DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 230 SO 010 092

AUTHOR Jorrin, Valerie
TITLE Social Workers and Manpower Programs: An Experimental Approach to Professional Training and Curriculum Development. Final Report 1970-1973.
INSTITUTION Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. School of Social Work.
SPONS AGENCY Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C. Office of Research and Development.
PUB DATE [73]
GRANT DL-92-34-70-16
NOTE 98p.; For a related document, see SO 010 091

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Programs; *Curriculum Development; Demonstration Projects; Federal Programs; *Field Experience Programs; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; Interdisciplinary Approach; Internship Programs; Management Education; *Manpower Development; Manpower Needs; Professional Training; Program Descriptions; *Public Administration Education; Social Services; Social Welfare; *Social Work; Training Laboratories; Welfare Services

ABSTRACT

This conference report is one of three volumes being issued by the Laboratory for Community Programming at the conclusion of its experimental program. This third volume is a comprehensive report on the three-year Laboratory project, including descriptions of student field work experiences during the Laboratory's definitive last year. This laboratory experiment was organized in recognition of the increasing demand for manpower specialists created by federally funded programs and of the need for unification between social workers and manpower organizations. This program performed three major functions: (1) the development of a training program in which graduate students in social work served internships in diverse community and federal manpower organizations; (2) the availability of technical assistance to these organizations in terms of community organizing, program and staff development, and mediating; and (3) the initiation of a social work curriculum devised to familiarize the student with the world of work and with the coordination of manpower programs and social work through a new approach to field work. Six essays by students involved in the experimental field work program reflect positive results for both the students and the organizations involved in the laboratory project. The appendix lists texts, course outlines, related papers and a proposal for a manpower development and training institute. (KC)

SOCIAL WORKERS AND MANPOWER PROGRAMS:

AN EXPERIMENTAL APPROACH TO PROFESSIONAL TRAINING AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

by

Valerie Jorrin

FINAL REPORT

1970 - 1973

Laboratory for Community Programming
Columbia University School of Social Work
New York City

The program of the Laboratory for Community Programming was made possible by grant #92-34-70-16 from the Office of Research and Development, Manpower Administration, United States Department of Labor.

CONTENTS

Foreword 5

I. INTRODUCTION 11

II. THE PROGRAM

Summary 19

Training and Program Development 22

Technical Assistance 31

Curriculum Development 35

III. THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE

Introduction

Robert Tropp 45

The New York City Manpower Area Planning Council

James F. Drinane 55

U.S. Department of Labor Manpower Administration, Office of the Regional Director

Walter Leutz 62

New York State Employment Service

Joanne Searcy 70

New York City Emergency Employment Program

Onella Stagoll 75

New York City Department of Employment,
Office of Employment Services

Robert Tropp 81

IV. NEW DIRECTIONS 91

Conclusions 93

V. STRUCTURE, STAFFING AND SUPPORT 99

Appendix 101

FOREWORD

The Laboratory for Community Programming was established at the Columbia University School of Social Work in October 1970 as a demonstration program to explore ways in which social workers being trained in community organization and planning could provide a new professional resource in the manpower field.

The Laboratory was one of several projects located at schools of social work which were funded by the Office of Research and Development of the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, in the late 1960's and early 1970's. These projects dealt with different aspects of the relationship between social work and manpower, with particular emphasis on the problems of professional training and staff development. In addition to the Laboratory, which was funded to demonstrate areas of possible collaboration in professional practice and curriculum development, the other projects included the following: The University of Chicago, University of Michigan, and Case Western Reserve University for a three-way study of decision-making in the WIN program; Rutgers University and Washington University for training programs for WIN staff; Michigan State University for a study of undergraduate social work education in relation to staffing needs of the WIN program; and Brandeis University and West Virginia University for a variety of research and demonstration projects under the Institutional Grant program. The Council on Social Work Education compiled a text for use by schools of social work, Manpower and Employment, A Source Book for Social Workers, published in 1972 under a related grant.

This administrative report is one of three volumes produced by the Laboratory for Community Programming which document the major results of its demonstration program. This report focuses on the experimental field work program and includes essays written by participating students which describe the specialized field work experiences of the Laboratory's definitive last year. These included field work assignments with the Department of Labor Regional Manpower Administrator's Office; New York State Employment Service; New York City Manpower Area Planning Council (CAMPS); New York City Human Resources Administration and Department of Employment; and the Columbia University Day Care Project.

Another volume is the conference report of the National Workshop on Manpower Curriculum Development in Social Work. It includes remarks and prepared papers given by leaders in manpower and social welfare, comments by conference participants and descriptions of seven approaches to curriculum development.

The third volume is a collection of course outlines and reading lists gathered from scholars at universities around the country. The course materials reflect the diversity of academic sponsorship for manpower subject matter. The materials are organized from the perspective of social work education and practice and suggest a number of ways to incorporate manpower content into social work curricula.

I would like to express here my appreciation to those who helped to make the Laboratory's program as interesting, as varied and ultimately, as successful as it was in providing solid educational experiences for professionals-in-training, and for developing a new understanding of the complex issues and problems of the world of work among all of us who participated.

I am very grateful to Beverly Bachemin and Joseph Seiler of the Office of Research and Development of the Manpower Administration, United States Department of Labor, for their continuing support and guidance; to Dean Mitchell Ginsberg and Associate Dean Sidney Berengarten of the Columbia University School of Social Work; to the staff of the Laboratory for Community Programming, Frank Kushin and Nancy Kolben, assistant directors and helpful colleagues; Carolyn Cunningham and Erica Muehl, secretaries and good friends; and to the students of the Laboratory, particularly the class of 1972-1973--Ruth Antoniades, James Drinane, Barbara Leiser, Walter Lutz, Joanne Searcy, Onella Stagoll, and Robert Tropp--for showing how challenging field work can be; and to all the agencies and their staffs who worked with and provided the opportunities and experiences that are the essence of professional education.

Finally, I am grateful that the work of the Laboratory coincided with the too-short career of Russell A. Nixon at the Columbia University School of Social Work. Without his pioneering course in Manpower, the Labor Market and Social Policy, the educational experience provided by the Laboratory would have been greatly diminished; it is when

the field experience and the classroom come together that the best professional training results. A tribute to him, following his untimely death on December 7, 1973, is included in the volume which reports on the National Workshop on Manpower Curriculum Development in Social Work.

Valerie Jorrin, Project Director
Laboratory for Community Programming

I. INTRODUCTION

The Laboratory for Community Programming was in operation at a time when overall human resources programs represented a $5 billion spending level and when new legislative and policy directions increasingly mandated direct links between welfare and employment programs. The service demands on welfare and manpower agencies were enlarging in number and scope; the services they were supposed to provide included employability assessments, remedial education, vocational training, job counseling and referral, day care, health services, and other supportive activities.

Community groups from the anti-poverty programs of the 1960's, grown sophisticated in ambition but unskilled in capability, were increasingly trying to fill the gaps of official agencies with a variety of direct services, hoping that the road would lead to jobs.

These developments underscored the recognized need in the manpower field for trained administrators, planners and direct service workers. A very limited number of programs existed which were specifically designed to train manpower administrators and planners. Most manpower professionals learned about their field on the job--invaluable experience, but limited in the number of trained staff produced and in the sufficiency of their academic preparation.[1] Yet no academic or professional field provided adequate preparation for dealing with the social, economic, political and organizational problems intrinsic to planning, service delivery and administration of manpower programs. As Garth Mangum has pointed out:

> It is interesting that federally funded manpower programs to enhance the employability of those not adequately prepared for job-market competition could have continued for a full decade with so little concern for the preparation of those administering the programs.[2]

---

[1] See John R. Niland, ed., The Production of Manpower Specialists (Ithaca, New York: New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, 1971).

[2] Garth L. Mangum, Foreword, op. cit., p. ix.

It was in this context that the various research and demonstration programs funded by the Manpower Administration were developed in schools of social work.

In its structure and content, social work education provides an educational resource for training knowledgeable professionals who can function as administrators, planners and direct service workers. The educational structure is built around a combination of supervised field work in which students carry out professional assignments, and an academic program based in the social sciences which includes work in methodology and social policy. Among social work educators there is increasing interest in public administration and planning and the inclusion of course materials and field work programs dealing with substantive areas.

Why then have the two fields been traditionally aloof? Russell Nixon attributed it to "a lack of clarity about functions, skills and processes within the social work profession itself," and to the failure of the manpower system, more than a decade after its essential legislation was passed, "to develop an integrated approach to the labor market, not simply as an economic problem of supply and demand, but as an overwhelming social problem involving a large part of the labor force that is disadvantaged in the competition for jobs." He noted that "the Federal-State Employment Service system continues to function primarily as a labor exchange: uncoordinated, unsympathetic, and often at war with the welfare-rehabilitative approach to the large, marginal population needing remedial services."[3]

Although Joseph Vigilante noted common concern with a disadvantaged clientele and labor market influence on limited job mobility, he also thought that the difficulties of placing people in jobs were "not unrelated to social policies and the limited capacities of personnel administering the programs." He concluded that "manpower programs have not made maximum use of available knowledge and experience in working with people."[4]

---

[3] Russell A. Nixon, "Social Work and Manpower: Prospects and Problems of Mutual Development," in conference report of the National Workshop on Manpower Curriculum Development in Social Work, The Need for Manpower Specialists: A New Role for Social Workers (New York: Laboratory for Community Programming, Columbia University School of Social Work, 1973).

[4] Joseph L. Vigilante, "Social Work and Manpower--A Veiled Interface," op. cit.

Conversely, social work has failed to "pay attention to the role of work in modern society." In discussing social work education, Eli Ginzberg, Chairman of the National Manpower Advisory Committee of the Department of Labor, has emphasized that "social work education must ... take pains to see that all students, no matter what their area of specialization may be, have some understanding of the critical role of work and the many conflicts that arise in the work arena."[5]

These comments keynoted the National Workshop on Manpower Curriculum Development in Social Work, organized and sponsored by the Laboratory for Community Programming in 1973. In exploring the implications for social work education, the Workshop followed the earlier work done by the Cornell Conference on Manpower for the Manpower Field in 1970, which identified the issues involved. Russell Nixon summarized the Cornell conclusions for the Workshop:

1. The need for manpower specialists is expected to increase steadily and greatly.

2. No systematic knowledge base and no adequate curriculum or training process exists for the preparation of manpower specialists.

3. In this undefined and more or less accidental "manpower for manpower" process, staff has come from many varied educational routes, but the primary source has been through economics or the closely related fields of industrial relations or business administration. This overemphasis on economics reflects the ... simplistic view of the manpower process ... [and] is dysfunctional....

4. There is a gross underrepresentation of minority participants in manpower program staffs. Women are also underrepresented and social workers have been a most incidental source of human resource staffing.

5. Training for the manpower system should be interdisciplinary, and the curriculum should cover a wide range of the social sciences with emphasis on human behavior, political, social and economic

[5] Eli Ginzberg, "The Manpower Challenge to Social Work," op. cit.

> relations and institutions.... Academic work must be combined with practical on-the-job administrative experience....[6]

As a demonstration program addressed to these issues, the Laboratory focused on how community organizing and planning skills as developed in social work could be brought together with the world of work, and how the issues of the world of work could be brought into social work education. The experimental field work approach was geared to training qualified professionals as administrators and planners in manpower and social welfare without losing touch with clients.

The Laboratory concentrated on 1) developing a broad range of field work opportunities integrated with specialized course content and seminars; 2) identifying models of technical assistance feasible for a University-based program; and 3) encouraging mutual recognition and involvement by social welfare and manpower professionals in collaborative work and curriculum development.

The themes sounded at the National Workshop for Manpower Curriculum by manpower and social work leaders alike were a confirmation of the Laboratory's work of the previous three years:

1. All social workers, whatever their area of practice or substantive interest, needed to know more about the world of work.

2. Schools of social work could, with little difficulty, add material dealing with the world of work to all basic courses and field work.

3. The standard social work curriculum--in content and the class-field educational structure--lends itself to the training of professionals prepared to work in the manpower field.

4. A narrowly-defined specialty in manpower within a social work curriculum was neither necessary nor desirable, but additions to core curriculum and new approaches to field work in the manpower area should be developed.

5. A community of interest and clientele exists between

---

[6] Nixon, op. cit.

the two areas, but historic practices have contributed to the maintenance of professional antagonisms.

6. Each educational institution has to devise its own programs in terms of specific curriculum content according to its particular objectives, emphases and resources.[7]

---

[7] Valerie Jorrin, ed., The Need for Manpower Specialists: A New Role for Social Workers, Foreword, op. cit.

II. THE PROGRAM

SUMMARY

objectives of the Laboratory for Community Programming originally stated were:

1. To assess the feasibility of collaboration between social work and manpower professionals, and to explore the difficulties and ways of resolving them in such collaborative arrangements.

2. To specify the contributions which social workers majoring in community organizing and planning can make to manpower and manpower-related programs.

3. To increase the pool of community organizer-planners with skills in providing technical assistance and training in manpower and manpower-related programs, and to increase the number of minority group persons with these skills.

4. To provide technical assistance and consultation to community groups for whom resources would otherwise be unavailable, and to train leaders of community groups in manpower program planning, implementation, and evaluation.

5. To test the feasibility of developing a non-profit Center for Community Programming to proivide technical assistance, consultation and training in manpower and community development under University auspices.

litional objectives for the third year which evolved from e Laboratory's earlier activities were:

6. To stimulate development of manpower curriculum components in schools of social work and to increase manpower knowledge in the social work profession.

7. To encourage interest among manpower administrators in community organizer-planners as a professional resource.

a demonstration program, the Laboratory established llaborative relationships with professionals in manpower, cial welfare and community development programs to try t ways to bring manpower program and policy needs together th social work skills.

During the three-year demonstration period, the Laboratory developed and carried out the following:

1. A field work training program which assigned nineteen graduate social work students specializing in community organization and planning to work with government and community agencies, many of which had had few dealings with social workers before.

2. An operational technical assistance program based at the School of Social Work which provided consultation to community groups and the University.

3. An integrated educational experience with manpower curriculum emphases in class and field for students participating in the Laboratory demonstration.

4. The National Workshop on Manpower Curriculum Development in Social Work, a national conference focused on the manpower-social work relationship, training needs and approaches to curriculum development.

5. A national survey of college and university courses which dealt with manpower issues and programs.

6. New training and occupational opportunities in the manpower field for social workers with a community organization and planning background.

7. An invitational paper and workshop on manpower policy and program implications for social work education at the 1973 annual program meeting of the Council on Social Work Education.

As outlined in the following pages, it can be seen how diversity of setting and experimentation in modes of practice were important considerations in the process of developing the experimental educational program in field work. Major themes and student assignments were different each year in a deliberate exploration of various options. The intent was to encompass many different settings at different levels of government and in the community and to encounter, through the student assignments, a variety of practice problems and challenges.

Within this context, the Laboratory carried out professional training, program development and technical

assistance functions. The combination of innovative field work, a survey course of manpower issues and programs, and teaching emphases on the substantive and organizational relationships of manpower, income maintenance and social service programs created a unified educational framework for student learning experiences. This approach to curriculum development, as demonstrated by the Laboratory, would be feasible to duplicate in other schools.

Furthermore, the encouragement of realistic collaboration between manpower and social work professions, the dissemination of ideas and approaches to curriculum development which came out of the National Workshop on Manpower Curriculum Development in Social Work, as well as the national survey of manpower courses conducted by the Laboratory, demonstrated the great reservoir of professional interest and the great potential for further development from both administrative and academic perspectives.[8]

The following sections will describe the specific activities involved in the three major program areas--training and program development, technical assistance, and curriculum development.

---

[8]See the companion volumes produced by the Laboratory for Community Programming, The Need for Manpower Specialists: A New Role for Social Workers, A Report of the National Workshop on Manpower Curriculum Development in Social Work, and Teaching Manpower: A Collection of Courses, for substantive discussion of these projects.

TRAINING AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

The Laboratory field work program in manpower for social work students in community organizing and planning was characterized by structural and substantive flexibility. Student assignments were developed to provide students with good learning opportunities for their professional training, to explore how community organizers and social planners could work in the manpower field and to highlight issues, professional functions and needs of different agencies.

Field instruction was provided by staff of the Laboratory, trained social workers experienced in community organization and planning. Daily program supervision was provided by responsible agency staff with whom students were assigned to work.

Selection of the agencies, negotiations regarding program assignments and supervisors, matching students and agencies, and dealing with any problems over the year were all the responsiblity of the Laboratory staff. In the terminology of the School, students were "placed" with the Laboratory which determined what the field assignments would be and completed the process. This permitted the Laboratory to explore the potential of many different agencies and assignments, selecting those which seemed to offer the most in terms of student learning for those individual students and in relation to the major programmatic theme for that year.

This way of structuring student assignments within a program framework was directed at the maximization of both educational and programmatic functions. It was a complex process in which the educational needs, apparent skills and background of individual students were painstakingly matched with the program needs and staff characteristics of different settings. Although the Laboratory identified many more promising assignments and intern locations than there were students, it was clear that some would not be appropriate for the particular students involved, nor were others possible within the time period. Decisions about student assignments had to take all these factors into consideration while furthering overall program goals.

During the grant period, the Laboratory privided field experience for nineteen selected graduate students, most of them in the second year of the two-year master's program and most of them with substantial prior work experience. The student groups of the first two years represented a balance by sex, age and ethnicity. In regard to the latter, about one-third were minority students--black, Puerto Rican and Mexican American--generally reflecting the composition of the School. During the final year, there were no minority students in the Project. This reflected changes in School enrollment caused by economic conditions and new public agency policies which curtailed educational leave, a prime route to graduate professional education for ma inority students.

Students spent three days a week in field work, for which they received six credits a semester. Because of the amount of time devoted to field work, students were able to become part-time staff, frequently accomplishing substantial assignments during the eight-month academic period in which they worked with government and community agencies.

THE FIRST YEAR -- 1970-1971

During the first year, the internships focused on carrying out manpower assignments for different kinds of community based agencies, such as the Neighborhood Manpower Service Center, the Federation of Addiction Agencies, and the Joint Apprenticeship Program. Identification of manpower issues from the community point of view was stressed--the poor delivery of services, lack of jobs, difficulties of providing useful training leading to jobs, and the variety of social, economic and educational obstacles to employment which the poor, the unskilled, and the minority person must face. The agencies were selected from a large group of potential assignments which were concerned with the manpower components of specific social problem areas, such as housing, health, drug addiction, and various aspects of technical assistance.

Joint Apprenticeship Program

The Joint Apprencticeship Program, partially funded by the Department of Labor, worked to open up job opportunities in the construction trades for black and Puerto Rican workers through acceptance in union apprenticeship programs. The student participated in the full range of

organizational activities, which included recruitment, tutoring and counseling of new applicants; negotiations with unions; and participation in staff development institutes which focused on the history and philosophy of the American labor movement. He worked on a survey of successful applicants to determine their experiences as apprentices, identified their need for supportive services, and organized an alumni group to provide mutual support. He wrote a paper dealing with the apprenticeship system, strategies such as the New York Plan, and their implications for minority employment.

Health Policy Advisory Center

The Health Policy Advisory Center was a technical assistance group which researched health issues, focusing on the delivery of health services and use of health manpower. The student, interested in occupational and career development programs for paraprofessionals, concentrated on various new proposals for paramedical personnel, such as physicians' assistants. He provided information to interested community, consumer and professional groups, carried out speaking engagements, and acted as a consultant to faculty at several colleges who were concerned with paraprofessional development in the health field.

Federation of Addiction Agencies

The Federation of Addiction Agencies was a group of predominantly black community-based addiction treatment programs, in the Central Brooklyn Model Cities area. The student was concerned with opening up training and job opportunities for addicts and ex-addicts. He established contacts with manpower agencies and developed a manpower program which built remedial education, skill training and job holding into the rehabilitation program of the therapeutic communities. He provided consultation to the vocational rehabilitation coordinator and other staff on manpower programs.

Mid-West Side Community Corporation-Neighborhood Manpower Service Center

The Mid-West Side Community Corporation was the local anti-poverty agency which administered Community Action, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and the Neighborhood Manpower Service Center. The local manpower office was part of New York City's Regional Manpower System under the

Manpower and Career Development Agency. The student provided technical assistance to the paraprofessional staff in job development, client referrals, the location of training and job resources for non-English speaking clients, and the development of a reorganization plan for the manpower center. She also did a study of the Regional Manpower System and its difficulties in providing the job development and training resources needed by the neighborhood centers for their clients.

Community Development and Planning Studio

The Community Development and Planning Studio provided technical assistance to community groups, through teams of graduate students from the graduate schools of Business, Law, Architecture and Social Work. The student was concerned with grass roots organizing problems in a Spanish-speaking neighborhood, identification of technical assistance techniques and problems, the problems of housing rehabilitation, and the utilization of local residents in neighborhood construction work.

Center for Mediation and Conflict Resolution

The Center for Mediation and Conflict Resolution experimented with the adaptation of collective bargaining and mediation techniques to the resolution of institutional-community conflicts. It developed training programs for community and organizational leaders in techniques of negotiation and mediation. The student took a participant-observer role, designed and implemented evaluation procedures and participated in program planning and development. She had particular concern for the usefulness of bargaining and mediating techniques in disputes dealing with manpower and job issues.

THE SECOND YEAR -- 1971-1972

During the second year, the internships moved into increasing involvement with government as well as community agencies. Assignments were grouped in four functional areas--public service employment, welfare and work, community development, and day care. All related to legislative and policy changes which were mandating stronger links between manpower, welfare and day care programs. Students were involved with issues relating to workfare, the uses of public service employment for welfare clients

and other unemployed persons, and the needs and availability of supportive services such as child care. They became familiar with legislation, programs and funding from the perspectives of neighborhood and city agencies. The assignments had aspects of program planning, program development, policy analysis, and research. Several also included administrative responsibilities, organizing tasks, and opportunities for direct client service.

Public Service Employment

Two students were at the Emergency Employment Act program development unit of the New York City Human Resources Administration. One worked on several planning assignments with specific responsibility for aspects of the welfare demonstration projects being funded under the Act and civil service reform; the other analyzed and developed training proposals, researched sources, and assisted in the negotiation of training contracts.

A third student worked as a staff aide to the National Public Service Employment Conference, a public interest group which sought to encourage expansion of public service job opportunities. He was involved in the development of program and policy materials, analysis of current statutes and legislation, and assisted in the preparation of testimony given before the House Education and Labor committee on pending manpower bills.

Two of these students also did research projects on civil service reform and new careers. A third researched and wrote a thesis on civil service requirements as obstacles to minority employment.

Welfare and Work

Special attention was paid to legislative and policy changes which increasingly linked work programs to day care and welfare reform, and which utilized new public service employment devices to create work slots for welfare recipients and other unemployed persons.

All students participated in meetings with community leaders, government officials and academic analysts and carried out short term assignments as part of their orientation to the Laboratory program. Two students engaged in exploratory work regarding the New York State Employment Service structure and operations. One participated with the Welfare Council of the New York Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers

to inform and interest social workers in the various public service employment and welfare reform proposals. One worked on a survey and analysis of welfare fraud studies, with particular attention to their relation to eligibility and employability. Others worked with welfare and community groups in regard to the questions of real jobs for employable recipients and the availability of adequate child care resources.

Community Development

Two stude[illegible]
One was [illegible] Local Community Corporation, continuing work similar to that done by the student during the previous year with the Neighborhood Manpower Service Center. The other worked with an active community development organization where he was involved with planning for the revitalization of neighborhood business and manufacturing and the construction of housing. In both activities he worked to build in job opportunities for community residents.

Both of these students in community agencies were responsible for training paraprofessional staff. Several other students and the project director also provided consultation to a number of community groups on an ad hoc basis.

Day Care

Three students were assigned to the Columbia University Day Care Project, a pilot program developed and administered by the Laboratory at the request of the University administration.[9] The Day Care Project worked to utilize professional and technical resources from within the University to (1) help establish prototype low-cost, broadly-based day care programs to serve both low and middle income families, and (2) develop training programs for day care workers.

The students provided organizing and technical assistance to community groups, and helped start three new programs.

[9]The University, in effect, became a client of the Laboratory as a technical assistance agency. It provided funds to the Laboratory to support an additional staff person and operational costs specifically generated by the pilot program.

They completed research on existing child care programs located in general proximity to the University and its Medical Center and carried out a survey of need within the University community.

The project staff and students developed alternatives, training components, and funding sources and helped to formulate an overall day care policy for the University as an employer and commu

During the first two years of the Laboratory, it was evident that many undeveloped alternatives existed for expansion and enrichment of the field experience of student community organizers and planners, as well as for their later professional involvement. In addition to those settings already described, possible collaboration in regard to providing a setting and work supervision for student interns was discussed with many other agencies. Discussions were held, for example, with the City of New York Contract Compliance Office to work on discriminatory employment practices; with the manpower division of United Neighborhood Houses, the federation of settlement houses in New York, to collaborate on training programs for day care and other paraprofessional workers; with the Manpower Career Development Agency training division; with the MCDA unit responsible for implementing the New York Plan to open up jobs in the construction trades to minorities; with the New York Urban Coalition; with the New York Health and Hospitals Corporation program responsible for training paraprofessional personnel; with the Manhattan Court Employment Project for Women.

THE THIRD YEAR -- 1972-1973

The third year program was clearly definitive in terms of establishing that a great potential, essentially untapped, exists in government manpower agencies for professional training and occupational commitment for social workers with a community organizing and planning background.

Five internships dealing with welfare-related manpower programs and public service employment were developed in the major government agencies--at federal, state, and city levels--which constitute the basic components of the official manpower system in New York City. Two more assignments were again in the day care area at the community level.

The assignments were with the following agencies:

U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Office of the Regional Director, WIN-Talmadge Task Force (monitoring and evaluation)

New York State Employment Service, Office of Metropolitan Coordinator of Social Services Programs (Coordination of Department of Social Services/State Employment Service programs for welfare recipients, including WIN)

New York City Manpower Area Planning Council (Official manpower planning agency--CAMPS--program evaluation and resource allocation)

New York City Department of Employment, Office of Employment Services (Analysis of labor market conditions and program monitoring)

New York City Emergency Employment Act Division, Planning and Program Unit (Public employment planning and job development)

Columbia University Day Care Project (Technical assistance and program development with community groups, professional schools and the University)

These were a group of deliberately related assignments which encompassed sophisticated functions in program planning and implementation, policy analysis, research and evaluation in relation to the Work Incentive Program (WIN), Public Employment Program (PEP), Work Relief Employment Program (WREP) and institutional and family day care. None of the government assignments involved client contact or direct service.

In all but one of the assignments, students were given responsible and complex staff responsibilities, frequently very different from anything they had done before. In the one exception, the New York State Employment Service, the student was required to develop an independent project as if she were an outside researcher; the large highly-structured bureaucracy of the Employment Service had no way to include her in on-going operations with staff responsibilities.

The approach to field instruction developed by the Laboratory was designed to provide maximum support to students who were required to work independently, to make their own

way in demanding agency situations, and to work out their own organizational relationships. The integrating program carried out by Laboratory staff included individual field instruction, weekly seminars which encompassed special student presentations, extra readings and guest lectures, and collaborative student efforts on term papers or other projects assigned in the classroom. The seminars, papers and projects were all based in the field experiences, but went far beyond discussion of daily activities, providing encouragement and opportunity for advanced work. Students were able to pool their knowledge in analyzing programs, legislation and agency operations from the perspectives of the different agencies and in comparing manpower and social work orientations. They were able to look at broader political issues as well as experience the more mundane daily politics of each institution. As a result, the Laboratory created its own manpower-welfare-day care network which served to support and assist students in their field assignments and in their class work, and an educational program with a scope broader than any possible in a single assignment.

Because the third year provided such a range of substantive experiences, special descriptive essays were written by participating students for inclusion in this volume. For this reason, no further description of the field assignments is offered in this section.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Technical assistance activities carried out by project staff and students covered a range of functions:

...Planning and program development

...Staff development

...Providing information

...Organizing

...Advocacy

...Mediating

...Research

Four technical assistance models, described below, emerged from work with the organizations where students were serving internships:

1. In agencies composed primarily of paraprofessional staff, the need for technical assistance was internal. Work with these agencies was characterized by efforts to develop or reorganize programs within the agencies and to increase the knowledge and skills or resident staffs. Activities related to program and staff development--proposal writing, searching out resources and consultation--were most important. These agencies included the Federation of Addiction Agencies, the Neighborhood Manpower Service Center, the local community development organizations, and the Joint Apprenticeship Program.

2. In organizations staffed primarily by professionals who provided technical assistance as a program function, interns carried out technical assistance activities focused on planning and program development, staff development, information, mediation and research in relation to clients or constituents. These were organizations such as the Health Policy Advisory Center, the Community Development and Planning Studio, the Center for Mediation and Conflict Resolution and the National Public Service Employment Conference.

3. In government agencies with primary functions of program planning and monitoring, interns provided specialized knowledge about client needs, patterns of human behavior and problems of direct service from their experiences and training as social workers. Although none were involved in providing direct service to clients as part of their assignments, all had had experience in working with people and were sensitive to the distance between client and program planner. Client needs as a frame of reference was a unique contribution in programs where staff colleagues were mostly economists, econometrists, planners, political scientists and other assorted manpower professionals. These agencies included those of the third year--the Regional Manpower Administrator's Office (WIN Task Force), the New York State Employment Service, the New York City Department of Employment, the Manpower Area Planning Council and the Emergency Employment Act planning unit.

4. In a University-based technical assistance program, the Columbia University Day Care Project, interns carried out the range of functions in relation to community and University consumer groups, day-care advocates, University officials and government agencies. The Day Care Project was a technical assistance program developed and carried out by the Laboratory in response to increasing University-community conflict over the service needs of the functional and geographic community in which the University is the major institution. In terms of the Laboratory's own development, the Day Care Project provided a client, a contract and a way for the Laboratory to become operational as a University-based technical assistance unit. Furthermore, the involvement with day care as a social service directly related to the needs of working mothers and as a supplementary service linked to welfare eligibility illustrated the problems encountered by many families. The Day Care Project provided a mix of experiences for the intern group:

   a. Direct contact with families who needed services.

   b. Opportunities to develop new programs, analyze service needs in the community and project their programmatic implications.

   c. Opportunities to become familiar with the

- details of statutory and administrative regulations dealing with welfare eligibility, work requirements and supportive services.

Substantial momentum resulted from the Laboratory's technical assistance activities, laying the groundwork for a more permanent technical assistance program. The development of significant contacts, credibility, and programmatic expertise takes time; the second and third years of Laboratory activity demonstrated the feasibility of a University-based program as a resource for technical assistance in organizing, planning and program development for manpower and manpower-related programs.

The idea of establishing a Center for Community Programming at the School of Social Work as originally projected was shown to be feasible in terms of skill and substance. However, the possibility of financial support from community clients was clearly not realistic. As with other academic and service programs, funding from institutional, philanthropic or governmental sources would be necessary to establish such an operation.[10]

In summary, the various technical assistance activities identified elements operative in a University-connected technical assistance program with both educational and service objectives:

1. Experienced staff and students can move into technical assistance roles with relative ease. The element of experience is critical; understanding and ability to perform the consultant role requires more than rudimentary knowledge or beginning competence.

2. Working knowledge of subject areas in relation to program development can be acquired through work on specific problems; refinement and knowledge in depth can be provided by consulting with experts in the field.

3. Direct relationship to operating programs, best demonstrated by a contract to do a job for the client, transforms the process from advice to responsibility and diminishes the inherent detachment of the University base.

---

[10] The Columbia University Day Care Project was maintained by University funding for three years after the Laboratory's demonstration period ended.

4. Contacts with community organizations and government agencies developed outside the University framework tend to lend pragmatic validity to the services provided.

5. Administration and faculty support for what is seen as a non-academic activity is important to interpret and clarify the direct relationship of technical assistance activities to professional and educational functions.

It was found that technical assistance offered under University auspices was welcomed by more sophisticated organizations as well as by those with limited expertise. The active interest of experienced people who are involved in professional education, as faculty or students, was seen as a bonus by most--bringing a fresh perception of problems and solutions, a knowledge of theoretical concepts, and a relatively objective analytic approach.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

As an experimental program concerned with the development of new field work curriculum elements, the Laboratory emphasized:

1. New approaches to field work in terms of work place and function.

2. Expanded definitions of student roles and responsibilities as interns.

3. Development of the Laboratory as a supportive and synthesizing mechanism as well as an educational resource in professional training.

4. Integration of academic work and field work.[11]

The relationship between academic course work and practical field work is critical in teaching students engaged in a practice profession. One provides the knowledge base, the other the experience and the opportunities to develop specific skills. In this regard, the community organization and planning sequence at the Columbia University School of Social Work expects students to develop demonstrable ability in the following areas during the two-year educational program for the master's degrees:[12]

1. Human relations.

2. Organizing and group management.

3. Analysis of programs and policies.

4. Strategy and tactics.

5. Administration.

---

[11]This section deals primarily with academic aspects of the Laboratory's field work program; training and program development are described in other sections of this report.

[12]Guide for Field Work Instructors, Community Organization and Planning Area (New York: Columbia University School of Social Work, January 1970 [mimeographed]), pp. 1-6.

Students are required to take courses in community organizing and planning methodology, social policy, social science, research, social and organizational behavior, and to carry out professionally-supervised field work during the two-year program. Content is based in the social sciences, especially sociology, social psychology and political science.

As part of its integrated educational approach, the Laboratory developed an academic component with three major features:

1. Manpower, The Labor Market and Social Policy, a survey course of manpower issues and programs.

The course was taught by the late Professor Russell A. Nixon, associate professor of social policy, for the first time in 1970-1971, concurrent with the start of the Laboratory. All students placed with the Laboratory were required to take the course as an adjunct to their field assignment. In addition, Professor Nixon, a recognized manpower expert, conducted special seminars for the Laboratory on manpower legislation and programs.

Consequently, manpower as a subject and as a field of practice was introduced in the School of Social Work. Furthermore, the special relationship between the subject course and the field work assignment provided a concentration in a substantive field that was unique in the community organization and planning area during the time of the project.

The Laboratory's experience suggested that, as an effective educational model, the combination provided substantial background in the manpower field and in-depth experience for Laboratory students; for others who took the course but were not placed with the Laboratory, it stimulated interest in manpower through joint projects with Laboratory students and the student grapevine.

2. Extensive integration of content between other classes and the field work program of the Laboratory.

By design, the Laboratory encouraged students to undertake research and independent study projects originating in their field assignments. Support was provided by the Laboratory in terms of staff consultation, release time and minor expenses to projects based in the field experience. These were given greater scope and learning impact through the additional dimension provided by

consultation and direction from outstanding classroom faculty.

As an example, in one year Professors Richard A. Cloward, Frances Fox Piven, Russell A. Nixon, Shirley Jenkins, Eugene B. Shinn, and Arlene Marcuso assisted Laboratory students on the study projects listed below:[13]

1. A survey of welfare fraud studies to determine methodology, patterns of conclusions and complaints, and ways in which this research was used to restrict welfare entitlements and to rationalize work relief.

2. A study of civil service reform activities being carried out in connection with public service employment programs funded under the Emergency Employment Act.

3. A study of civil service requirements as obstacles to the entrance of minority persons to jobs in the uniformed municipal services (police, fire, sanitation) in ten key cities.

4. A survey of existing day care facilities and an analysis of policy considerations for the University.

5. A survey of interest and need for child care programs among members of the University community.

6. A proposal for a paraprofessional training program in manpower and social work skills at CUSSW.

7. An analysis of previous evaluations of effectiveness of the New Careers Programs.

Laboratory students were encouraged to take related courses

[13]The course outline for Professor Nixon's course for 1972-1973 is appended, as well as a listing of some of the papers written by students for his class. After the initial round of papers, he requested that students specifically address themselves to questions of social work involvement with the field of manpower. The course outline for 1972-1973 is also included in one of the companion volumes issued by the Laboratory for Community Programming, Teaching Manpower: A Collection of Courses, selected from a national survey of manpower courses.

offered by the School of Social Work as electives and by other divisions of the University. Foremost among these was the two-semester course, Human Resources and Economic Welfare, taught at the School of Business by Professor Eli Ginzberg, Chairman of the National Manpower Advisory Committee.

School of Social Work offerings included:

Professional-Paraprofessional Practice: Roles in Mental Health and Social Welfare;
Social Work Administration;
Seminar in Staff Development and Supervision for Organizer-Planners;
Seminar in Organizational Change;
Legislative Seminar;
Deviant Behavior and the Social Structure;
The Politics of Social Welfare Policy;
Social Work and Social Problems;
Poverty as a Focus for Social Policy;
The American Social Security System;
Legal Rights of Social Welfare Beneficiaries;
Organized Labor and Social Welfare;
Social Services: Policy and Delivery Strategies.

Courses at other divisions included:

Labor and Public Policy;
Industrial Relations and Organizational Behavior;
Human Resources and Economic Welfare;
Economics of Labor and Human Resources;
Seminar in Labor and Human Resources;
Education and Manpower Planning;
Labor Economics;
The Role of Women in Economic Life;
Seminar in Labor Economics;
Principles of Population Geography.

3. Weekly seminars and group projects conducted by the Laboratory as an educational resource.

As described earlier, the Laboratory provided synthesis, resources and opportunities for advanced work.[14] The weekly seminars, in which students pooled their knowledge and shared their experiences, included extra readings, guest lectures and special presentations. A library of

[14] See discussion of the third year training program.

books on manpower was developed and maintained in the project office for the use of Laboratory students and others who were working on papers dealing with manpower. (It was one indication of the distance between social work and manpower that the social work library had few books dealing with the subject; at Columbia University, as at many other institutions, most books dealing with manpower issues are located in the School of Business Administration.) The Laboratory's books have become part of the School of Social Work library, assuring at least a core collection which deals with the manpower field.

The special presentations focused on a particular problem or issue related to the program development, monitoring and evaluation responsibilities students were carrying out in their assignments. Through the seminar, the students learned about the varied implementation of manpower programs, about their relationship to welfare programs, about enabling legislation and the implications of alternate policies.

A particularly good example of how the seminar operated was a seven-week series devoted to a detailed analysis of the then recently passed Talmadge Amendment and how it was being implemented. Each student was responsible for preparing and gathering relevant material for distribution to the group, for describing and analyzing the ways his agency or program was involved, and for discussing how certain aspects could help or hurt clients. As with other seminar subjects, this one derived from the students' field experiences.

Another good example was the guest lecture by the Research Director of the Manpower Area Planning Council, who presented an exciting exposition of research techniques and guidelines used by the Council in determining how to allocate the City's manpower funds and how to evaluate programs. He made research real and meaningful to the whole student group.

Because of the structure of the field work program, with its network of related assignments, the Laboratory had access to outstanding practitioners in the manpower field for students to work with and to participate in the seminars.

Also, because it was the place where the perspectives and values of manpower and social work could be compared the relationship of program tasks and policy issues to community organization and planning skills and practice was

a constant theme.

The Community Organization and Planning Manual for Field Instructors notes that "the nature of the assignment, the placement agency, and the field instructor all make critical contributions to field learning.... The three factors are interdependent...."[15] In this case, the fourth element provided by the Laboratory as a synthesizing mechanism was essential. Special practice approaches in an innovative project such as this one require students to work independently and to take a major role in determining the content and scope of their specific responsibilities. The onus was on them to make something meaningful of their assignments, but it could not have happened without the strong support and guidance of the Laboratory staff and the educational back-up provided by the overall Laboratory program.

The results, shown most clearly in the work the students were able to do--and do well--during the course of their internships and in the jobs they qualified for afterward, indicated that the combination of at least one course and a field program (as contrasted with a discrete assignment for one student) which included a variety of assignments undertaken by different student participants, group seminars and projects designed to integrate class and field work, and school-based field instruction provided meaningful training in the manpower field within the social work curriculum.

In addition, the Laboratory carried out two major curriculum development programs in its third year--the National Workshop on Manpower Curriculum Development in Social Work, and the national survey of manpower courses. Because these efforts have been described earlier, and are the subjects of the two companion volumes to this report, there will be no further discussion of them here.

The third major curriculum development activity stimulated and supported by the Laboratory during its last year was the development of a doctoral dissertation by the Laboratory's assistant director for manpower.[16] Funded by the Manpower Administration's Office of Research and Development and sponsored by the National Association of Social

---

[15] [illegible], II-9.

[16] Frank Kushin, The Social Worker in Manpower Programs: An Assessment of Professional Tasks, Dilemmas and Educational Implications (New York: Columbia University School of Social Work, doctoral dissertation to be completed in 1977).

Workers, the study has focused on 331 social workers who are employed in manpower and manpower-related programs in different parts of the country. Its findings indicate that there are relatively few social workers engaged with primary manpower programs, and that those who are, are more frequently involved in indirect services dealing with planning, program development and research. Conversely, the study also found that a very large number of social workers are engaged in manpower and employment-related duties in social work agencies.

The implications for curriculum development in social work drawn from the study are similar to the conclusions of the National Workshop on Manpower Curriculum Development in Social Work--that manpower content can and should be incorporated into the mainstream of basic social work curriculum elements and that major changes in the social work curriculum are not necessary in order to give students basic grounding in the subject.

III. THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE

1972 -- 1973

The following essays recount field experiences of students placed with the Laboratory for Community Programming of the Columbia University School of Social Work during the academic year, 1972-1973. In each of their different assignments, they describe the programs and the variety of functions they have carried out in government agencies. Their accounts illustrate how people being trained in community organization and planning in a school of social work can tackle complex planning jobs, what they bring to them, what they learn, what they need to know.

These essays were written to give a picture of these new sorts of learning experiences, with their dual potential--providing new resources for government agencies and new opportunities for student learning and professional involvement.

The essays do not represent the complete range of activities of the Laboratory which have been described in the report; this group of papers is presented to serve as an illustrative resource for purposes of discussion on curriculum.

V. J.

INTRODUCTION

The essays which comprise this section represent the subjective experiences of five students who participated in the Laboratory for Community Programming during 1972-1973. None is intended to be a definitive magnum opus. Rather, each of us has set forth in narrative fashion a descriptive analysis of our respective field placements which shared a common manpower theme.

As students placed in disparate manpower settings, we encountered many similar problems and were asked to perform tasks which required the same kinds of skill and knowledge to be carried out correctly. We came equipped to perform some tasks and had to learn new skills to accomplish others.

If social work is to contemplate making inroads into the manpower field, then it will have to know what is relevant for inclusion in curriculum and what can be expected from a social worker in manpower. There is little experience among social workers in this field. In a recent NASW survey of its membership it was found that 0.1% of social workers work in employment settings.[1]

Very few other schools have manpower components which include actual field placements in manpower agencies. Our experience is unique, and hopefully, can serve as a tentative first step toward the creation of what Russell Nixon has identified as a manpower social worker.[2]

Our field experience had three distinct components to it. All of us were placed in actual manpower settings for three days a week and were required to

---

[1] N.A.S.W. printout of "Present Practice" from unpublished Manpower Data Survey.

[2] Russell A. Nixon, "Manpower--A New Area for Social Work and New Roles for Social Workers," in Manpower and Employment: A Source Book for Social Workers, ed. by Margaret Purvine (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1972), p. 258.

do the same things as our non-social worker colleagues. In addition, our social work supervision comes from the Laboratory for Community Programming. Finally, all students assigned to the Laboratory were required to take a course entitled, "Manpower, the Labor Market, and Social Policy." Each of these three elements played a distinct role in shaping the parameters of our training. Their contribution will become apparent in the ensuing discussion.

Our entry into manpower sites was not too difficult to accomplish. Negotiations between the Laboratory and cooperating agencies were focused on the need to define assignments for us within on-going programs. Every one of the agencies was open, interested and quite amenable, even though, with two exceptions, the agency personnel had little experience with social work interns as we were called.

Once admitted, we were mostly treated as part-time staff. In the beginning we experienced some problems establishing credibility with our new co-workers. Very few of them had the slightest inclination of what a professional social worker was, or what he might be capable of. In one case the problem was compounded because the student was typecast as an outsider and not given any responsibility within an on-going program. She had to literally carve out a place for herself in a strict bureaucracy whose members came up through the ranks.

We, in turn, were unsure of what to expect from our new colleagues. For the most part, people in the manpower field come from disciplines such as economics and business administration which stress skills such as planning, systems and statistical analysis. These are hardly prime subject areas within the social work curriculum.[3] Since we were to function on a par with the full-time employees, it became necessary for us to acquire an understanding of the "tools of the trade."

Communication was of paramount importance. To understand

---

[3] No one discipline is predominant in the manpower field. Manpower specialists come from a variety of fields. See Herbert S. Parnes, Educational Requirements for the Development of Human Resources Specialists," in The Production of Manpower Specialists: A Volume of Selected Papers, ed. by John R. Niland (Ithaca, New York: New York School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, 1971), pp. 75-76.

and perform our assignments we had to learn the jargon. Such terms as "interfacing" became part of our daily vocabulary. We had to immerse ourselves in the minute details of program development based upon city, state and federal legislation and administrative guidelines. Some of us found ourselves evaluating actual and future programs. Others did program planning and monitoring. Without first learning these basics, we would not have been able to establish meaningful communication.[4] Once we established some command of the planning argot and familiarized ourselves with agency personnel and procedures, we began to be regarded in a new light and were given more responsibility.

As mutual expectations grew, we were able to focus our attention on how our specific tasks related to the manpower area and to social work concerns. All of us know from first hand experience how haphazard and poorly planned most manpower and welfare/workfare programs seem. To an outsider or lower level staff member placed in one wrinkle of a never ending, forever twisting and turning piece of red tape, it must seem as though the manpower system functions according to some as yet unknown law of social entropy. None of the pieces quite fit together. For example, state and city agencies are often competitive. Both are constantly trying to bob and weave through federal guidelines and maximize their federal reimbursements. Both are agencies of two different levels of government whose chief administrators, the governor and mayor are political rivals. Very little cooperation exists between rival bureaucracies. Our personal experience is consistent with that observed elsewhere. Garth Mangum writes:

> There were too many separate federal programs offering support for services of the same kind or for the same clientele, all with varying funding sources, eligibility rules, application procedures, and administrative guidelines. Yet none of these programs, nor all of them altogether, had sufficient appropriations to serve more than a fraction of those eligible.[5]

---

[4] Without communication, very little can be accomplished. Even among social workers, very little real communication takes place between members of the same profession. See Willard C. Richan, "A Common Language for Social Work," Social Work, XVII (November 1972), p. 22.

[5] Garth L. Mangum, The Emergence of Manpower Policy (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969), p. 69.

In rational planning terms, most of the programs discussed in the individual essays do not make sense. Rationality requires that alternative courses of action be noted together with their consequences. These alternative courses must be ordered on preference scales, with the social and economic costs balanced against outcomes.[6]

The most efficient method to achieve one's goal is the most rational. Efficiency is used here in terms of both monetary and social costs.[7] Very little service has been given to those intended to receive it, nor does society benefit. Much has been paid for, but very little has been bought.

The term social cost is inclusive of many things. It is a collective term pertaining to society as a whole as well as to segments within it. When we ask what the social costs of a program are, we are really asking for an analysis of its effects upon the population for which it is designed, for those who sponsor it, and for those who carry it out. Manpower programs in the United States take as their underlying premise that there is something amiss with the clients entering the program. They lack skills. They do not fit into the labor market. They are on welfare, Ergo, they must be deficient in some way. No attention is paid to the labor market mechanism itself. People are trained in skills for which no jobs exist or, in the case of enforced work, are given degrading, meaningless tasks.

What are the social costs? Our experience has served to illustrate four areas where a heavy cost is incurred. First, clients do not receive service; their potential is not developed nor is access to positions within the labor market opened up to them. Second, line staff and socially conscious employees become exasperated at their inability to influence what they know to be ineffective, unnecessary, harsh policy. Staff morale suffers and with it organizational efficiency and unity of purpose. This social cost is exacerbated in some agencies by racial

---

[6] These elements of rationality have been borrowed from and are expansions of the conditions of rationality in William H. Riker, The Theory of Political Coalitions (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967), pp. 18-19.

[7] See Herbert Simon, Administrative Behavior (New York: The Free Press, 1957), p. 122. Simon's definition of efficiency refers to costs, but does not specify social as distinct from monetary costs.

overtones. Minority staff feel it especially difficult to carry out agency mandates. Third, the inefficient, ill-directed and unsuccessful use of public funds always provides grist for someone's political mill. In the welfare field, the failure of the original Work Incentive Program (WIN-I) led to the harshen workfare of WIN-II. It is a cyclical process. Fourth, the real source of the problem--THE FACT THAT THERE ARE NO JOBS--gets ignored.

A recognition that the labor market, not the unemployed, is primarily to blame for otherwise employable people being on welfare would require a whole new outlook. Rather than concentration upon the individuals, the new focus would be upon the labor market system itself. The outlook would be one of structural change as opposed to the current emphasis upon residual change. The difference between the two approaches is well worth noting.

> Structural change is more likely to be preventative because it attacks those factors in the situation that precipitate or aggravate problematic behavior. In contrast, residual treatments, to the extent that causation stems from the social structure, are constantly employed against a never ending flow of casualties.[8]

From a manpower perspective, the individual is considered only in terms of his potentiality as a producer of goods; "the individual is not treated as a consumer, as a parent, as a voter, or as any of the numerous other roles that he may fill from time to time."[9] If human resources are to be rationally used, then, "No individual with potential for highly skilled work should involuntarily perform work of a lesser nature."[10]

---

[8] Robert R. Mayer, Social Planning and Social Change (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972), p. 38. It should be pointed out that there is a basic similarity between the residual approach and the blaming of the victim approach. Both approaches share the desire to avoid the real problem; the poor are blamed for their poverty. See William Ryan, Blaming the Victim (New York: Vintage Books, 1971), especially pp. 3-30.

[9] John R. Niland, "The Nature of the Manpower Function," in The Production of Manpower Specialists, op. cit., p. 9.

[10] Ibid.

There is no necessary incompatibility between the manpower and social work perspectives. Ideally, they are both highly compatible. Social workers too would like to see men and women gainfully employed in occupations where ability alone served as the only indicator of success. Yet, very hard questions must be asked. What does potential for highly skilled work mean? Who shall determine what skills will be highly valued? By what standards? When one starts to give the concepts operational definitions, the answers are far from self-evident. They depend upon who does the defining, by what criteria, and how much he is willing to invest in order to develop human potential.

The answer to these questions is difficult to get at. So much depends upon ideology, who holds power, scarcity of resources and the exigencies of the moment. We have observed that as new priorities in one arena occur, they effect others. Sometimes there is an intent, and sometimes not. The promise of revenue sharing on the federal level has seen the reorganization of manpower agencies in anticipation of that change. Likewise, with an anti-welfare bias omnipresent throughout the nation, even qualified welfare applicants find it difficult to get on the rolls. All sorts of obstacles are placed in their path; they must take pictures, fill out lengthy forms, and wait on interminably long lines.[11]

---

[11] In a report made public on Sunday, March 25, 1973, The New York Times quoted the following from the ninth report of the New York State Commission to Make a Study of Governmental Operations in New York State:

> The city, "believed it could save money by not discovering, referring or helping people in trouble." (p. 27)

Welfare administrators are politically vulnerable and hence very restrictive. This phenomenon exemplifies a phenomenon called Spontaneous Field Control and refers to the fact that, "Often when you act, as unintended by-products of your behavior you produce signals about rewards or deprivations or even the rewards or deprivations themselves; these ... influence another person's expectations.... He responds in an attempt to avoid the threatened deprivations or secure the expected gratifications. ..." See Robert A. Dahl and Charles E. Lindbloorm, Politics, Economics and Welfare (New York: Harper & Row, 1953), p. 100. See also, Frances Fox Piven and Richard Cloward, Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare (New York: Pantheon Books, 1971) for a discussion of specific techniques used to keep welfare rolls down.

Who are these recipients who wait to be served? What is their potential?

We have found as social workers that we were relatively uninformed of the ramifications which the whole manpower area has for welfare clients when we first began our assignments. Were we not social work students viewing our experience as a learning device, it might be fairly easy to lose sight of the consequence which manpower programs have for the poor. A common complaint of all of us was the absolute removal from clients which our field work settings demanded. Our only information about programs came to us through statistical abstractions. In that kind of an environment it is much easier to accept productivity and cost-benefit standards without much hesitation. The figures tend to take on a life of their own for those decision makers in the bureaucracies. It is their only contact with clients.

Given that manpower and welfare programs are to be inextricably tied, then, unless social workers care to abandon the welfare recipients to the kinds of programs described in the essays which follow, they must make more of an effort to get involved in the manpower area. Our experience has shown that social workers can function at least as well as those trained in other disciplines. Traditionally, social workers have been as outside of the system as the clients whose interests they seek to protect. Gaining access to that system means learning, as we did, how to deal with statistics; knowing something about economics and labor market theory; learning what flow charts and Program Evaluation Review Technique (PERT) can mean; and finally, being knowledgeable in administrative techniques and organizational behavior both internally and externally. The essays included here reflect much more than just a commonality of problems.

There is another side to be taken. We carried an added dimension to our assignments--for the clients. When opportunities arose, we discussed the issue with our colleagues. We approached assignments from the point of view of social work and tried to keep in mind that the statistics before us represented people. Many of our co-workers wrestled with the same problem. Others did not, and at times we tried to do some consciousness-raising with them, with some success.

Coming from a social work background, we had different criteria for judging a program's effectiveness. We wanted to know what it did to those who entered it as

well as what its financial outlay was. Rather than detract from accepted planning principles, this adds still another premise for rational program determination--the premise of social cost, a heretofore ignored consideration in planning. Failure to appreciate this fact places too much faith in statistics and de-humanizes the clients to something akin to a machine. Even if those who plan and administer programs dictated by the people's representatives do not intend to penalize human dignity by their actions, it is done nonetheless.

While our field assignments gave us an intimate knowledge of day to day manpower operations in the field, we also were given a much broader perspective of events through our course, "Manpower, the Labor Market and Social Policy," and our participation in the Laboratory for Community Programming.

The course gave us a fundamental background in labor market dynamics, the meaning of work in society, a history of U.S. manpower programs and policies, and their relation to social policy. Of necessity the course was limited in depth so that it could encompass the broad scope an introductory course should have. For those of us actually working in manpower agencies, a more in-depth look at labor market analysis or the legislative process detailed with respect to manpower program analysis would have been extremely valuable. Any curriculum designed to train social workers as manpower professionals must include a sequel to the one semester exposure we had.

Even as working in agencies gave us practical experience and taking the manpower course gave us basic knowledge and perspective, the Laboratory for Community Programming served to add still another dimension to our experience. Weekly sessions of the entire Laboratory were held to discuss and evaluate manpower and practice issues. Guest speakers at the first three sessions included Dean Mitchell I. Ginsberg, Professor Alfred J. Kahn and Professor Russell A. Nixon. They spoke in some detail to us about the HR1 proposals, the planning issues involved in current child care alternatives and the history of manpower legislation and policy respectively. These first introductory sessions provided us with a framework from which our subsequent analyses of these issues took shape.

All of the students took responsibility for the direction of our weekly meetings. Very quickly these sessions took the form of seminars in which we each gave presentations on our field assignments or on particular programs we felt we needed to know more about. For example, seven

weeks were spent in an in-depth analysis of the WIN program as it was legislated and functioned originally and, currently, under the Talmadge Amendment to the Social Security Act.

Because we had such free and open exchange, each of us knew what the other was doing. We also knew what each of our placement agencies was doing. In this respect, we had a considerable advantage over our colleagues in manpower. Because of this awareness and familiarity with each placement, our perspective sharpened. We could see how the rigidity of one placement served to affect its relations with clients, staff and other agencies. In another case, we were able to note how dysfunctional lack of some real definitive structure can be for everyone concerned.

In addition to the above, it should be borne in mind that all of the Laboratory students are specializing in community organization and planning. Consequently, we have taken courses in subject areas which have served us well. These have included such areas of study as community assessment; identification of and strategies for dealing with differing power bases; organizational behavior; theories of management and their application to social service administration. There has been a complementary relationship between courses offered in the organization and planning sequence and the requirements placed upon us in carrying out field assignments.

The five manpower placements discussed here should only be taken as illustrative settings in which social workers can make a contribution. There are many more kinds of potential practice areas for those of us in community organization as well as for those specializing in case and group work.

Our experience has indicated many gaps in direct service which stem from an incomplete picture regarding clients. Very few social workers are available to make an assessment of clients' needs and abilities as they are related to manpower programs. No one really takes into consideration the social costs paid by the client. Consequently, very limited input is given to those making legislative and administrative decisions about the population for whom they are deciding. Clients get to be numbers which are consumed by computer memory banks. They need someone who will know how to convert those numbers into flesh and blood terms.

Social workers might be able to redefine some of the programs in such a way as to actually benefit clients. Even apart from mandatory work relief, there are many individuals who have difficulties coping with the stresses imposed upon them by unemployment and underemployment. Many of these working poor need higher incomes. They need to gain self-respect and dignity and that need is intimately tied in with the world of work.[13]

Staff development and training offer another possibility for social work in-put in manpower agencies if those who make and implement policy are to accept social cost as a premise in making their decisions. Problems of authority, of racial tension between minority agency staff members and their white counterparts all fall potentially within the expertise of social workers. Apart from manpower agencies, social workers can make a valuable contribution to staff development programs designed to give workers more job satisfaction.

The suggestions just given are not intended to be inclusive of all of the possibilities. Rather, they are meant to be illustrative of the wide ranging applicability the manpower field offers to social work practitioners. To accommodate the wide disparity which is possible, several types of courses within social work would be required as well as a core curriculum in manpower which will be common to all. It is hoped that the essays which follow will lead us one step closer to defining the place which social work has within the manpower field.

---

[13] For example, see the article by William Spring, Bennett Harrison and Thomas Vietorisz, "Crisis of the Underemployed," New York Times Magazine, November 5, 1972. See also, Elliott Liebow, Tally's Corner (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1967), and "H.E.W. Study Finds Job Discontent is Hurting Nation," New York Times, December 22, 1972, p. 1.

Robert Tropp

THE NEW YORK CITY MANPOWER AREA PLANNING COUNCIL

James F. Drinane

The New York City Manpower Area Planning Council (MAPC) is a thirty-four member body appointed by the Mayor. Its specific charge is to establish priorities for the expenditure of the federal, state, and city monies currently spent in the City each year for manpower programs. All major manpower-related agencies in the City are members of the Council. Business, labor, and client groups are also represented.

MAPC is New York City's component of the CAMPS system, Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System. CAMPS was set up by the United States Department of Labor to establish priorities and to coordinate manpower services in each state and locality.

The Manpower Council is engaged in three major activities. The first is the publication of an Annual Plan, prepared for each fiscal year, which has three major components. First, there is a review of all manpower programs in operation in the city during the previous year. This review is comprehensive, covering all manpoer activities, and is based on assessments which have been prepared by staff throughout the year. The second component of the plan is a discussion of New York City's labor market, presenting its prospects and trends based on the latest and best available data. This component also goes into some detail on the various groups in New York City that have been designated by MAPC as target groups for manpower service. The final component of the plan contains the recommendations of the Council for the following fiscal year. Based upon the analyses of program performance, and of the labor market, MAPC presents its recommendations for the use of the Federal manpower monies available to the City for that year. The status of this particular component is somewhat in flux this year due to the indefinite nature and future of Manpower Revenue Sharing. As it looks now, the total amount of new funds to be obligated can be divided into two broad pieces: MTS, Manpower Training Services, and MRS, Manpower Revenue Sharing. MTS represents the more nationally based programs, JOBS, EEA, and WIN. Appropriations under these programs are virtually "locked in" by the Federal Government, although MAPC will continue with its

assessments of these programs and work with the local operators of these programs. MRS represents categorical programs like JOP, PSC, MDTA, CEP, CAMPS, Operation Mainstream, and others. In these latter areas, MAPC will have considerably more discretion this year in setting funding priorities, expanding successful programs and discouraging unsuccessful ones.

The second major activity of MAPC is program assessments, already referred to in the previous paragraph. Different people on staff are responsible for preparing paper on various manpower programs in New York City. These papers are reviewed by special panels of the Council and then submitted to the full Council. The constitute the basis for the recommendations made by the Council in the Annual Plan. These assessments involve studying and analyzing the performance data of the programs, including completion, placement, and retention rates, the occupations and wages of completers, the cost of the project per successful placement and how well the available funds and slots were utilized. It also involves comparing these results with the intent of the program and with other programs and comparing the characteristics of those served in the program with MAPC's target groups.

The third major activity of MAPC is proposal review. Any applicant desiring manpower training funds from the Department of Labor must submit his proposal to the Council for review and comment. Again, the work is done by staff, and passed on to the appropriate panel of the Council. Although at this point MAPC does not have actual veto power over projects, MAPC's recommendations must be included before a program is funded. MAPC's concern in reviewing proposals is to fit them into the priorities of the Annual Plan, looking specifically at whether or not target groups will be served, whether the training proposed offers realistic job opportunities, based on labor market analysis; whether the program is designed in such a way that success is possible, i.e., whether it provides for those components which would be necessary for the group to be served; and finally, whether the cost is realistic, based on the experience of other programs.

By examining and comparing programs, certain trends develop very clearly which lay out the options open to manpower planners. For example, it has been found that programs which involve pre-training hires, like OJT, JOP, PSCP, EEA, and others, have the highest performance ratings and provide the best job opportunities. However, these very same programs also usually have the smallest percentages of really hard core unemployed workers:

welfare recipients, young dropouts, non-English speaking persons, and ex-addicts and ex-offenders. On the other hand, more institutionally oriented programs like MDTA Institutional, WIN, and CEP, reach more of the difficult groups, but have the poorest performance ratings. At the very least, such analysis lays out clear policy options--we know better what the implications of our decisions are.

Furthermore, certain obvious service gaps emerge. For example, in neither type of program do we find many efforts either directed at or even open to ex-addicts and ex-offenders. Such a situation certainly has social policy implications and MAPC is one of many agencies in a position to attempt to do something about it.

My activities at MAPC have been largely analytic in nature. A major part of my work has involved learning how to evaluate program performance; how to analyze labor market data; and how to use census data and other research sources. It has entailed practical learning experiences in the use of data which I would never have gotten through course work alone. In addition, it has involved developing skills which will be useful in whatever jobs I may have.

My first assignment at MAPC was an analysis of hourly wages and occupations of WIN enrollees in "Job Entry" as compared to the wages and occupations of the female working population of New York City's low income areas. The implications of the analysis were that despite the great cost ($19 million in New York City in year the WIN program did not have much impact on the employment potential of its enrollees. At best, WIN enrollees were placed in the same types and levels of jobs which comparable groups in the overall poverty area population have generally manned anyway.

Another major assignment I have worked on is an analysis and assessment of the Jobs Optional Program (JOP). This program provides reimbursement to an employer up to one half of a trainee's salary for a specified OJT period, determined by the skill level of the job trained for. The usual amount is about $1,000. The program requires that 50% of the slots be for the disadvantaged, for whom there is a longer reimbursement period. The program involves both entry and upgrading components.

Most of the contracts are quite small--some as small as one employee--in small manufacturing and retail establishments. However the bulk of the total JOP slots (about 80%) are allotted to several large contracts with business, labor, and social service organizations which

subcontr[illegible]ese training slots out to numerous firms.

Since a program like JOP is characterized by a great number of individual contracts, MAPC does not review each proposal, but rather is working on establishing a set of funding guidelines and priorities which will constitute our position on the use of OJT funds. Hence, in my assignment I was not so interested in evaluating the performance of specific contracts, but rather in attempting to clarify which type of JOP programs perform best, and how JOP might best be used to serve MAPC's target groups.

JOP is considered a statewide program, and separate data for New York City are not collected. Therefore my first job was collecting and organizing all the relevant data. We were able to get statewide data on characteristics of JOP enrollees. Since New York City utilizes about 40% of the total state of JOP funds, we felt that this data was helpful, if not strictly applicable to New York City.

To get data on actual programs, so we could select a sample of contracts and compare different types, it was necessary to get copies of the actual vouchers contractors submitted to the Employment Service for reimbursement. Gathering, sorting out, and arranging these vouchers was a monumental physical task, but once it was done we could look at the most recent voucher for any contract. This voucher [illegible]tes not only the amount of money the [illegible]or had received under the program but also the jobs trained for, the number of slots filled to that date, the number still in the program and the cumulative number of completers, early terminees, and completers no longer employed, as well as an estimate of the wages paid to the employee. This information enabled us to compute and compare maximum and actual completion, employment, and retention rates.

Once we had prepared all of this data on our sample of contracts, we were able to compare Entry and Upgrading components, and more significantly, the large "Prime" contracts, in which agencies subcontracted out slots to small firms, and the smaller contracts directly with employers. We wanted to test the hypothesis that the smaller contracts could perform better and offer better opportunities since the job developer was able to "work on" the employer for a better job opportunity. Actually we found that the performance rating of the "Prime" contracts was slightly better than that of the direct contracts. The "Prime" contracts appeared to be the more expensive, since administrative costs were included in the cost of the contracts. However, the direct contracts also have administrative costs, but these costs are

hidden in the bulk amount allotted to the Employment Service to market and negotiate these direct contracts.

We are inclined to believe that one of the great strengths of the JOP program is lost if contract development and actual recruitment of trainees are in entirely separate hands, the latter being the sole responsibility of the employer. However we feel that such a program could be a valuable resource in the hands of a Neighborhood Youth Corps job developer, a drug program placement unit, or a Department of Corrections counselor. In such cases, the JOP program might be a way to zero in on developing job and training opportunities for groups experiencing particular difficulty in finding and holding jobs.

A third assignment I have worked on is developing a section of the MAPC Annual Plan entitled, "The Universe of Need for Manpower Service." It is an attempt to illustrate the "dual labor market" at work, utilizing available data--the 1970 census, the Selected Low Income Areas Survey, and other sources. It is an attempt to come to grips with those who don't succeed in New York City's labor market, and why. It is an attempt to see how the "why" is a function of both the labor market itself, and the people who experience the difficulty.

The first part of this analysis considers the dimensions of the city's poverty. There are various indicators available: the poverty level; 125% of the poverty level; the incidence of Public Assistance Income; the Bureau of Labor Statistics lower living standard; and the actual median incomes of different groups of workers.

After these general considerations, the analysis looks more closely at three major subgroups: the underemployed, the unemployed, and those unnecessarily out of the labor force. These categories are difficult to clarify. The underemployed is a nebulous concept, and depends on what standard one chooses to set. The unemployed are not just one static group, a set percentage of the labor force, but actually a much larger group moving into and out of jobs. Each month the same unemployment figure represents a largely different group of people. Those out of the labor force are easy to talk about conceptually, but difficult to actually single out.

Finally the analysis discusses the ten MAPC target groups for manpower services: Youth under 21, High School dropouts, Ex-addicts, Ex-offenders, the Handicapped, Veterans, Welfare Recipients, Older Workers (over 45), Heads of Households, and Non-English speaking persons. The

analysis does not attempt to give an exact estimate of the size of these groups, but rather a more generalized survey of the evidence for their need for manpower service. This is for two reasons. First, such estimates are in most cases quite tenuous. And second, the numerical estimates are deceiving because of the considerable overlapping between these groups. For example, an ex-addict is also likely to appear in the youth, dropout, and ex-offender categories. Nevertheless, we are able to look closely at these groups and present some data which in most cases supports what is generally held intuitively, i.e., that these groups have serious difficulties with the labor market in New York City.

Finally, this analysis attempts to build a conceptual model of what specific services these groups need (e.g., job counseling, OJT, income maintenance, day care, etc), which current manpower programs provide these services, and to what extent these target groups have been able to get into and benefit from these programs.

Of course, such a model is neither all-inclusive nor perfect. It does not include the many other criteria which are relevant, such as program performance ratings and cost. However the model suggests one way to approach the problem of manpower planning, bearing in mind that resources are limited, and that manpower programs have only minimal impact on the operation of the labor market and the economy.

Having given three descriptions of what types of tasks I perform at MAPC, crucial questions arise. Should social workers be developing the skills involved in doing what I have described? Is this an appropriate area for involvement of social workers? I think the answer may be obvious to the participants of the National Workshop on Manpower Curriculum Development in Social Work. The record of manpower programs has not been an illustrious one, and recent developments in the area of welfare - workfare are downright repressive. Social work does entail as part of its ethical base an over-arching commitment to concern with how programs will affect the consumers of service. While such a stance is not exclusive to social work, nor do all social workers exemplify it in their work, nonetheless such a commitment is crucial to effective and humane manpower planning. When it is lacking, as it apparently often is, programs are planned and priorities are set which do not reflect the real needs of the people to be served.

Since programs are predominantly designed to serve the

poor, social work's traditional involvement with the poor and programs designed to serve the poor can add an important dimension to manpower planning.. Social work's orientation to human service entails an element critical to manpower planning, i.e., that manpower programs should serve people and not the system. Indeed there needs to be transformation of the economy, the labor market, and overall distribution of wealth in this society. Manpower programs are a feeble tool with which to even contemplate achieving this task. Nevertheless, within manpower planning lies the opportunity to give service to some, and to advocate for individual rights and human dignity in the planning of employment programs for poor people.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION
OFFICE OF THE REGIONAL DIRECTOR

Walter Leutz

My field assignment is with the WIN-Talmadge task force at the Regional Office of the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL). The task force has been assigned the task of implementing the Talmadge Amendments to the Work Incentive Program (WIN-II) in the states in the region (New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands). The main activities of the task force are negotiating contracts with the respective state employment services (SES) and welfare departments in the states and monitoring and assisting in the implementation of the new directions of the WIN-II legislation.

The Talmadge Amendments have made significant changes in the WIN program. The general thrust of the amendments has been to change WIN from a largely voluntary and training-intensive program to a mandatory and placement oriented one. Unless exempt,[1] all recipients of Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) must register for manpower services as a requirement for eligibility for welfare.

Welfare offices have contracts with DOL to determine whether a client is mandatory or exempt and to register mandatory clients (as well as any who volunteer). Welfare must also organize a Separate Administrative Unit (SAU) to deliver supportive services to clients participating in the WIN program. These services are 90% federally reimbursable as opposed to the usual 75%, thus giving welfare financial incentive to deliver the services required by the Program. The most important services are child care and medical assistance. In forming the SAU, the Talmadge Amendments aim to assure efficient and sufficient provision of social support services. Their lack was a fault of WIN-I.

[1] Exempt recipients are children under 16, children between 16 and 21 who are in school, the incapacitated, those over age 65, those too remote from a WIN Project, those needed in the home to care for an incapacitated person, wives of registered fathers, and mothers with children under six years old.

On the manpower side the new emphasis is on job placement and on-the-job training (OJT) rather than institutional training and education. This is reflected in a shortening of the time of participation in WIN from an average of one year (with a maximum of two) to an average of six months (with a maximum of one year). It is also required that the states spend one-third of their WIN funds on OJT and Public Service Employment. Finally, the national office of DOL has instituted a comprehensive set of performance standards which, along with the mandatory registration provisions greatly increase the volume of the program. The national standards project that 1,500,000 clients will have to register for WIN (40% of the caseload) and that 750,000 will become WIN participants. Standards for other WIN Program components (OJT, Direct Placement, etc.) are broken out in turn. The goals for each region, state and project are broken down in terms of these percentages of their respective caseloads.

The task force is a temporary unit which reports directly to the Regional Manpower Administrator (RMA). Its staff consists of a director, four field representatives, a contracts specialist and a receptionist-typist. Each field representative is mainly responsible for a particular state in the region and conducts his primary activities in that state.

My assignment at DOL has been to function as a staff member (half-time) on the task force. It is apparent that the objectives and activities of my assignment with the task force are difficult to analyze in the client-group-change terms of the usual community organization-social work placement. Since I never get very close to the clients of the program, I have no opportunities to work in any group setting with them.

Rather, the bureaucratic setting of the assignment calls for administrative objectives and skills. Most of the objectives of my assignment are defined by those of the task force itself, as they have been briefly mentioned above. In addition, I have the objective of assessing what special contribution (if any) I, as a social worker, make to the task force. The specifics and tentative outcomes of this objective will be examined in more detail later.

In order to assume the role of field representative I have had to acquire new knowledge and skills. I have had to learn the specifics of the WIN legislation and guidelines, especially in reference to the roles, requirements and objectives of the various agencies and governmental bodies involved. I have had to learn a

good deal about such areas as the nature and types of manpower services, the characteristics of WIN's potential labor market, as well as the characteristics and needs of the WIN clients themselves.

The skills needed to carry out the assignment cover a broad range. The central task force activity, monitoring, demands skills in program evaluation and development as well as technical assistance. The task force is also involved in contracting, data collection and evaluation, fiscal matters and program planning.

WIN-II involves a wide range of manpower and social welfare services and the WIN staff must be familiar with all of them. On the social welfare side, WIN requires that DOL and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) coordinate the registration of AFDC recipients into the program and oversee the delivery of supportive services by the local welfare departments. On the manpower side, DOL monitors contracts for skill training, basic education and vocational counseling and job placement through SES.

The focus of task force activities are the state agencies which carry out the WIN program. Each state must submit a plan to DOL which contains state and local project goals consistent with federal guidelines and participation levels. This plan is part of the contract the federal government has with the states and is the basis of state operations and federal evaluations. Separate contracts are signed with state welfare offices and employment services, the welfare contract being much smaller since it covers only eligibility determination and registration.

While the program emphasis of WIN has changed with the Talmadge Amendments, WIN-II does not call for great changes in state or local operations. SES has had to hire some new staff, shorten the length of service to individual clients and redirect some of its spending to conform with a federal emphasis on certain types of manpower services. The welfare offices have had to make greater changes in that they have had to institute a new set of criteria for eligibility, i.e., participation or exemption from WIN. This has necessitated some training of staff, and an introduction of new forms and new procedures. WIN-related work, however, still involves only a small fraction of welfare staff time.

Since I have been at DOL, I have been on a number of monitoring visits to both welfare and employment offices in New York and New Jersey. The DOL field representatives have found that the most effective method of looking at a

local project is a program "walk through," asking questions about what happens to clients at each step of the program with an emphasis on the general linkage of the various sub-systems of the program. Among the specific areas which receive attention are staff qualifications, levels and allocation; the volume of participants at each point in the program; procedures for paper work; linkages with outside systems; and the characteristics of WIN participants.

The field representatives also seek feedback about programmatic or policy problems the local project is experiencing. The representatives can offer clarification of policy and program priorities and aims as well as giving examples of the ways other projects deal with similar problems. The problems identified in such sessions are included in field reports and become part of the continuing evaluation of the program.

Monitoring visits can be big, bureaucratic affairs, filled with confusion and resistance such as a visit to one New Jersey WIN project which involved no less than seven federal officials from the national and regional levels of both DOL and HEW and twenty-five state and local officials from SES and welfare. The presence of national officials usually charges the atmosphere somewhat since they are much less sympathetic towards complaints about the problems in meeting WIN participation standards and much closer to those who can apply the ultimate sanction of reducing federal funds for a state.

Monitoring visits can also be more relaxed and useful encounters such as a visit one task force member and I made to another New Jersey WIN office. With only a few state and local officials there, we were able to talk openly about the limitations of the program, identify their strengths and weaknesses, and recommend changes in local program operation which would benefit both the local office and its clients.

The monitoring experience differs widely among local welfare offices also. At one office in Manhattan, we found that a series of labor union problems and a lack of direction from the central office have kept that office from doing any more than a token implementation of WIN registration procedures. The situation was so chaotic that the monitoring staff could make no meaningful suggestions to the office manager. A visit to one welfare office in New Jersey revealed the opposite extreme of a registration procedure running so smoothly that no recommendations were in order.

States and large cities as a whole are also the subjects of federal monitoring visits. I have accompanied task force members in large and small meetings with administrators on these levels in New Jersey, New York, and New York City. These meetings involved the various aspects of program implementation and compliance checking as they relate to the obligations of higher administrative levels. Specific examples of matters dealt with here are checking plans for WIN staff training by the states and gaining an acceptance of performance standards.

The implementation of WIN-II in the region has not gone smoothly. While the Talmadge redirection of WIN has not brought about extensive procedural changes in state and local agencies involved with the program, there has been considerable resistance and resentment against it. The resistance has been based on a mixture of financial, ideological and professional grounds. In general, funding for WIN is currently far too small to give even the services called for in the legislation, and those services themselves are too limited and short-lived to make clients "employable" even in a strong labor market. With present high unemployment rates, WIN clients are simply not competitive. The manpower professionals in the WIN centers feel the need for more varied training and educational resources and a longer training period in order to better prepare the large numbers of disadvantaged clients they must now serve.

Welfare departments do not relish their role in the program. They claim they are not reimbursed enough for the time it takes them to register clients. They also feel that the social service resources they are mandated to supply WIN clients (especially quality day care) simply do not exist. Finally, many welfare professionals do not feel that mothers should be forced into work and work training programs, especially into a program as inadequate as WIN-II.

At times the resistance to WIN-II has been quite overt. Officials have argued openly about the inadequacy of the program and the impossibility of meeting the participation and placement goals. They say that to even approach the placement goals, they must place participants in low-wage jobs which could have been obtained without WIN training. For the first six or seven months of the program, one state simply refused to implement WIN-II and continued the intensive services and low enrollment of WIN-I. Concrete threats from DOL have finally brought some changes in this case, but it seems likely that the resistance will merely move to more covert and bureaucratic means which are also popular in other states.

The use of these more covert bureaucratic types of resistance takes varied forms. Information becomes "not available"; money is not spent; staffs get no training; unions refuse new tasks. Reasons for not meeting contract standards and resisting the new regulations center around the various weaknesses of WIN goals and requirements. The task force does not have the power to directly stop this resistance or to invoke sanctions against the states. Through its monitoring visits and data gathering, the task force can only note the types and extent of non-compliance, suggest ways for the states to comply, and inform them of the possible consequences (a cut in funds) of not doing so. Task force staff does have some flexibility in choosing what to report, evaluating the validity of the reasons for non-compliance, and choosing what to tell the state and local officials about the flexibility and priorities of the federal standards. The consensus at all levels is that many goals will not be met by any of the states so there is nothing to do but wait and see what happens when higher decisions are made.

With my orientation as a social worker, I had feelings of entering alien territory when I came to the task force. It did not seem unlikely to me that the task force members' views of welfare recipients might be somewhat more punitive than mine. Fortunately, this was not the case. I think we all also agree that WIN-II, with its low funding and limited services, is an inadequate programmatic response to the goal of providing employment and training to welfare recipients.

Given this shared perspective, the potential for major disagreement among members of the task force who have somewhat differing views has been reduced. The similarity in outlook has also led to a shared series of operational goals. First, we feel that it is our responsibility to see that the best possible services are given to WIN participants within the limitations of the program. This goal includes such things as making sure that staffs are hired and trained; that training, placement and job development components are working towards the best possible vocational goals for participants; and that quality child care and other social services are being provided.

Second, we try to make sure that as few participants as possible lose their welfare benefits for failing to comply with the mandatory provisions of the program. Realizing this goal involves creating an atmosphere of concern for the interests and needs of clients at the local level, as well as encouraging efficient procedures

for communication with clients who resist or do not respond to the requirements of the program.

Finally, this orientation requires that we continually document the inadequacies and problems of WIN-II and communicate them upward to policy makers. These inadequacies lie mostly with basic assumptions of the program, i.e., that jobs exist for welfare recipients and that recipients are ready to fill them. These inadequacies have been documented before in a number of voluminous evaluations of WIN.[2] Since WIN is being expanded in Fiscal Year '74, it does not seem that these negative evaluations have made much difference. However, the staff feels the responsibility to keep making them.

As a social worker, I have not really been able to add to these three basic goals of the task force staff. The goals were in place and being acted on when I came and hopefully will remain after I leave. I have been able to operate within the framework of the goals. Any special contribution I have been able to make as a social worker goes to my earlier first hand experience with welfare recipients and WIN participants and my general knowledge of the problems which they and other disadvantaged people face.

My most relevant experience in this regard was as a VISTA volunteer in Tennessee where I was active in Welfare Rights organizing and knew people who were WIN-I participants. I saw that people wanted to work and that they felt degraded on welfare. Many were eager to accept WIN's promise to get them off the rolls. But I also saw the problems they faced obtaining good child care and other supportive services and the frustrations they experienced when the promised jobs did not materialize. I saw that even when there were jobs offered they were low-wage and dead-end.

It's all too easy to ignore these human factors when one has no day-to-day contact with them. It's even easier when one has never had such contact. I have tried to convey and keep conscious of this delicate fabric of hope which WIN creates and all too often destroys. I think my ideas have been well received largely because other members have had similar first hand experience. One of the staff worked in a Community Action Program in Washington, D.C.; another worked in a multi-service storefront in upstate New York. It seems likely that

---

[2] See especially the Auerback Report to the United States Department of Labor, September 15, 1972.

these backgrounds help explain the presence of attitudes and objectives which were compatible with mine. To the extent which one agrees with the three "goals" of the task force, one can make a case for staffing such manpower units with people who have had direct work with clients.

The central characteristic of social work is a background of direct work with disadvantaged clients and a primary allegiance to them. To the extent that social workers have some training and experience in administration, program evaluation and development, and organizational structure in general, we should be able to make a valuable contribution in settings like the WIN task force.

NEW YORK STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Joanne Searcy

Government interest in the unemployment problem over the past decade and the resulting emphases on employment services has produced mammoth changes in the structure and operation of the State Employment Services. These changes can be seen primarily as a result of a change in clientele. Since most of the unemployed meet criteria that define them as "disadvantaged," and since most "disadvantaged" people are "disadvantaged" because of social and educational as well as economic problems, various manpower legislation has delegated training, educational, and social service responsibilities to the State Employment Services, as well as job placement. Traditionally, the State Employment Services viewed a relatively small group of employers looking for unskilled or semi-skilled labor as their clients; now, through legislation and directive, the Employment Services must view the unemployed as their clients.

Structural and functional changes in SES are reflected in the myriad of employment service programs for which SES has been given administrative responsibility--Youth Services, Concentrated Employment Program, Manpower Training, 131.4 program, WIN, Human Resources Development. Since all of these programs entail something beyond mere job placement of the participants, one would think a social worker might carve out a role somewhere within SES.

Initially, I was placed with the Social Services Coordinator of the 131.4 program within the New York State Employment Service. This particular program is a result of an amendment to the New York State Social Services law which requires Home Relief recipients to register for work at the local NYSES offices.

When the 131.4 program participant picks up his welfare check from the local NYSES office, he is referred to an interviewer who renders job counseling services and, if possible, job placement services. The social service coordinator acts as a liaison between NYSES and the Department of Social Services, and the coordinator's office serves as the central administrative body for the 131.4 program within NYSES.

My first couple of weeks at NYSES were spent in orientation. The staff was most helpful in describing agency programs and the structure and process by which these programs were implemented. I was well received in the local NYSES offices where I spent time talking with various levels of NYSES staff and observing their actual work with program participants. My orientation was so thorough that by the end of my second week, I felt that I was ready to assume responsibility for some agency task.

However, I was soon made painfully aware that the very nature of this agency produced a situation which made this endeavor impossible. Let me explain.

When I say "nature of the agency" I am speaking of characteristics of the agency, or system, which transcend any personal characteristics of the staff within the agency. Although the nature of the agency structure had a direct bearing on the difficulties I encountered while working at NYSES, the following comments are presented as a description of the structure--not necessarily as a criticism.

I think it can be said that NYSES sees its function solely as that of implementing policy and administering programs which are legislatively mandated. Policies are determined at the highest state levels without contributions from those with operational responsibility. They are handed down by means of directives from the administrative staff to the program staff for implementation. This produces the hierarchical structure which makes lateral movement into the agency structure difficult, if not impossible. The problem of an "outsider" assuming any on-going agency responsibility is compounded by the fact that the agency is staffed by long-term Civil Service employees whose job descriptions seem to cover every conceivable function of the agency. Furthermore, the agency's perception of me both as a student and a social worker presented problems in that there were no precedents for either role within this particular agency. Thus, a situation resulted in which both NYSES staff and I groped about in an attempt to carve out a role and function for me within the agency.

As a result of some administrative changes at NYSES, it was decided that I would not work with the 131.4 program. Because my own interest as well as the Laboratory's interest in the WIN program, it was agreed that I would develop a proposal for an independent research project having to do with implementation of the relatively new Talmadge Amendment in the WIN program. NYSES staff

encouraged my doing this and were most cooperative in giving me the necessary sanctions and administrative approvals.

My attempts to find a research topic which was feasible, of interest, and of value led to my speaking informally with various people involved in the WIN program, outside as well as within NYSES. Initially, my proposed study involved describing the intake process of selected clients referred to WIN offices in New York City to determine how the offices could best be utilized. My intent was to look at the needs and problems of WIN participants and the relationship to the process by which participants become self-supporting. The study was then refocused on the uses of supportive services as a facilitating factor in this process. However, because of the complexity of the process involved in WIN implementation and because of lack of access to Department of Social Services WIN-related records, and in some cases to DSS staff within the WIN offices, I found it impossible to operationalize this study.

Ultimately, I developed a proposal to compare two groups of WIN participants--those working and removed from the welfare roles and those working but not removed from the welfare roles--to determine what variables account for this difference in these two groups. Again, NYSES officials approved my proposal and the cooperation and support they rendered and their assistance in helping me obtain my research sample was most helpful.

Briefly, my research involved collecting data from the records of a sample (approximately one-third of the total) of WIN participants who completed job entry during the period from July 1, 1972 through December 31, 1972. Of these 225 cases, 150 were still receiving supplemental welfare payments while the remaining 75 were terminated from the welfare rolls. This ratio of those on/off welfare is comparable to the on/off welfare ratio for the total population. From records in five local WIN offices, I recorded statistical data for a total of 93 variables. These variables were grouped into the following categories: demographic data, pre-WIN work experience, WIN training, and post-WIN job characteristics. I had wanted to obtain information regarding the specific social services delivered to WIN participants while in the WIN program; however, because of the inaccessibility of Department of Social Services records, I could not do this.

Before I began collecting the data, I hypothesized that

number of dependents and wage level of present job would be the two crucial variables accounting for the difference between those working who are still on welfare and those working who are no longer on the welfare rolls. Although the analysis of data was not as complete as would have been desirable, the results did not bear out the hypothesis. It would have been better for the study if time had permitted additional correlations to be made.

Although my experience as a student was limited by the fact that I was unable to assume any on-going agency responsibility, I learned a great deal about NYSES as an agency and about the WIN program. However, it would be a mistake to generalize from my experience as a student assigned to NYSES to conclude that there is no role for social workers within the State Employment Services.

The problem was not so much that of substantive work, but rather that of entrance into the system which would allow one to assume responsibility for agency tasks. As a result of my experience with NYSES, my view is that there is room for social workers to carry out new roles, as well as to assume responsibility for presently existing tasks which are now undertaken by other kinds of professionals.

A look at some existing functions which social workers might undertake could be useful. Perhaps the most obvious function for the social worker would be that of rendering counseling services to SES program participants. Of course, SES counseling services are primarily concerned with job placement and/or training. This is as narrow a perspective as is that of the social worker who fails to take into account the employment problems of his client and concerns himself only with intra-psychic difficulties.

It is my opinion, however, that a social worker in an employment service could integrate the environmental and psycho-social factors affecting the individual client. Furthermore, social work training provides a certain perspective from which social problems are defined, and an ability to look beyond the individual case to identify structural causes which can be related to large groups within the society. Since it would seem that the use of social work expertise in defining structural problems is, by definition, limited when the social worker works with individual clients, this kind of knowledge could be utilized in supervisory or administrative roles. Furthermore, the present emphasis in social service programs on employment is all the more reason for social workers to become involved on an administrative level in the provision of employment services.

As previously mentioned, policy and program planning in the State Employment Service is, for the most part, carried out by administrators who are set apart from those responsible for program and policy implementation. The same holds true for program evaluation where responsibility is given to private research firms. The emphasis of these evaluations is usually centered around the outcome for the program participant, rather than how the methods and procedures of SES affect the outcome. This type of research is, of course, valid and necessary, but in the absence of information regarding the relationship between the actual workings of the agency and its affect on program participants, information gained from this type of research is incomplete. Thus, an appropriate role for social workers might be that of program evaluation.

Changes in agency policy and procedures, based on input from the staff involved with program implementation, could grow out of such evaluations. Recognition that the workings of the agency can influence the program participant might encourage a willingness on the part of the agency to use this influence to maximize program effectiveness for these participants.

Social workers have long been in the forefront among those who cry out against the ineffectiveness of service agencies in meeting client needs. At the same time, however, there has seemed to be a reluctance on the part of the profession to do anything about this problem by working for change within these agencies. It doesn't take a social work education to be critical, but the value of social work education cannot be seen unless the social worker is in a position to do something about those things of which he is critical.

NEW YORK CITY EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

Onella Stagoll

My field assignment this year has been to work with the Program and Planning unit of the Emergency Employment Program of New York City, known nationally as the Public Employment Program (PEP). As the program agent, New York City is charged with implementing this program in accordance with the Emergency Employment Act (EEA) passed in the Federal Congress in August 1971. The Emergency Employment Program is located administratively in the Department of Employment of the Human Resources Administration. Of the $2.25 billion Federal appropriation for the first two years of the program, New York City was allocated approximately $17 million over the two year period. Because of a Federal freeze on the hiring of program participants the City has not spent all of this.

Essentially the purpose of the EEA was to create public service employment for the unemployed and the underemployed. As defined by the legislation, the objectives of the EEA were twofold.

1. To give financial assistance to public employers which would be used to provide unemployed and underemployed persons with transitional employment.

2. To provide needed public services to the community. The intent of the Act was to balance increased employment in public service jobs of those groups most critically affected by unemployment with the priorities and needs of city government.

Only one year earlier, in December 1970, President Nixon vetoed the Employment and Manpower Act which had proposed a similar, more extensively funded public employment program. In so doing, the President referred to public service employment as employment of "last resort" which "relegated" the unemployed to "dead end" jobs. Clearly the President was not committed to a program of public service employment, and the legislation and Congressional history suggest he supported the EEA as a temporary measure to overcome rising unemployment and inflation. Although seen by many as representing a shift in emphasis

in manpower policy from the private to the public sector, the wording of the Emergency Employment Act indicates this was not so. The Emergency Employment Program was an emergency measure only and there is a lot of emphasis on the "transitional" nature of the program. Considering the steadily increasing rise in unemployment and the estimated 5 million jobs in the private sector which need to be done (National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress, 1965), the $2.5 billion is only minimal funding. The legislation itself and the limited funding imposed restrictions on the program agents in their efforts to meet the EEA objectives.

The major guidelines to the program agents reflect some of the thinking behind the legislation:

1. The program was to be "transitional" and the movement of participants into unsubsidized jobs was to be a high priority.

2. Target populations were defined and priorities were established. The most important groups to be served were to be Vietnam era veterans, heads of households, minority groups and unemployed below the ages of 22 and above 44. It is among these groups that unemployment is greatest.

3. Attempts were to be made (wherever possible) to bring change in Civil Service requirements in order to reduce artificial barriers to the employment and occupational advancement of the disadvantaged.

To date there have been over 4,000 participants in the New York City program. Because of the minimal funding and local budget pressures, the City used the money in large part as a means to quickly fill jobs made vacant by earlier budget cuts, an approach used by many other localities. With a far greater number of applicants than jobs available agencies were able to cream. In addition, opposition from some municipal unions made it difficult to develop jobs which provided career opportunities for the disadvantaged. A large number of positions were for professonal and skilled unemployed and not for the "hard core" unemployed, a procedure not, as is often thought, in conflict with either the guidelines or the intent of the Act.

Some of the consequences of creaming and union opposition, as well as loosely worded guidelines and Federal pressure to implement the program rapidly, are that the City has had difficulty in meeting the priority quotas

from the target population. Vietnam era veterans and minority groups tend to be underrepresented amongst program participants in comparison with their percentage representation amongst the unemployed. Civil Service reform, which could help facilitate the movement of the disadvantaged into permanent public service employment, is difficult to accomplish and to date, the number of participants moving into unsubsidized employment is not very encouraging.

Since basic policies were decided at higher levels in the city administration, there is a question of how much a planning unit can do after decisions on how the program is to be implemented have been made. Although the New York City program had some administrative flexibility, the tough problems were how to increase hiring from the target group, how to provide a more accessible and comprehensive training program, and how to implement the transition of participants into unsubsidized employment. Because the recruitment and hiring of participants was run as a straight employment operation, there was little attention given to the job applicant and his work needs. Things such as providing Spanish speaking interviewers, following up drop-outs to determine why they leave the program, and providing supportive services or referral services where necessary were not included. Issues such as need for child care were not even considered. What seems significant is the lack of contact with program participants and assessment of the impact of the program on their lives. Essentially the program is planned and implemented without consideration for human needs, and it need not have been so.

Toward the end of 1972, with the program in its second year of operation, the emphasis of the Program and Planning unit was turned to the developing of a plan to move participants into unsubsidized employment. It is in relation to the planning for this movement that I have been primarily occupied. My involvement at the Emergency Employment Program provided me with several different types of learning opportunities. First, there was the opportunity to study a piece of legislation. My first assignment at the agency (one which has continued) was to read and digest the Act itself and the guidelines as well as many other materials relating to the program--reviews, evaluations, press reports and so on. Before coming to the Emergency Employment Program I was barely familiar with the program. I thought it was supposed to provide employment for the poor but was not doing well because it had failed to meet or understand the needs of the poor. During my time at the agency, I was able to see the limitations of the legislation as well

as the problems confronting the program agents.

Learning through written material is not unique to this setting, it happens in every organization. The difference in this instance for me was that for the first time I was struggling to understand a piece of legislation. It was an important experience. One of the shortcomings of social work education is that, in an attempt to emphasize the human aspects of social welfare, the individual and his situation is stressed, often at the expense of studying the political and economic theories and realities. An intensive examination of the Act provided the chance to work with "hard data," not only "feelings."

There was also the chance to learn how and why legislation is implemented in a particular way. This required developing an understanding of the agency and its administrative structure, its political obligations and constraints and its decision-making process. Working with people at a fairly high decision-making level provided the opportunity to examine legislation from a broader perspective.

In the day-to-day work, there was the opportunity to develop analytic skills and learn how to collect and interpret data of both simple and complicated nature. The setting also required the development of skills in research and planning and provided an opportunity to understand the social implications of economics and the labor market, an experience usually not available to social work students. Finally there has been the need to develop some sophistication in putting together fiscal reports and compiling the fiscal aspects of the 1973 Contract with the Department of Labor. This has meant understanding and working with concepts such as in-kind contributions, fringe benefits and salaries, and has enabled me to learn a lot about budgets.

The major part of my work for the first semester was in developing the possibilities for employing participants on a permanent basis in the private sector. I was particularly involved in analyzing all of the EEA titles in terms of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT) so that the job specifications could be coded "universally" as are jobs at NYSES and other employment agencies. Although somewhat tedious, this analysis was a valuable tool in drawing up a comparison between EEA jobs and other jobs, both in the public service and in private industry. This analysis involved consultation with job developers and counsellors and provided the opportunity to learn something about the field of job development and the labor market. There

was little I brought in the way of social work knowledge to this assignment. I was learning about manpower, data collection, analysis and presentation of material in a concise and meaningful fashion. My past experience with hard data was limited and there was a lot to learn.

Another smaller area of work which I was involved in for a short period was job development. This required working with the various employing agencies in developing the kinds of job slots they will have. The goal of job development is to develop jobs which meet the requirements of the Department of Labor, the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Personnel, the needs of the agency and the needs of the "disadvantaged" in that order. Theoretically these positions should be developed with a view to employing the disadvantaged and the structurally unemployed, as is the stated intent of the Act.

My most recent involvement has been in collecting and analyzing data concerning the movement of EEA participants into unsubsidized jobs, and also data relating to participants' civil service status. The transition of participants into unsubsidized jobs is a very slow one:

1. Unemployment in the city as a whole is at such a high rate that it is difficult for participants to be absorbed into the private sector, particularly since many are not adequately skilled.

2. Moving participants into permanent civil service jobs is difficult, because for the first time in many years the city is not increasing its number of employees. Not only are many agencies operating under a hiring freeze but many are also forced to lay off employees. Assuming that the Emergency Employment participant has taken a civil service exam and qualified for permanent employment, he will probably find himself at the bottom of a long priority list. There is little chance of trying to persuade agencies that program participants should be hired ahead of other applicants when there are no lists, or where the position is provisonal. It is equally unlikely that exceptions to the hiring freeze would be made for program participants.

3. Now that the Federal 1974 budget has discontinued funding for the program there is no

budget or motivation for the City to place participants in unsubsidized City employment.

Throughout the time I have been at the Emergency Employment program, the agency has been undergoing administrative change. In terms of a learning experience, the administrative structure and problems I observed provided the opportunity to learn something of the meaning of bureaucratic patterns of decision-making and communication. Since the Emergency Employment Program is a part of the super bureaucracy of the Human Resources Administration, decision-making and communication is from the top down. Staff are unrelated to the decision-making process and are frequently uninformed about basic goals and objectives. Where there is concern for the program participants it is difficult to gear planning to participants' needs. Additionally, the Fiscal Year 1974 Federal budget left the future unclear--will the program be terminated this year or will the unspent funds be extended? As a result of these factors, as well as a public inquiry and a critical press, staff morale suffers.

There were many things to be learned at the Emergency Employment program. Much of the learning and exposure has been to the difficulties of effective planning and the intricacies of city government. The negatives could easily serve as a deterrent to entering the field. However, if one were skilled in politics and management, one could perform the job successfully and bring to it a concern and understanding of the needs of people.

NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT, OFFICE OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

Robert Tropp

At the time that final negotiations were completed for my field assignment, welfare and workfare had just been joined under the Talmadge Amendments. The result was a myriad of programs.

In New York City, it was decided that those having the most unimpeachable qualifications for implementing these programs were the managers, the Harvard MBA's and computer technologists. Social workers were seen as too permissive, and, therefore, were excluded from having any influence in developing programs. In fact, many were downright opposed to the welfare-workfare connection in the first place and could hardly be expected to work for its continuing success. This it may be supposed was further proof to the powers that be that social workers were out of step with the times.

Given this background, it is not surprising that when I was assigned to the welfare agency's Division of Employment Services to work on a special task force, I was regarded somewhat as a fish out of water. My immediate supervisor kept insisting at our first meeting that I would probably never see any clients and that almost all of my work would involve research, analysis of data, and, in general, non-people types of activities.

As originally conceived, the function of the task force was to analyze the labor market situation in New York City. This called for an analysis of the supply and demand for labor in the city. In order to have a complete picture, overall studies of manpower and employment programs, data from the census, Bureau of Labor Statistics and elsewhere had to be gathered, analyzed, put into tabular form and be accompanied by explanations. Ultimately, it became necessary to set up a macro-economic model for viewing dollar flow to and from the various sectors within the city's economy.

The establishment of the task force coincided with

anticipation of revenue sharing in manpower programs. It was our intention to provide a rationale for supplanting the current categorical approach to manpower and employment programs with a comprehensive plan designed to place revenues where they were needed. Under the current system of categorical programs there can be no overall planning. There are too many programs authorized under separate pieces of legislation, having little or no impact on real problems of unemployment and training. With all of the categorical funds pooled under one authority, money could be dispensed with accountability where needed, to create employment or to implement training programs. The decision as to what strategy would be most effective would depend upon how tight or loose the labor market was.

I soon showed myself equal to the tasks of data collection and analysis outlined above. Very often it became necessary to become self-taught or get on-the-job training (OJT) as I got more involved with the world of economics. Economic texts and continuous discussion with others in the task force helped considerably. I learned much from working in this kind of a situation, and as I proved myself, my co-workers began to re-evaluate long held stereotypes of social workers as bumbling, ananalytic caseworkers.

The task force lasted about a month and a half. Then came the reorganization. The huge superagency had decided to undergo a major organizational change. Twelve departments were to be reshuffled, streamlined and converted into five. As a part of this overall effort, a new Department of Employment was created.

The reorganization brought new priorities. Current programs had to be evaluated and new ones developed. In keeping with the drive towards efficient use of resources and the desire to seek ways in which more meaningful manpower and employment programs could develop, the new department set about the task of putting its own house in order.

These events brought about a change in the composition and direction of the task force. It was now assigned to help in an analysis of a vocational education program under which Home Relief clients are sent to private schools having contracts with the city. The schools are not paid according to performance by their students, and, heretofore, there has been no attempt to hold them accountable for the quality of instruction.

The objectives in this assignment were quite different from those in the task force. The task force was really set up as a kind of "think-tank." Its objectives were not to solve all of the city's manpower and employment problems, but rather to come up with some theoretical framework for analyzing them and for designing policies and programs to correct them. The objective was a long range one, and our function was to initiate the process of examining the labor market situation in New York City.

The goals of the vocational training assignment were far less grandiose. Specifically, the assignment was to gather facts about the program's performance. This data, together with legislative and legal mandates for the program, will, hopefully, someday serve as the basis for changing current practices.

Information was accumulated by going through the files of the Evaluation Training Control Unit of the office where day to day monitoring of the program occurs. The mechanics consisted of collecting information on each of the enrollees since the inception of the program on 3 x 5 index cards. Several days were spent in recording, sorting, resorting and analyzing the data. Most of the work was pure and simple mechanical work which did not require professional expertise. Nonetheless, in order to evaluate, one must have data, and there just does not exist an interesting way to copy it on 3 x 5 cards.

The upshot of the analysis was that the program is too costly for what it produces. We thought that before, but it was necessary to document it for the purpose of changing its current structure and arriving at contracts with private vocational schools which make them accountable for the product they turn out.

Following this assignment, I worked on another, very different one, a new thrust in workfare/welfare at the Department of Employment, the Work Relief Employment Project (WREP). WREP is designed to correct the supposed abuses under PWP, an earlier workfare attempt. The lack of incentive and jobs is to be replaced by guaranteed half-time employment in temporary jobs in city agencies created especially for eligible Home Relief recipients. There is no element of voluntarism in the participation except for those over age 55, and failure to accept work within WREP becomes grounds for denial of relief. Punitive sanctions have not been removed.

Under this program, a client will receive his grant in the form of a payroll check from the place where he is employed. Because the money comes to him in the form of payment, he may be liable to pay income taxes on it. If he does have money withheld, he, as an employed low wage earner, would probably be entitled to get a tax rebate when he files. In the meantime he must live on less for most of the year than he would have had to live on were he still on Home Relief."

Given the limiting parameters placed by the legislature--no costs in excess of home relief expenditures, no permanent or Civil Service jobs, a program limit of one year--WREP becomes, perhaps a more efficient income disbursement mechanism than PWP, but certainly as punitive.

It occurred to me that WREP is really quite old in philosophy and to prove it, I showed some passages from Karl De Schweinitz' book, England's Road to Social Security to people in the Department of Employment. I showed them Edward III's Statute of Labour and the first Queen Elizabeth's addiiton to the Poor Law which talked about putting rogues and vagabonds back to work. Everyone was struck by the similarity of those statements with current legislative mandates nationally and in the state, especially WREP. Everything changes and remains the same. History repeats itself.

One can only wonder why so little attention is paid to the history of social welfare and, in fact, to the experiences other nations have had in developing manpower/welfare policies. There is so little perspective in the field. Social work might be able to fill in some of the gaps. We social workers do study welfare history; we do look at current policies in the light of past practices. Yet, we have failed to apply our knowledge. One of my fellow students told me that an Albany legislator informed him that social workers rarely contact him or his colleagues with information. Right now we can only guess that social workers could have an effect on legislation.

Probably WREP will, in some form or other, become an unfortunate fact of life for many Home Relief recipients. It is undeniable that those persons within the department who advocated a full-employment program were trying to combine humanism with rational planning. They were examining unemployment and welfare in a new light and come to the conclusion that a welfare "cure" may partially be brought about by creating employment opportunities. The approach looked to changes in the demand

side of the labor market rather than exclusively to supply as had traditionally been the case.

Yet, employment is not its object. If it were, temporary jobs and a spending ceiling equivalent to the current Home Relief expense would not be the prime factors they are. Establishing a ceiling and coupling it with enforced work is not only an action in keeping with the Elizabethan Poor Law, it also takes the principle of less-eligibility of that doctrine and gives it a prominent place in establishing work opportunities and resources. The jobs are the lowest paying and work must be done to account for the dollar value of the grant received. In addition since the jobs are defined as being outside the normal scope of current Civil Service positions, they must be created and, by statute, be temporary. The jobs will therefore in all likelihood be dead-end, secondary ones which offer little or nothing to those forced to hold them.

My assignment with respect to WREP had been to try and identify data needs in relation to evaluation of WREP's operations and impact. In this regard I have been able to pick up some valuable analytic and research skills which social work as a profession needs to develop further. Besides data collection, analysis and presentation, I have developed an understanding of flow charts in program planning and have had to wrestle with problems of research design. For example, what kinds of hypotheses are needed to evaluate WREP's effectiveness? If it does indeed make recipients more employable, how can we know that? What does the term employable mean? In order to come to any conclusions, it is necessary to develop the concepts, arrive at operational definitions for them and pose them in testable hypotheses.

In developing these assignments, I am struck by the absolute lack of substantive knowledge regarding the labor market, such as the status of various occupations within it. There is very little mathematical-statistical data which will permit a good evaluation of WREP's impact. As a consequence, the success or failure of the program will not be determined with any degree of accuracy. People will see in WREP what they choose to.

Given all that has been said so far, it seems appropriate to reflect upon the relation of social work to the world of manpower as I have been experiencing it. My assignment is very atypical of the usual social work field placement. I have no constituency, I do not see clients, and I have no job-related contact whatsoever

with other social workers. My world of work consists of numbers, hypotheses, evaluations and tons of paper. It is important to remember that none of those around me have any contact with clients at all. The living flesh and blood realities of the unemployed and poor get "transubstantiated" into dry statistics. It is from these statistics that the planners plan, the Department of Social Services administers, and the legislators legislate.

Even the jargon reflects this. One document at DSS written as an interim description of the WREP program speaks about "bleeding" the Home Relief clients slowly into the system. Every document speaks of processing clients with the same equanimity that one would speak of processing cattle.

To illustrate the attitudinal consequences such "client abstraction" can have, I cite the following incident. During the second week of March, I was working on data requirements to test some WREP impact questions. In this connection, I had occasion to speak with a highly placed researcher in the New York State Department of Labor. When I told him I was interested in obtaining data which would give some indication of supply and demand by occupation within the labor market, he wanted to know why I needed the information. When I informed him of the reason, he launched into a dissertation whose basic thesis was that the poor should take any job even if it paid less than welfare. They could always get ahead like his parents did.

It's an old argument which we've all heard before. Instead of the emotional rebuttal usually triggered in me by such a stand, I spoke to him of dual labor market theory and the fact that there is no real mobility. I then pointed out to him that his argument was essentially based upon value judgments which were not borne out by the facts of economics. In addition, I asked him why anyone who was poor should accept wages lower than welfare. Wouldn't such a proposition really serve to maintain low wage industry? Why, I asked him should the government choose to indirectly subsidize low paying employment when it could make a more efficient use of its funds by giving welfare recipients the means to overcome their circumstances and gain entrance to the primary labor market of good wages and advancement?

The argument was couched in purely rational economic terms. I was able to discuss the issue on an informational level. When he spoke of welfare people refusing to work because they had it so good, I asked him when

was the last time he ever spoke to a welfare recipient. Silence. My advice to him was to become more acquainted with the situation than he appeared to be.

Prior to this year such a dialogue would have been impossible for me to engage in. I did not know enough about labor markets, about economics, about welfare administration, and about research to argue effectively.

If my experience is a valid indication, then we must begin to pick up those skills which will help us look out for the interests of the poor and other clients in a more effective way. Planners and economists should not have a monopoly on administrative decision-making authority. We could make a substantive legislative in-put too. If this experience has taught me anything, it is that even the most well-intentioned, highly trained planners are often mistaken and uncertain in the practice of their craft. When they are, it is the poor who suffer.

If we are to put our sense of humanism and our expertise into effective programs, then we must also develop a knowledge of the tools and capacity to work with them which will give us the ability to convince others. Because of my field assignment, I am learning how to use those tools which social work does not stress. If we can retain the professional concern with people as human beings, then we should be able to combine good administration with professional ethics.

IV. NEW DIRECTIONS

The Laboratory for Community Programming was, in effect, a mechanism for moving social workers into manpower. Through this medium of a University-sponsored graduate field work training program, the Laboratory was able to identify new possibilities, try them out, and arrive at some definitive findings in regard to the match between social work and manpower.

As noted throughout this report, the two fields relate to the same clients and the same social problem areas, and require similar skills; in fact, there is so much in common between the precepts and practice of social work and the functional needs of manpower programs that it is difficult to see why the combination is not more frequently viewed as a natural one. However, as comments at the National Workshop on Manpower Curriculum Development in Social Work pointed out so candidly, professional antagonism and structural rigidity have been the case more often than not.

In spite of this somewhat negative context, the Laboratory's efforts to develop substantive field work assignments in city, state and federal manpower agencies and in community organizations met with unqualified interest and assistance.

The settings differed in organizational and administrative structure, auspices, objectives, staffing patterns and levels, size, and funding. In most, administrative and operating staff had little familiarity with the ability or range of competence of social workers, other than limited and inaccurate stereotypes, or with the expectations and requirements of field training in social work. Several had had earlier experiences with other types of internship programs in which both time and expectations were more limited; program staff frequently had to put more time and effort into training such interns than they thought the return was worth. Furthermore, the existence of training in community organization and planning as a discipline within social work was new to many. Most agency staff had no knowledge of the community organization and planning curriculum and of the skills and knowledge base it emphasized, nor were they aware of the caliber of the students. Yet the receptivity of non-social work agencies to taking in social work interns and to providing this kind of training experience was uniformly positive.

The outcome was illuminating in terms of the Laboratory's objectives:

1. The administrative and program staff with whom the interns worked discovered that the amount of time the interns gave and the kinds of responsibilities they could take on were much greater than they had expected.

2. As the students demonstrated their abilities, their mentors became more willing to give them substantial administrative and program responsibilities and to involve them fully in the activities of the agencies.[1]

3. The interns came to be viewed as trusted, reliable staff members and as additional resources for the agencies.

4. A majority of the interns were offered jobs if any were available in the agencies where they carried out their field assignments.

5. The agencies were usually interested in continuing the training relationship with the Laboratory.

The task was to demonstrate that social workers trained in community organization and planning could do the jobs that needed to be done. Although some explication might be done through written material, the significant demonstration came from the actual positive experiences of manpower administrators and program staff with the Laboratory's student community organizer/planners.

The impact of the Laboratory on training community organizer/planners as manpower specialists and developing new roles for them in the manpower system might be seen in 1) the number of its graduates who chose to work in the manpower field as a result of their internship experiences; 2) the number of new field work placements created by its efforts and 3) the longer-range institutional possibilities suggested by the Laboratory's experience.

Of the nineteen students involved in the three-year

---

[1] The outstanding exception was the New York State Employment Service. As noted earlier, the student was treated as an outside researcher. The agency was cooperative and provided data for a research project, but it did not take her in as a staff person.

program, it is believed that at least eleven pursued occupational goals related to their field assignments with the Laboratory. It should be noted, however, that many publicly-funded programs were experiencing severe budget cuts and staff retrenchment at the time the project ended. Although their intest was high and their experience excellent, students took jobs where they could find them, returned to previous jobs or went on to law school or other academic work.

At the end of the demonstration period, two continuing field placements were arranged with the Associate Regional Manpower Administrator and one with the Manpower Area Planning Council. In the latter, the MAPC staff member who was to be the field instructor was a graduate of the Laboratory's first year. Her experience with the Laboratory led to her seeking a job in the manpower planning agency and subsequently to training students. It seemed likely that other second-generation field placements would be generated by other students who were able to pursue their interest in the manpower field.

The emphases on interdisciplinary collaboration, substantive courses and a combined social problem/field of practice focus which characterized the Laboratory's demonstration approach to social work training were subsequently reflected in the Columbia University School of Social Work's reorganized curriculum, including a "world of work" concentration.

CONCLUSIONS

The Laboratory's experience confirmed that social workers were not involved in any significant or substantial way in manpower activities nor was there systematic inclusion of manpower information in course or field work in schools of social work.

That there was a need for such curriculum development, and an unanswered interest in it among social work educators and practitioners, there could no longer be any question after the National Workshop on Manpower Curriculum Development in Social Work.

It was apparent that the conference tapped into an area of increasing interest among people in the social work

profession. It was evident that the Laboratory's development of a manpower concentration and specialized field work program was a pioneering effort in social work, and that in organizing the conference (demand for which doubled its size to eighty participants), a national network was created of people who were beginning to work in the manpower field from a social work perspective.

In addition, interest and enthusiasm for further program development along the lines of the Laboratory's program was made clear by faculty from many schools at the Council on Social Work Education annual program meeting where a paper and a workshop were presented. The existence of a constituency, and its need for organization and leadership were frequently noted.

And, as the internships demonstrated, there was clearly a place for professional social work involvement in the administration and planning of manpower programs, as well as in direct service with clients.

Where then could this kind of experience lead? With ongoing funding, an institutionalized program could have built on the directions which were defined by the Laboratory's experiences in student training, curriculum development and program activities like the National Workship on Manpower Curriculum Development in Social Work.[2]

Within a broader professional context, the Laboratory's experience made clear that there is much that can be done. Social work training emphasizes the development of skill in interpersonal relations and group management, the understanding of social and cultural problems, knowledge of community institutions and the strategies and techniques of program planning and service delivery. People who work in manpower programs and community agencies invariably deal with individual, social, cultural and institutional problems. They come from many different educational, occupational and professional backgrounds. No one is trained or educated to work in manpower specifically, there is no particular "manpower profession," yet people become manpower professionals.

---

[2] A draft proposal for such a program, a Regional Manpower Development and Training Institute, which was based on the Laboratory's experience and related to New York City, is appended. Although it was suggested for the Columbia University School of Social Work, the basic ideas would be applicable for development at other schools of social work.

The match between social work skills and the needs of manpower and related programs proved, in the Laboratory's experience, to be particularly fitting and appropriate.

V: STRUCTURE, STAFFING AND SUPPORT

The Laboratory for Community Programming functioned in many ways as a separate agency in carrying out program responsibilities and training students within the context of its own program objectives, while being accountable to the School and the University. Although these characteristics were complementary within an overall program format, they represented a new and perhaps distinctive combination of auspices, program responsibility and educational functions for a program located at the School of Social Work.

The Laboratory's staff included Valerie Jorrin, project director; Frank Kushin, assistant director for manpower; Nancy Kolben, assistant director for the Columbia University Day Care Project; and Carolyn Cunningham, project secretary. Mr. Kushin joined the project in June 1971; Mrs. Kolben in February 1972. Mrs. Jorrin and Ms. Cunningham were with the project from its start in September 1970.

As project director, Mrs. Jorrin was responsible for the administration, direction and implementation of the Laboratory program.. This included program planning and development, design and implementation of project activities, and direction of the educational program. Development of student internships, group meetings and seminars, professional papers and reports, and instructional and advising responsibility for Laboratory students were components of her educational functions. She was also responsible for staff supervision.

In addition, Mrs. Jorrin acted as the director of the Columbia University Day Care Project. She was responsible for its planning, administration and implementation. In this capacity she represented the University administration and the Dean of the School of Social Work in various negotiations, formulated policy recommendations for the University, developed and supervised the on-going program and acted as a technical consultant to the Dean and the President of the University.

Mrs. Jorrin was a member of the Community Organization and Planning area.

Mr. Kushin, a doctoral student during his two years with the project, participated in planning and program development. Working part time the first year and full time

the second, he was responsible for creation of the Laboratory's library of books and periodicals dealing with manpower, the development of a number of field assignments, and field instruction for five students. Mr. Kushin completed his comprehensive examinations for the doctorate during the second year and developed a dissertation proposal based on the curriculum and practice questions raised by the Laboratory's experience in training social workers to work in manpower programs. His work is one of the concrete products of the Laboratory's curriculum development activities.[1]

Mrs. Kolben participated in planning and program development in regard to the Columbia University Day Care Project. Her responsibilities were specifically related to implementation of Day Care Project activities, and to the development of the Laboratory's technical assistance functions. She developed field assignments in day care and provided field instruction for two students.

The grant from the Manpower Administration provided basic support for the salaries of the project director and project secretary, supplies, travel and student fellowships. During the first year, funds were provided to four students to assist with tuition; during the second and third years, fellowships were provided to five students each year from grant funds. In addition, the third year budget covered salaries of the assistant director for manpower, the conference coordinator and the expenses of the National Workshop on Manpower Curriculum Development in Social Work.

The School of Social Work provided support for the assistant director for manpower during the first and second years, for offices and furnishings, administrative and supporting services, and telephone and communications costs. The School also provided additional fellowship funds to supplement those available from the grant.

During the second and third years, the University provided support for the assistant director for day care, and a small budget for program expenses specifically generated by activities of the Columbia University Day Care Project.

---

[1] See description of dissertation study, The Social Worker in Manpower Programs: An Assessment of Professional Tasks, Dilemmas and Educational Implications, in Curriculum Development section.

APPENDIX

I. Manpower, The Labor Market, and Social Policy

Professor Russell A. Nixon
Columbia University School of Social Work

A. Course Outline 1972-1973 103

B. A Selection of Titles of Manpower Papers 108

II. Regional Manpower Development and Training Institute

Summary of Draft Proposal 110

Columbia University School of Social Work
Russell A. Nixon, Social Work T6814, Fall 1972

MANPOWER, THE LABOR MARKET, AND SOCIAL POLICY

Required Texts

Manpower Report of the President, April 1972. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

G. Mangum. The Emergence of Manpower Policy, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

M. Purvine, ed. Manpower and Employment: A Source Book for Social Workers, New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1972.

Course Outline

Session 1

Manpower, social work, and social policy. Course objectives, content and methods. Definitions. Manpower issues and goals, relations to social work practice and social policy.

Mangum, pp. 1-11.

Manpower Report, pp. 1-24 and selective survey.

Purvine, ed., section IV articles by Purvine and Nixon.

Sessions 2, 3

Work and employment: personal and social implications.

Purvine, ed., section I articles by Macarov and Herrick.

Purvine, ed., section II articles by Wolfbein, Neff, Jacques, and Liebow.

R. Theobald. "Jobs for All or Incomes for All: An Urgent Choice," Public Welfare, January 1966, pp. 43-49.

E. Fromm. "The Psychological Aspects of the Guaranteed Income," in The Guaranteed Income, R. Theobald, New York: Doubleday, 1967, pp. 183-193.

H. Perlman. Persona: Social Role and Personality. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968, pp. 59-86.

E. Mandel. "Workers Under Neo-Capitalism." International Socialist Review, November/December 1968, pp. 1-16.

Optional:

E. Liebow. Tally's Corner: A Study of Negro Street-corner Men. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1967.

W. Neff. Work and Human Behavior. New York: Atherton Press, 1968, pp. 3-42 and 236-260.

W. Neff. "Work and Rehabilitation." Journal of Rehabilitation, September/October 1970, pp. 16-22.

D. Bell. "Work in the Life of an American," in Manpower in the United States, Haber, et al., eds. New York: Harper & Row, 1954, pp. 3-22.

H. Swados. "Myth of the Happy Worker," Nation, August 15, 1957, pp. 65-68.

National Association of Social Workers. "Blueprint for an NASW Geared to Change," including "A Plan for Resolving the Manpower Issue," NASW News, February 1969, pp. 33-46.

Sessions 4, 5

The labor market, its operation and problems.

P. Samuelson. Economics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971, pp. 547-570.

Purvine, ed., section II articles by Piore, Kreps, Berg, Hiestand, and Griggs Supreme Court decision.

R. Nixon. The Labor Market Framework of Job Development: Some Problems and Prospects. New York: New York University, 1967, 60 pp.

M. Freedman. The Process of Work Establishment. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969, Foreword and pp. 1-12, 114-130.

H. Hilaski. "How Poverty Area Residents Look for Work." Monthly Labor Review, March 1971, pp. 41-45.

Session 6

Guest Speaker Ivar Berg, Professor of Sociology at the Columbia University Graduate School of Business. Author of Education and Jobs: The Great Training Robbery.

Session 7

Labor supply, the labor force:

Encyclopedia of Social Work. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1971, all entries pp. 693-743.

Purvine, ed., section II articles by Ginzberg, Sheppard, Derryck and Schmidt.

United States Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics. How the Government Measures Unemployment, June 1967, pp. 1-18.

United States Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics. The U.S. Labor Force: Projections to 1985. Special Labor Force Report, No. 119, 10 pp. (See Travis, Monthly Labor Review, May 1970.)

United States Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics. Work Experience of the Population in 1971. Special Labor Force Report advance summary, 3 pp.

United States Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics. Employment and Unemployment in 1971. Special Labor Force Report, No. 142, 9 pp. (See Green and Stinson, Monthly Labor Review, February 1972, pp. 20-28.)

Session 8

Demand for Labor

Purvine, ed., section II articles by Schultze, Harrison, Cohn, and Gilpatrick.

T. Christoffel. "The Permanent Job Shortage," in Up Against the American Myth, T. Christoffel, et al., eds. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970, pp. 258-275.

R. Lekachman. Public Service Employment: Jobs for All. Public Affairs Pamphlet, No. 481, New York; 1972.

Optional:

T. Schultz. "Reflections on Investment in Man," Journal of Political Economy, Vol. 70, No. 5, Supplement October 1962, pp. 1-8.

G. Myrdal. Challenge to Affluence. New York: Vintage, 1965, pp. 13-53.

C. Wilcox. Toward Social Welfare. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, 1969, pp. 291-311.

E. Gilpatrick. Structural Unemployment and Aggregate Demand. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1966, pp. 1-26 and 203-229.

Hearings on the Emergency Employment Act of 1971, pp. 125-143, statement by Bennett Harrison to U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor, March 2, 1971.

Hearings on Manpower Development and Training Legislation, part 3, pp. 1229-1267, statement by Charles Killingsworth to U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, March 25, 1970.

G. Mangum. "Guaranteeing Employment Opportunities," in Social Policies for America in the Seventies, R. Theobald, ed. New York: Doubleday, 1968., pp. 25-55.

"Public Service Employment: Open Road or Dead End." New Generation, Winter 1971, articles by Hodgson, Harrison, Cohn, and Spring, pp. 1-25.

M. Rein. Social Policy. New York: Random House, 1970, pp. 374-411.

I. Berg. Education and Jobs: The Great Training Robbery. New York: Praeger, 1970, Foreword and pp. 177-194.

R. Nixon. "The Great Training Robbery," a review. Social Policy, September/October 1970.

Sessions 9, 10

Manpower policies and programs: history, current status, issues, and evaluation.

Mangum, pp. 12-161.

S. Rosen. "Social Policy and Manpower Development." Encyclopedia of Social Work, pp. 1395-1414.

Manpower Report, review.

Session 11

Guest Robert Schrank, Ford Foundation Project Specialist for Manpower, formerly Assistant Commissioner, New York City Manpower Careers and Development Agency.

Session 12

Foreign manpower programs.

F. Blaemping. "Manpower Policies: Lessons for the U.S. from Foreign Experience." Proceedings, Industrial Relations Research Association, Spring 1970, pp. 523-557.

B. Reubens. "A Foreign Experience: Swedish Active Manpower Policy." New Generation, Winter 1971, pp. 26-32.

J. Gurley. "Capitalist and Maoist Economic Development, in America's Asia, E. Friedman and M. Selden, eds. New York: Vintage, 1971, pp. 324-339.

Beatrice Reubens, Senior Research Associate, Conservation of Human Resources, Columbia University will be a guest speaker at this session. See her book The Hard to Employ: European Programs, New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.

Session 13

Guests Dean Mitchell Ginsberg, Dr. Margaret Purvine (Council of Social Work Education), and Ms. Valerie Jorrin (Laboratory for Community Programming).

Session 14

Course review and evaluation.

Columbia University School of Social Work

T6814--MANPOWER, THE LABOR MARKET, AND SOCIAL POLICY

Russell A. Nixon

A Selection of Titles of Manpower Papers

Unemployment and Self-Esteem

The New York State Employment Service in Manpower Policy

The Public Service Work Opportunity Project

Psychosocial Implications of Work

Health and Manpower: A Consideration of the Relationship from the Standpoint of the Differential Utilization of Staff and Service Delivery

The Nature and Meaning of Work and Its Relationship to Casework

The World of Work: A Factor in Medical Diagnosis and Treatment

A Comparative Analysis of Manpower Policy in the States and in Europe

The Old Professionals and the New Join Forces: A Challenge to Social Workers

The Social Worker's Role in Rehabilitation

Discrimination, Manpower, and the Black Male: Implications for Social Work

"Like It Is": The Black Social Worker and the Manpower Problem

Manpower: Some Structural Dilemmas for Social Workers and Indigenous Nonprofessionals in the Social Welfare Field

Servants of the People: A Look at Household Employment

Employment Profile for Washington Heights-Inwood

Manpower, Social Work, and the Older Worker

Manpower, the Labor Market, and Social Policy: In a Vocational Rehabilitation Setting

Education, Manpower, and the Role of Social Work

The Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor and the Social Case Worker: A Comparison

Do Clients Have a Chance?: A Case Study and Analysis of the WIN Program

World War II: A Period of Full Employment

Impact of Manpower Policies on Minorities in the Construction Industry in New York City

New York City's Regional Manpower System--Objectives and Effectiveness on the Mid West Side

The Relevancy of Work as a Helping Agent in Curbing Delinquent Behavior in Youths, Ages Fourteen and Fifteen

The Carnegie Report, Need for Trained Physicians, and the Black Vietnam Veteran

Neighborhood Youth Corps

Health Manpower: New Career Opportunities in Neighborhood Health Centers for the Paraprofessional

Manpower and the Community Mental Health Center

Neighborhood Medical Care: A Manpower Analysis

WPA: Its Implications for Today

Automation and its Impact on Older Workers

A Discussion of Economic and Political Interaction in the Historical Emergence of U.S. Manpower Policy

Resounding Voices: A View of the Neighborhood Youth Corps in New York City

Women in the Labor Force: Sweden, United States, and Soviet Union

An Analysis: The Public Service Careers Program in the Department of Social Services

Work Incentive Program and the Puerto Rican in New York City

A Comparison of Vocational Rehabilitation in Denmark, the Soviet Union, and the United States

Draft Proposal

REGIONAL MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING INSTITUTE

Located at the Columbia University School of Social Work, the Institute would provide a professional resource and training center that focused on manpower policy, program and service delivery issues of New York City and its surrounding area. It would develop and carry out demonstration and research activities for government agencies and community organizations, as well as providing an integrated, cohesive educational program dealing with the manpower-welfare-supportive service structure for students, graduate social workers and practitioners in the manpower field. The program would have the following major components:

I. Educational Activities

A. An interdisciplinary program to train social workers at the bachelor's, master's and doctoral levels to carry out planning, program development, administrative and direct service roles.

1. Relevant courses dealing with manpower and welfare issues, offered at the School of Social Work and other divisions of the University would be included in a coordinated academic program.

2. Field assignments at agencies such as the U.S. Department of Labor, New York State Employment Service, New York City Department of Employment and Manpower Area Planning Council would be continued. Other assignments with agencies such as Department of Social Services Employment Centers, WIN, and other relevant programs of the Human Resources Administration would be developed. The field training program would include policy, planning and program development assignments and direct service assignments.

3. Field of practice seminars would combine students from both community organizing/planning and direct service tracks. Classroom faculty, school and agency

field instructors and other agency colleagues would be involved.

4. Agency field instructors, such as those already trained or identified by the Laboratory would participate in program development.

5. School field instructors would assure assignments in settings where no agency field instructor was available, carry out academic and programmatic responsibilities and provide consultation to agency colleagues in relation to student training and assignments.

B. Interdisciplinary colloquia, dealing with regional issues and addressed to a regional audience of students, educators and practitioners, would be organized at regular intervals.

C. Consultation and materials would be provided to classroom and field faculty interested in incorporating manpower-related material in their courses and assignments.

D. Technical assistance would be provided to manpower and welfare agencies and community organizations in regard to staff development and in-service training needs (seminars, short-term courses, etc.).

II. Demonstration Activities

Demonstration activities would be developed with both training and programmatic objectives. For example, the Institute might take responsibility for operating a "Separate Administrative Unit," in a WIN center as mandated by the Talmadge Amendment. These units, composed of social workers and a supervisor, are supposed to provide necessary social services for WIN participants. Such a unit, for demonstration and training purposes, could be staffed by students and a field instructor. Other students and staff could be related to the service unit to carry out monitoring, research and program development in relation to service delivery.

The Institute would have knowledgeable staff capable of carrying out technical assistance

assignments and providing consultation to manpower and social agencies in relation to planning, program development and service delivery. Programs would be developed to contribute to agency problem-solving capability and to suggest policy and program directions. Such Institute activities would draw on academic and professional resources in the regional area.

III. Curriculum and Program Development in Social Work

The Institute would be a resource and technical assistance center not only for schools of social work and social and manpower agencies in the New York area, but it would also be responsible for implementing the recommendations of the National Workshop on Manpower Curriculum Development in Social Work. It would work in concert with organizations such as the Council on Social Work Education and the National Association of Social Workers to encourage social work interest in the manpower field and to assist schools in developing curriculum components suited to their needs and resources.

One specific activity would be the publication of a journal or series of monographs dealing with social work and manpower. Others would include regional and national meetings involving social work and manpower professionals to encourage joint program development on local and national levels.

IV. Research and Evaluation

The Institute would serve as a stimulant, resource and umbrella for a variety of activities. It would be able to draw upon participants in its interdisciplinary educational program, doctoral and master's degree students, and participating agencies to develop and carry out various research efforts, including doctoral dissertations. In addition, it would regularly document its findings from its educational demonstration and research programs so that they would be useful to others.