staff), e. lack of time (parent coordinator).

5. Training and educational programs for teachers and especially parents, a. time, b. transportation and babysitters lacking for parents, c. commitment, d. lack of resources—locality of centers, e. how to involve curriculum committee, f. motivation, g. recognizing needs of parents and knowing how to meet these needs.

6. Really meeting needs (individual) of children, a. time, b. lack of people, c. budgets, d. outside commitments, e. lack of complete knowledge of early childhood education, f. not knowing how to meet needs, g. lack of ed. specialist, h. lack of resource people, i. helping parents understand child's needs, j. lack of commitment from agency to children's needs.

7. Training of staff in evaluation of children, a. time, b. budget, (all of the above).

8. Organized system of recruitment, a. knowledge of the community, b. time, c. lack of publicity, d. funds, e. lack of adequate staff, f. stigma attached to H.S., g. area-geographical, h. lack of knowledge of target area residents.

9. Involvement with Public Schools, a. stigma attached to pre-school programs, b. lack of knowledge about our programs, c. effective public relations, d. communication, e. time.

10. Role of parents and volunteers in classroom, a. communication, b. time, c. expectations of volunteers and teachers, d. lack of training for volunteers and parents.

11. Learning good health habits, a. definition of responsibility, b. time, c. lack of communication for appropriate dress, d. conflict of values between home and schools and expected behavior.

12. Lack of training, teachers staff, parents.
lack of knowledge, b. time, c. resources, d. co-
ordination of objectives and total program.
14. Bridging gap between home and school.
15. Gaining support of community agencies, a. lack of
knowledge on part of professional community, b.
lack of their rime, c. lack of time on our part,
d. need for public relations, maintaining good
PR with landlords (i.e., churches)
16. Create a more effective career ladder.

CENTRAL STAFF

1. Lack of clear role definitions
2. Inability of Executive Director to delegate authori-
ity and responsibility
3. Lack of professional behavior on part of staff
4. Lack of demonstrated administrative ability on part
of staff (program directors).
5. Rumors
6. Lack of commitment--Board and Staff
7. Reluctance of Board and Staff to accept training.
8. Failure to delegate programmatic responsibility to
consumers.
9. Lack of monitoring and evaluation techniques.
10. Lack of communication.
12. Lack of information.
13. Lack of timely submission of reports.
14. Role of fiscal officer in agency.
15. Inability to cope with agency growth rate.
16. Office space.
17. Lack of accessibility.
18. Executive Director is too accessible.
19. Lack of Board code of ethics.
20. Lack of adequate community relations.
21. Lack of planning and foresight (crisis orientated)
22. Budget limitations.

SOME GENERAL (RELATED TO ALL COMPONENTS) PROBLEMS HIGHLIGHTED:

1. Transportation
2. Money
3. Space
4. Public Relations
5. Staff
6. Communication Co-ordination
7. Consumer involvement
8. Evaluation
9. Meeting individual needs.
10. Commitment
11. Training and Follow-up
12. Administrative Accessibility
13. Program Follow-up
14. Time
SOME RECOMMENDATIONS AS A RESULT OF THE OD SESSION
(afternoon of second day):

1. Complete a resource book with contributions from willing programs to include:
   a. individual functions and services
   b. outside resources used by each program

2. Make available the above through a publication to all programs.

3. Schedule monthly staff meetings (all staff).

4. Reinforcement of lines of communication among staff and program directors.

5. Agency Newspaper...more input and description of program goals and problems.

6. Coordination of Day Care and Head Start Staffing selected at OD session:
   Cindy Henry (Interim coordinator) plus: Jenny, Liz, Mary and Marilyn.

7. SOUNDING BOARD established to do following:
   a. Establishment of Speaker Bureau
   b. Attempt to compile present resource persons and materials.
   c. Future needs.