

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 502

VT 012 858

AUTHOR Cape, William H., Ed.  
TITLE Hiring the Disadvantaged.  
INSTITUTION North Carolina Univ., Chapel Hill. Institute of  
Government.  
PUB DATE 70  
NOTE 89p.  
AVAILABLE FROM Institute of Government, Box 990, Chapel Hill, N.C.  
27514 (\$2.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.  
DESCRIPTORS Conference Reports, \*Culturally Disadvantaged,  
\*Employment Opportunities, Employment Practices,  
\*Employment Problems, Employment Programs, Equal  
Opportunities (Jobs); \*Government Employees,  
Manpower Development, \*Manpower Utilization

ABSTRACT

To provide an opportunity for state and local government officials to exchange information on the problem of providing public employment for the disadvantaged, a 2-day workshop was held at the University of North Carolina in November 1969. This report includes a resume of the workshop sessions and nine papers presented by participants. All aspects of the problem were discussed, with emphasis on maintaining merit principles while removing unnecessary job barriers. (BH)

EDO 48502



# HIRING THE DISADVANTAGED

VT 012858

ED0 48502

# HIRING THE DISADVANTAGED

EDITED BY WILLIAM H. CAPE

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT/University of North Carolina  
at Chapel Hill  
1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION  
& WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED  
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR  
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF  
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-  
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-  
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT

The University of North Carolina  
at Chapel Hill

John L. Sanders, Director  
Milton S. Heath, Jr., Associate Director

STAFF

Rebecca S. Ballentine  
William A. Campbell  
George M. Cleland  
Michael Crowell  
Joseph S. Ferrell  
Douglas R. Gill  
Philip P. Green, Jr.  
Donald B. Hayman  
C. E. Hinsdale  
S. Kenneth Howard  
Dorothy J. Kiester  
David M. Lawrence  
Henry W. Lewis  
Ben F. Lceb, Jr.  
Richard R. McMahon  
Harvey D. Miller  
Elmer R. Oettinger  
Robert E. Phay  
Robert E. Stipe  
Mason P. Thomas, Jr.  
H. Rutherford Turnbull, III  
Philip T. Vance  
David G. Warren  
L. Poindexter Watts  
Warren Jake Wicker

From the very outset, the principal measure of progress toward equality will be that of employment. It is the primary source of individual or group identity. In America what you do is what you are: to do nothing is to be nothing; to do little is to be little. The equations are implacable and blunt, and ruthlessly public.

---Daniel Patrick Moynihan

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPY-  
RIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROICHE ONLY  
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY *Institute of  
Government, University  
of North Carolina at Chapel*  
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING  
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE  
OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION  
OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PER-  
MISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWN ER."

Copyright, 1970

Institute of Government

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Made in the United States of America

## *Contents*

Introduction	1
The Public Sector and the Disadvantaged	5
By William H. Cape	
Public Personnel Management and the Disadvantaged	15
By George H. Esser, Jr.	
The Small Discussion Groups	32
The Role of the State Personnel Department	49
By Claude E. Caldwell	
Employing Well-Educated Minority Members	52
By Gloria Johnson	
The Need to Make Good on Promises of Equal Opportunity	54
By James Wilson	
The New Careers Program	57
By Albert C. Capehart, Jr.	
The Concentrated Employment Program	61
By Hoyle Martin	
The Concept of a Career Ladder	66
By James Moncrief	

vi

Some Observations on Personnel Ideas and Practices	72
By Jean J. Couturier	
Roster of Participants	76
Program Planning Committee	82

## *Introduction*

In November, 1969, the Institute of Government and the North Carolina Chapter of the Public Personnel Association cooperated with the National Civil Service League, whose headquarters are in Washington, D.C., in sponsoring a workshop on "Public Personnel Management and the Disadvantaged." The workshop was held at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill on November 18-19, 1969. The official attendance at the two-day program was approximately 135 persons.

As a nonpartisan, nonprofit citizens' organization, the National Civil Service League is dedicated to promoting efficiency in local, state, and federal governments. Its activities relating to research, education, counseling, and advisory services are intended to promote improvements in public management. A primary concern is the quality of public administration at all levels of government. The League's current survey of state and local government personnel practices seeks to determine how and why the disadvantaged are systematically excluded from public employment and what the government jurisdictions are doing to utilize the disadvantaged.

Its activities relating to employment of the disadvantaged are supported by a project associated with the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. By sponsoring workshops in various states, the League hopes to facilitate hiring the disadvantaged in the public service by encouraging the removal of those merit system job barriers that are unduly restrictive. Broadly defined, the disadvantaged include "those who are educationally, socially, economically, or otherwise deprived." According to the League approach, the action plan is "to facilitate the hiring of the disadvantaged under merit principles."

The North Carolina workshop sessions, covering portions of two days, dealt with the problem areas concerning the employment of the disadvantaged by the State of North Carolina and surrounding

states and their local governments. The title of the keynote speech, presented by George H. Esser, Jr., Program Adviser for the Ford Foundation, was identical with the central theme of the workshop. Esser's plea to the workshop participants was summarized vividly in his concluding statement:

. . . the task you are undertaking is not simply intended to respond to legal demands. The task you are undertaking is central to the task of the American people--to bring in the one-third who were left out, to bring them in quickly and productively, to restore their confidence in American institutions, and to demonstrate, for once and for all, that our institutions are not just designed for the white man, for the educated man, for the middle class man. They are designed and work for all men, to assure all men equal opportunities, equal justice, and the full advantage of our constitutional freedoms.

The workshop involved local public officials from the same general geographical area. Through an exchange of ideas and information about employment practices, methods of increasing public employment for the disadvantaged were explored. Much attention was given to the job barriers, both institutionalized and otherwise, that restrict entrance into government employment of minority groups and others who are handicapped because of lack of education and skills.

The case studies dealt with the legal, administrative, budgetary, recruitment, classification, testing, and training aspects of hiring the disadvantaged. The problem situation given each study group was intended to stimulate thinking. The conclusions of each discussion group were reported back to the entire workshop group in reporting sessions.

A primary purpose of the several workshop sessions was to bring together key public officials from local and state government to exchange information and help solve the problem of increasing public employment for the disadvantaged. Such an exchange of ideas and sharing of experiences about implementing training programs tends to promote a more receptive environment for hiring the disadvantaged in public service. The goal is to maintain merit principles insofar as possible by bringing understanding and pressure to remove those job barriers that discriminate against the so-called "unemployables."

The general study committees discussed the main issues involved in the planning stages of a special employment program for the disadvantaged in some detail. The difficulty of persuading

those who do not have the minimal qualifications for employment to participate in special programs designed to upgrade their skills and general abilities was strongly emphasized. Special recruitment efforts, effective training avenues, and career-building opportunities are areas that must receive sympathetic attention when administrative actions and legislative support are forthcoming for placement of the disadvantaged in public positions.

Attendance, the problems discussed, the feelings exposed, and the possibilities posed all indicated that the North Carolina workshop was highly successful. Whether any significant results will stem from the challenging program remains to be seen. Since relatively few top management officials or state and community leaders attended, the likelihood of program implementation was diminished considerably. Many who attended were already dedicated and sensitive to the employment needs of the disadvantaged. Those who were skeptical and who had "heard the story before" may have gained some new insights and understanding. Most of those officials in responsible government positions appeared to agree to some of the suggested employment practices and "played the game" in a workshop setting. Whether they had serious intentions of promoting such practices in their own agencies may be another matter. Until and unless manpower shortages dictate the hiring of the disadvantaged, it is doubtful that the information and experience of the North Carolina workshop will result in any significant local and state programs for training and qualifying the deprived categories, both white and black, for improved government employment opportunities. Other factors, such as federal financial assistance, disruptions and threats of disruption by the minority groups, and changes in attitudes among government employees, could hasten the active recruitment and training of the disadvantaged in the state.

This report contains the keynote speech, other speeches, a selected resume of the reports of the workshop sessions, and the comments of selected panelists.

William H. Cape

Chapel Hill  
Summer, 1970

# *The Public Sector and the Disadvantaged*

WILLIAM H. CAPE

Institute of Government  
University of North Carolina  
at Chapel Hill

Hiring the disadvantaged in the public sector under merit principles requires understanding and cooperation on the part of state and local government officials and the citizens. One need is to remove unnecessary job barriers, whether formal or informal, that presently restrict the employment of the disadvantaged in governmental positions. A major thrust in this direction would help update the present personnel systems and develop better programs to increase public manpower by training and employing those with low levels of skills. The basic problems include removing unnecessarily restrictive provisions in the public personnel regulations, overcoming the racial barriers to employment, developing improved attitudes toward employing those who have not had an opportunity to acquire job skills, motivating those who are largely unskilled or discriminated against to pursue public employment, and developing ways for the disadvantaged to climb the ladder once they have gained training and experience in lower-level public positions.

A specially designed employment program to recruit the disadvantaged for a governmental unit requires the support of top management, the active involvement of supervisors, and the acceptance of such efforts by the lower-echelon employees. What is needed is an ability by the regular staff to understand the worker's problems, and ideally the latter's acceptance of a first-line supervisor or counselor. To be successful, the disadvantaged worker must have confidence in himself when trying to solve a problem either on or off the job. With people who have been left out of the midstream of public positions--whether through lack of education, conviction for a felony, racial prejudice, or physical injury--the personal environment in which they find themselves is crucial in their willingness to accept the institution's norms. It is most difficult for them to accept the middle-class attitudes, time practices, task sequences, and implicit values embodied in the typical government work situation.

To be effective, governmental officials must build support systems for the disadvantaged. To have self-respect, to be productive, and to accept what is expected of them in the work environment is a new experience for many poorly educated and unskilled people. Their attitudes, often characterized by absenteeism and tardiness, seem to reflect an apparent expectation of failure. They need special assistance to help them adjust to their work environment. Other elements relating to personal attitudes concern appropriate behavior, acceptable dress, and actual agency involvement. The initial training needs typically concern entry-level job-skills development, remedial formal education courses, and human relations discussions. The worker from a background that does not understand the middle-class work environment--including punctuality, set working hours, and fixed days worked per week--requires patience, understanding, and time-consuming efforts from public managers. These nearly defeated persons must be helped in simple ways if they are to become self-respected and self-supporting in the government's labor force.

Prejudiced attitudes, biased treatment, segregated work assignments, social ostracism and expressions of indifference and hostility are alleged with reference to hiring the disadvantaged, especially by the minority group members. Many public employers have gained a reputation for a general lack of sensitivity toward uneducated and untrained people. These employers often feel that their responsibility ends if they avoid specific instances of discrimination in employment practices. It may never occur to them--or little concern them--that totally unwarranted qualification standards or the specific discriminatory testing practices used to qualify persons for job performance may generally discriminate.

#### Equal Employment Opportunities

The lack of equal employment opportunities in both government and business is a frequent complaint. Those in lower-level governmental jobs report limited access to better positions, especially at the supervisory level. White supervisors are commonly used for black employees, but many jurisdictions do not promote blacks to supervise white personnel. Since promotions are often based on such factors as formal education, specific types of experience, and written and oral examinations, the complaints among many of the disadvantaged are to the effect that they are passed over by arbitrary standards based on artificial values and standards. Although there may be valid reasons for not promoting a particular public employee who receives an acceptable

efficiency rating, they are often not explained to the one directly involved.

A recent study of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights titled For ALL the People, By ALL the People concluded that the local and state governments have not assured equal job opportunity. Minority group members are often not hired for responsible government positions even though they have the necessary education and experience requirements. Often they are excluded entirely from decision-making positions. Where they hold higher-status positions, their tasks usually relate only to the problems of minority groups. Although the study reported an overall unfavorable occupational status of minorities in state and local governments, it also found that "they generally have better access to white-collar jobs (in such governments) than in private employment."

The 1969 study conducted by the U.S. Civil Service Commission concluded that

. . . minority applicants frequently are subjected to a variety of screening and selection devices which bear little if any relation to the needs of the job, but which place them at a disadvantage in their efforts to obtain government employment.

It also observed that "there have been few efforts by State and local governments to eliminate such unequal selection devices."

Much job discrimination, then, is attributed to racial discrimination both deliberate and inadvertent. The emphasis on training opportunities over specific antidiscrimination measures may be the politically more feasible approach to promoting employment of the disadvantaged, but such emphasis is questioned by knowledgeable people. Minority incomes continue to lag behind those of whites for a number of reasons, including discrimination and lack of education or training and acceptable experience. Such deficiencies are pertinent factors in a lower occupational status. While the direct attacks on discrimination generate political protests and pressures, there appears to be less resistance in the attempt to circumvent the policies of outright discrimination by increasing funds for manpower training programs. These programs tend, according to some opinions and surveys, to keep minorities out of the unemployed statistics and delay their involvement in the nation's work force.

Many governmental officials do not make concerted efforts to seek out qualified minority and other less-qualified disadvantaged

applicants. Such efforts are essential if the patterns of employment discrimination and the "hard-core unemployables" are to be broken. For example, minority group members are least likely to learn about and seek jobs where few if any minorities are employed. Since personal referrals are the most frequent method of securing jobs, minority persons are more likely to learn about and apply for positions in those agencies in which they are traditionally employed. This means, then, if the patterns of employment segregation and discrimination are to be breached, that a systematic, comprehensive program of firsthand personal recruitment of minorities must be pursued.

A major task is to motivate the disadvantaged, black and white, to seek education and training for self-improvement. Various federally supported community training projects are intended to persuade the youthful underachievers with ability--underachieving because of their impoverished backgrounds--to finish high school, go to college, or enroll in quality vocational courses. These youngsters need personal guidance in preparing for a productive adulthood and assistance in getting employment chances with career opportunities.

The adult disadvantaged--especially if they are unemployed, underemployed, or systematically discriminated against over the years--may resist initial efforts to help them. Their willingness to be trained in special skill areas will not be enthusiastic if employment prospects are not good before the training period. The outlook is brighter when a job is assured when they have finished a training program successfully. It is difficult to promote training among the disadvantaged when employment barriers remain the same.

#### Job Requirements

Some established job requirements for government positions--i.e., educational achievements, performance on written and oral examinations, residency, etc.--are inaccurate indicators of average ability to perform satisfactorily on the job and discriminate against otherwise qualified whites and minority group applicants. Middle-class-oriented written examinations, for example, do this. Since many such tests--typically emphasizing knowledge rather than actual performance of required duties--have not been validated, the majority group members have an advantage in scoring higher on the examinations.

Oral examinations, whether used in addition to or in lieu of written tests, have an element of subjectivity. Such evaluations can be manipulated to the detriment of the disadvantaged group applicants. Oral interview boards often are criticized because they have no minority group members, because they are composed of highly educated interviewers with little or no experience in dealing with minorities, and because they evaluate personal traits that are not directly concerned with the duties of the government positions involved. The minimum steps to reduce such complaints include minority representation on interview boards, briefing of board members on the anxieties and fears facing minority applicants, providing preparatory material for applicants to study before the interview, and tape-recording interviews to refer to when complaints are made against the interviewers.

Often an effective means to evaluate an applicant's qualifications is the performance test. Evaluating ability to perform the actual tasks associated with the job may eliminate arbitrary and irrelevant factors like the verbal and knowledge abilities inherent in written tests. Although time-consuming and expensive to administer, such on-the-job tests in various positions may be more valid than written tests. Also, the disadvantaged can see the direct application of valid competition among applicants for the positions they are seeking. At the same time, where such tests are relevant, they give some assurance that only qualified applicants are placed on the eligible lists. Since the probationary period allows public employers to dismiss new employees easily, any mischoices made through liberalization of the selection process to accommodate the disadvantaged can be remedied during the initial period of employment.

Other job requirements imposed on applicants for government positions which are unrelated to capability in the performance of jobs include citizenship, minimum residency requirements, voter registration in the jurisdictions and "proper" party affiliation. Because of discriminatory housing practices or lack of housing and lack of or inadequacy of public transportation in many areas, the disadvantaged are unable to accept public employment in particular geographical areas. Many disadvantaged individuals are unwilling to move to distant areas for uncertain employment opportunities.

Public jurisdictions typically investigate potential employees for police records. As a disqualification from public employment, such background investigations tend to affect the minority groups more than the whites. The minority members often appear to be more subject to arrest without probable cause. Since

the application forms ordinarily request such information, many disadvantaged persons who have arrest records simply do not apply for public positions. Applicants have no way of knowing how important their prior arrest and conviction records are in the employee selection process. In practice, evaluation of these records results in placing many applicants with criminal records--depending on such factors as age at the time of arrest, type of offense, nature of position sought, and so forth--on eligibility lists. Yet minority groups often believe that the screening process relating to them can be consciously or unconsciously unusually meticulous when it involves arrests and convictions.

The 1969 report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights referred to earlier states that the "barriers to equal opportunity for minority group members are greater in police and fire departments than in any other area of State and local government." The survey found that "Negroes were conspicuously absent from positions above the level of patrolman or fireman." The Commission stated that such departments have "discouraged minority persons from joining their ranks by failure to recruit effectively and by permitting unequal treatment on the job, including unequal promotional opportunities, discriminatory job assignments, and harassment by fellow workers." At the same time, the intensive minority recruitment efforts by police departments are sometimes hampered by the tension and hostility between the minorities and the police agencies.

It is obvious that the civil service or merit systems do not necessarily assure equal opportunity or equal treatment for disadvantaged persons. In particular, administrators may violate the merit concept and thereby practice discrimination. The personnel practices and procedures developed over the years are not necessarily valid today, yet the disadvantaged may still be discouraged from even applying for positions in the public agencies. Since the personnel agencies have considerable discretion in developing the mechanics of the selection process, the minimum qualifications for eligibility for each class of positions are determined. If they are set validly, the merit concept is protected. If the required qualifications are not particularly related to the jobs to be performed, then those who could fill the positions are denied entry by the "system." The decision in establishing passing scores, manipulating the use of employee eligibility lists, leaving positions vacant to avoid hiring minorities--all of these are discriminatory practices that may be followed which do not treat all persons equally.

### Employment Programs for the Disadvantaged

To achieve equality in state and local government employment, the United States Commission on Civil Rights has recommended that a continuous program of employment equality be adopted and maintained to fulfill the obligation under the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Such efforts are to assure "that current employment practices are non-discriminatory" and "that the continuing effects of past discriminatory practices are undone." All such efforts, according to the Commission, should include the following elements:

1. An evaluation of employment practices and employee utilization patterns adequate to show the nature and extent of barriers to equal opportunity for minorities and of any discriminatory underutilization of minorities.
2. Preparation and implementation of a program of action which is calculated:
  - a. to eliminate or neutralize all discriminatory barriers to equal employment opportunity; and
  - b. to undo any patterns of minority underutilization which have been brought about by past discrimination.

The solutions to the problems of unemployment and underemployment, especially when many positions are unfilled in the state and local government agencies, can be supported by generating public interest and by exerting the influence of public interest groups. For example, the goals of the National Alliance of Businessmen include the training, to some extent with government subsidies and employment, of several hundred thousand of the hard-core unemployed within the next few years.

The National Civil Service League plans to seek acceptance in its effort to hire the disadvantaged by providing the services that follow:

Co-sponsor a major national conference of key leaders in government, public personnel management, business, industry, organized labor and civil rights organizations.

Prepare and disseminate basic issues, papers, and reports to stimulate public discussion and action.

Sponsor and conduct regional state and local meetings and seminars to encourage citizen interest.

Furnish data and survey information which will lead to the revision of state and local civil services.

Establish and maintain a national mailing list of organizations and individuals to help effect program goals.

Strengthen and modernize civil service systems by encouraging those principles of merit employment which reflect the needs of society and concepts of modern personnel management.

Encourage the development of career ladders for public personnel under merit principles.

Support the initiation of merit systems in state and local governments now hiring through patronage.

In the implementation stage of the public employment and the disadvantaged project, the National Civil Service League plans to establish a consulting service for the local and state governments. The information to be provided will concern the following:

Techniques for creating new positions in the public service. . . especially in those areas where personnel is in short supply.

Recruitment techniques that jurisdictions have used successfully in recruiting the disadvantaged.

Training for supervisors who orient the newly employed disadvantaged to public service.

Job-screening techniques that will lessen cultural bias in testing.

Job analysis that can:

- (1) relieve the professional worker of many nonprofessional tasks, and
- (2) create new positions that could encompass work of a nonprofessional nature.

State and local public employment practices are covered by Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. However, two federal programs are intended specifically to promote equal opportunity in certain state and local government programs: (1) the Federal

Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration primarily covers public assistance and state health programs, state employment and unemployment insurance programs, and civil defense programs; and (2) the Department of Housing and Urban Development contracts with local public housing and urban renewal agencies including nondiscriminatory requirements. A recent study concluded that

Neither program has been effective in providing equal opportunity for minority group members. No effective standards and guidelines have been established for an affirmative action program to correct past discriminatory practices and to increase opportunities for minorities. The limited efforts which have been made have not been successful.

In its efforts to improve public personnel management, the National Civil Service League seeks to initiate an action program making it possible for the state and local governments to employ larger numbers of the disadvantaged. The principle goals are:

To develop for the disadvantaged, productive meaningful jobs within the career civil service of state, county, and municipal governments throughout the country.

To encourage and facilitate the hiring of disadvantaged persons in jobs other than traditional service-type occupations.

To encourage and publicize improvements in recruitment practices, screening procedures, standards, and selection processes that enhance employment opportunities for the disadvantaged.

To formulate a Model Program for Public Employment of the Disadvantaged and a revised Model Civil Service Law which will encourage desirable changes in state and local civil service legislation.

In developing a Model Program for Public Employment of the Disadvantaged, the League is surveying the personnel practices among the state and local governments. The over-all goal is to discover those methods that are successful in utilizing the limited knowledge and skills of the disadvantaged. Disseminating information on the survey findings should elicit specific proposals on what the public entities can do to use the largely unskilled labor force better.

One problem area involves disseminating information on what federal financial aid and programs are available to improve the public service employment opportunities for the disadvantaged.

Another type of assistance relates to drafting a series of class descriptions for government entrance-level positions that can utilize the abilities of these people. The plan is to provide technical assistance on how to increase the number of jobs with career opportunities for disadvantaged persons.

#### Toward the Future

In the final analysis, one of the most challenging responsibilities of government in the area of personnel administration is to recruit, train, and retain people presently relegated to the disadvantaged categories. Whether the personal deficiencies relate to education, skills, personal habits, attitudes, or discriminatory practices on the part of others, these people deserve opportunities to develop self-respect, to be self-supporting, and to join the ranks of the gainfully employed. It is incumbent upon government officials, as well as those in business, to entice the disadvantaged into the world of work and accomplishment. The usual training practices and employment requirements for government employment are inadequate. Helping the disadvantaged and so-called hard-core unemployed to adjust to working environments is an effort to help solve the problems of our society.

# *Public Personnel Management and the Disadvantaged*

GEORGE H. ESSER, JR.

Program Adviser  
The Ford Foundation  
Chapel Hill

Ten years ago, or even five years ago, a North Carolinian could survey the condition of government in this state and smugly conclude that he lived in a favored land.

As we moved toward the affluence of the sixties, we had some reason to bless the poverty of our earlier years. Because we had no great cities until well into the twentieth century, we escaped the corruption and spoils that marked city government in this country in the latter third of the nineteenth century and in the early years of the twentieth. Government was small scale, fitted to a land of farmers and small towns. Governmental institutions were simple, and our expectations from government were limited. Governmental actions were personal and uncomplicated, fitted to an agricultural economy in which everyone was poor or almost poor, and everyone knew each other. North Carolinians were a homogeneous people, a Bible-loving and God-fearing people, and the ethics of our Puritanism became deeply rooted in our governmental practices.

As our towns began to grow into cities, we looked outside the state and early and directly imported the governmental reforms first advocated as the cure for the sins of the large cities. The city manager form of government became more widespread for town and city and county alike. We accepted and put into practice that the city manager was the professional administrator, that mayors were to be seen but rarely heard, that city councils were chosen from among the best-informed business and professional men in the city, and that councils fixed general policy for managers to implement. We adopted land-use planning in advance of other states, approached municipal functions like water and sewers from a scientific point of view, pioneered in state-city cooperation for highway systems, and led the way in strengthening county government. Because we had escaped the ravages of political patronage and the spoils system, few of our cities felt the

need for civil service systems. Rather, we rode the tide of the newer practices in public personnel administration in the city manager, with help as necessary from qualified assistants. And the managers steadily introduced measures to improve the quality of public administration without the leveling effect of bureaucratic civil service systems that often protected positions without regard to the adequacy of performance.

This view is oversimplified, but all generalizations are oversimplified. When we view state government over the same period, the same general directions can be perceived. The State Merit System, introduced by mandate from the federal government, applied only to employment in the Social Security agencies. Although the merit system has been widely and frequently damned, some thoughtful observers point out that it has made great contributions to sound personnel administration in this state, influencing directly the movement toward adequate salaries for competent state employees, encouraging the spread of job classification, and introducing and helping promote sound personnel policies. This influence led directly to the reputation for quality in the state's personnel system today.

And so where do we stand today? Why is this workshop necessary? How do we evaluate the quality of government today and most particularly the quality of personnel administration? Can we be as smug today as we were ten years ago? Have we lost our standards of excellence, our efforts to improve performance?

Despite the fact that we have not lost or diluted our standards of excellence or our efforts to improve our performance, we are not so well off today, and the reason is perfectly obvious. Ten years ago local and state government was by and of two-thirds of the people, but ostensibly for all the people. In those intervening years the one-third of our people who are black or brown have risen up to demand their rights to participate in government and indeed in all the privileges of citizenship, to throw off the shackles of legal and economic and political segregation and discrimination, to assert their own interpretation of democratic values and governmental needs and programs, and to ask for justice and equality now. Many of us have come to dislike very much the term "disadvantaged," but the black man will say and does say that if he is disadvantaged, it is the fault of the white man--because it is the white man who governed all those years, who made provision for inadequate schools in the black community, who denied the black man access to jobs in business and in government, who denied the black man a role in government.

In our efforts to perfect our democratic institutions, in our efforts to achieve peaceful communities with justice for all, in our efforts to insure a good education for all our children, in our efforts to administer fair and honest and effective public personnel systems, it is most important that we hear what the black man is saying to us rather than to succumb to the temptation to hear what we think the black man should be saying. And as we listen, we must exercise patience and understanding without fear; understanding that members of every minority group have had to throw off a greater fear that they have lived with every day from childhood; understanding that this is the first generation of Negroes and Indians and Mexican-Americans that has not had to be taught how to live under legal discrimination; understanding that the younger generation does not comprehend why legal rights cannot be simply translated into equal opportunities.

For the black man is saying something more than simply asserting his desire to become a junior partner in white institutions. He is seeking political and economic power and identity and responsibility. And he is challenging some of our basic governmental practices and institutions as being inherently discriminatory.

He is asking why, if he is a citizen, federal legislation is still needed to force most southern counties, including many in our state, to permit registration of black people to vote.

He is challenging the concept of at-large elections that permit the white majority to deny the black man--and the poor man--assured representation on many city councils and county commissions.

He is raising questions about the values of middle-class America and of professional public administrators, who reflect those values--values that define as "necessary and good," for example, such programs as urban renewal and expressways that more often than not sweep away the poor man's home without providing him a good alternative for housing. He is challenging the attitudes of the personnel of housing authorities, social services, and employment services that too often have been patronizing, if not insulting, in their relationships with the poor black man. He is demanding that his point of view on education, and housing, and health services, and the administration of justice be heard; and his point of view is often contrary to the way that we look on these same issues. But if you stop a moment and try to see those same issues from his point of view, the inherent justice of his concerns begins to come through.

Finally, he is asking why, if he is to have equal rights and opportunities, there are so few jobs in government for him,

particularly jobs that carry responsibility and authority and decent wages. He is challenging the very standards of public personnel administration that seem to include white people in and black people out.

We need not belabor the point that white people and black people see the world very differently. In 1968 the North Carolina Fund employed a national polling organization to define black and white attitudes toward one another across a whole range of problems.<sup>1</sup> The results were not unexpected, but they provide us a quantitative basis for understanding our problem. White people do believe that they are smarter, more energetic, and more reliable than black people. They believe that people are poor because they are lazy, that they are unemployed or seek welfare because they are lazy and no-count. They believe that Negroes, on the other hand, do have the same opportunities as white people, and that they could make it on their own if they only tried.

To no one's surprise, Negroes held almost diametrically opposite views. And a similar poll by CBS during the same period confirmed our North Carolina poll's findings and found the same attitudes everywhere in this country.

Other surveys in this state support the poor black man on those points that can be quantified.<sup>2</sup> Contrary to myth, the only able-bodied poor who receive welfare assistance are mothers of young children. Ninety-seven per cent of the male heads of households in poor communities are working, and about half of those work more than forty hours a week. Poverty is more related to low wages than to unwillingness to work, and low wages are more related to a low-wage, labor-intensive economy than any other factor.

I cite these facts, knowing that many of them are familiar to you. As we approach public personnel management in these turbulent times, however, I think that we must make a very special effort to seek and develop the rare ability to understand how public employees and prospective employees of all races differ in their views of our community, our state, our nation. If we do not, we will not achieve the successful democratic institutions that are the foundation of a peaceful and achieving society. The anger, the frustration, the alienation now found between men and women in the same community are realities with which we will have to live for years to come. We will be asked to understand much that we cannot easily understand, to deal with demands we find unreasonable and irrational, and we will live with tension and

suspicion. But if it is any comfort--and I find it small comfort-- I have discovered that poor people and black people, outside of government, often look upon what we say and do with the same frustration, as representing the same unreasonable and irrational attitudes, as encouraging the same suspicion.

I have also found from personal experience, in an organization 45 per cent of whose employees were black and a significant portion disadvantaged, that black and white people can work together and enjoy mutual respect. My greatest satisfaction has been to see people grow and develop, take pride in themselves, and overcome their fear and their poverty. Of course I am familiar with the militants, with whom I often disagree. But I ask myself--"How would I respond under similar circumstances?" And the militants, I can assure you, are like you and me in their love for family and their children and a stable and fair and productive society.

Our national task, I repeat, is one of reconciliation, and it will be the hardest task we have ever undertaken.

Let me now return to the question How do we evaluate public personnel administration today. As a matter of fact, based on our traditional standards, the quality of public personnel administration in North Carolina is pretty good. We can stand our system, our policies, our practices up against the best in the country without apology. But when we come to the facts on employment--measured by the standard of government by, of, and for all the people--the hard questions are raised. The easiest statistics to examine are those in state government, last analyzed by the Good Neighbor Council in 1968. Let me quote from some of their findings:

1. Of the 49,296 employees in State Government at the end of the summer of 1968, 8,423 or 17.1% were non-white. This figure represents an increase of 1.5% over the 15.6% figure determined in 1966.
2. The rate at which Negroes have been employed in State Government has improved dramatically. Between 1964 and 1966, Negroes represented only 13% of all new hirings; between 1966 and 1968, they represented more than 28% of all newly hired persons.
3. As determined in 1966 and in 1964, more than 80% of all Negro employees were concentrated in the areas of Education, and Health and Hospitals.

4. Almost without exception, the number of Negro employees in predominantly Negro institutions has declined once again during the past two years. Now only 3 out of every 8 Negro employees are found in such facilities. One-half of all Negroes were similarly situated in 1966; nearly 3 out of 5 were in all-Negro offices in 1964.
5. Twenty-seven of the 57 non-Education or Health-connected agencies had no Negro employees. Most were small, however. Only 2.4% of all State employees worked in all-white offices.
6. The nine largest non-Education or Health-connected agencies employed 21,382 persons, of whom only 5.0% were Negroes or Indians.
7. Negroes now constitute 12.1% of all Raleigh-based employees. This figure is up significantly from the 6.4% found in 1964. Negroes currently comprise 1,579 of the 11,394 employees in the Capital.
8. The percentage of Negroes in high-level professional, semi-professional, managerial and clerical positions has risen from 5.5% of the total non-white employment in 1964 to 8.4% in 1968.
9. While the percentage of Negroes in clerical and semi-professional positions has risen, the percentage in professional and managerial positions had declined.
10. The percentage of Negroes in traditional jobs remains at about 63%.
11. The three positions alone of janitor, maid, and attendant occupy 2,316 Negroes or 27.5% of all Negro employees.
12. In State Government, Negro women still average a higher salary than do Negro men.<sup>3</sup>

By our traditional standards, this is progress. But measured by the expectations of the black man, this "progress" is evidence of our continuing unwillingness to open the doors to a fair share of jobs, particularly of the skilled and professional jobs.

But many of you will have objections, based on your recent experience. You may say that the record should not be interpreted as reflecting racial discrimination but rather the fact that members

of minority groups do not meet the qualifications for your jobs. You may point out that you are under tremendous pressure to raise the standards for employment so as to increase efficiency and to justify higher salaries. These are laudable goals, and it may be that these qualifications are not being directly met.

You may point out that the traditions in many of your departments, particularly the police and fire departments, call for every new employee to come in at the lowest entry level and compete with his peers for promotion over a long period of years. You cannot, you will say, make it possible now for black men to enter a higher levels. You may point out that they will not stay on the job, that turnover is very high. You may point out that some of your departments refuse to request or employ black men and women, despite your efforts to encourage them to do so.

I recognize and accept at face value all these and the other objections that you may make.

But I submit that these objections, however valid and however compelling, serve more to define the magnitude of your task than to rationalize the number of jobs and the kinds of jobs that Negroes and other minority group members can, should, and must fill in the years to come. I admit the difficulties of having to readjust a segregated work force into an integrated work force. I recognize and understand your problems in recruitment, in finding persons who meet your standards in education and experience, in helping to battle excessive turnover.

But if creative public personnel administrators--you and legislators and city councilmen and county commissioners and managers and department heads--cannot raise the level of minority employment to a level at least proportionate to the population of the minority in your community without sacrificing the quality of governmental performance, the result will be a geometric increase in what we face today--a widespread lack of confidence in government by the black man and the brown man, a lack of confidence perhaps as serious as that lack of confidence that 200 years ago was characterized by the phrase "Taxation without representation is tyranny."

It is not enough to fall back on the concept of the majority vote, when for decades the operative force has been a white-vote majority. It is not enough to fall back on qualifications and policies and procedures that were developed for and applied to a white work force. Confidence in government on the part of the minority as well as the majority is the basis of peaceful government, and the most significant element in that confidence is their participation in governmental policy and administration. And this

must be achieved sooner rather than later, and without sacrificing the qualitative standards you all seek.

Recently the U.S. Civil Rights Commission published a special report that should be bed-time reading for everyone in this room. Entitled For ALL the People, By ALL the People, A Report on Equal Opportunity in State and Local Government Employment, the report surveys in depth the employment of minority groups by state and local government in seven metropolitan areas, including Atlanta, Houston, Memphis, and Baton Rouge in the South. The findings are probably what one would expect. The analysis is complicated because, as in North Carolina, large numbers of public employees are found in unskilled, low-paying jobs that traditionally have been filled by Negroes and other minority groups. But the basic finding of the report is our concern today:

The basic finding of this report is that State and local governments have failed to fulfill their obligation to assure equal job opportunity. In many localities, minority group members are denied equal access to responsible government jobs at the State and local level and often are totally excluded from employment except in the most menial capacities. In many areas of government, minority group members are excluded almost entirely from decisionmaking positions, and even in those instances where they hold jobs carrying higher status, these jobs tend to involve work only with the problems of minority group members.

Not only do State and local governments consciously and overtly discriminate in hiring and promoting minority group members, but they do not foster positive programs to deal with discriminatory treatment on the job. Too many public officials feel that their responsibility toward equal employment opportunity is satisfied merely by avoiding specific acts of discrimination in hiring and promotion. Rarely do State and local governments perceive the need for affirmative programs to recruit and upgrade minority group members for jobs in which they are inadequately represented. When recruiting programs do exist, minority group applicants frequently are subjected to a variety of screening and selection devices which bear little if any relation to the needs of the job, but which place them at a disadvantage in their effort to secure government employment. There have been few efforts by State and local governments to eliminate such unequal selection devices.<sup>4</sup>

Let us move on from that basic point to examine several particular problems that are commonly cited in current studies of

employment of the poor, the uneducated, the disadvantaged--whatever their color.

#### New Careers

One of the most striking features of government today is that at a time when government is understaffed and overworked, when needs and demands for governmental services are rising--astronomically in areas like health and medical services--we have a labor surplus among those who are least educated, least professionally trained for available jobs, and least paid. A high proportion of these people are employed in some way, but most of them are either underemployed in terms of their wages or not employed regularly. We found, as I have already mentioned, in a survey of 31 target areas comprised primarily of the poor in North Carolina, that 97 per cent of the heads of poor households were working, and that almost half of them were working more than 40 hours a week. They were poor not because they were lazy but because they were working at jobs that did not pay enough to provide a decent standard of living.

In the years that The North Carolina Fund attempted to intervene at many different points in the poverty cycle, it learned that people most effectively break out of poverty when governmental services are structured in such a way that the poor are actually involved in planning and implementing those services and activities designed for their benefit. Of the many programs undertaken by The North Carolina Fund, the New Careers concept (not alone the Department of Labor program) stands out as one of the more promising methods for improving the delivery of essential health, education, and welfare services. New Careers means more than jobs. In theory, the concept proposes to

Improve the structure and quality of services by reorganizing jobs or staffing patterns;

Relieve severe personnel shortages in the human services by tapping new sources of trainable manpower; and

Reduce poverty by providing the poor and unskilled with alternatives to unemployment and underemployment.

Although New Careers holds out the possibility of advancing several goals at once, in practice there are many obstacles faced in implementing a new program with multiple objectives.

According to the 1960 census, 43 per cent of the family units in North Carolina were headed by individuals who had completed less than eight years of school. This is twice the national figure and is exceeded only by South Carolina's percentage. Given this fact and the fact that lack of manpower seriously hampers the ability of state and local governments to deliver the human services that are needed, it is essential that we direct our energies to a search for new methods of manpower development that will help offset the lack of formal education as qualification for jobs in these areas.

Programs using the New Careers concept represent a realistic attack upon unemployment in that they provide training and education to the worker while he is on the job. This is crucial, for it lowers the traditional barriers that block poorly educated workers from employment in new kinds of jobs and eventual productive, self-reliant citizenship.

Various studies and experience gained in North Carolina through utilization of nonprofessionals in community action agencies and other governmental agencies indicate that at least five factors impede the development of New Careers:

1. Failure of the sponsoring agencies to implement the career ladder concept;
2. Failure of the user agency to provide skills and incentives for upgrading the worker from one level of performance to higher levels of performance and responsibility;
3. Failure to design training programs that effectively utilize the newer learning method;
4. Failure to develop functional job descriptions consistent from agency to agency or community to community; and
5. Failure to involve sufficiently the established service agencies, private industry, and educational institutions in training and career developments.

Why, in reality, has there remained a gap between concept and practice in North Carolina and elsewhere?

To date, the major emphasis has been on developing entry-level jobs rather than on training or on the design of career ladders. Furthermore, successful New Careers programs require the coordination of many diverse resources and may involve a number of different grant-in-aid programs. Framers of the New Careers legislation

appear to have underestimated the resistance to change inherent in government and its institutions. Local and state governments, furthermore, frequently lack the tax base to support the expansion of services they render and are continuing to feel the budget pinch. They are not in the position to commit themselves to long-term promises to train and upgrade nonprofessional employees--which is what New Careers is all about.

New Careers programs pose a unique problem in that they seek to bring about a redefinition of existing responsibilities, the grouping of subprofessional responsibilities, and the employment of individuals who have not acquired necessary formal educational qualifications. There are a number of very important reasons for strengthening the New Careers Program in North Carolina:

1. The supply of trained people in the human services professions is inadequate for staffing services according to current patterns of delivery;
2. Extension of essential services and improvements in the patterns of delivery are generating manpower needs at an even more rapid rate;
3. The rising frustrations and sense of hopelessness of the poor that are caused in part by 1 and 2 above must be eased by the resolution of the manpower shortage in the service professions;
4. Training and employment of nonprofessionals in these helping professions can strengthen the delivery system and provide a constructive response to the needs of the poor.

I make these recommendations with more knowledge and sympathy than you may imagine for the problems that many of you have faced in implementing New Careers programs. I am aware of the turnover, that training is often unsatisfactory, that neither employees nor employers believe that the concept is for real, and that red tape is endless. But these are the problems we have faced in introducing any sound advance in government. We should look upon the problems we have met as the steppingstones to success, extending the concept of creative public personnel administration to this new challenge, this new era, when we must combine the need for staffing governmental services with the need for meaningful and constructive employment for thousands of persons who are not now constructively employed.

### Police and Fire Departments

The Civil Rights Commission Report I previously cited heads a special chapter on equal opportunity in police and fire departments with this statement:

Barriers and obstacles to equal employment opportunity for minority group members were greater among uniformed policemen and firemen than in any other area of State and local government....

Police and fire departments are similar in many respects. Each has a uniformed force, with a formal semi-military chain of command. They are the most widely visible manifestations of local government operating throughout the community. Each is charged with protecting life and property; each exposes its men to danger in the course of their duties; and each stresses discipline and team spirit. Both promote entirely from within, requiring each applicant to begin as a recruit irrespective of his background or experience. In most cities both departments have the same general entry requirements and salary ranges. There are, however, important differences between the two protective services which are reflected in the relationships of the two to the minority community, the minority applicant and the minority member on the force.

One of the more significant differences lies in the fact that police departments across the country are understaffed, some substantially below authorized strength, while for the most part fire departments are not.<sup>5</sup>

I could go into all the problems that I know are found in the police and fire departments in this state today. I am aware of the traditions, the qualification requirements, the testing and promotion procedures that are said to make it impossible to recruit minority members to the force. I am aware of the personal interrelationships in the intimacy of a semimilitary organization which make integrated forces difficult to build and morale difficult to maintain. I am aware that some departments in different cities have almost dramatically different records in recruiting and maintaining higher levels of minority employment. I am very deeply aware of the tensions that exist particularly between law enforcement agencies and the black communities in many of our cities and counties.

There are no easy answers to these questions. In fact, I have noted that many of the proposed answers introduced from the outside often increase resistance to change.

In more than twenty years of working with local and state government in North Carolina, I have known with warmth and respect many of the leaders in law enforcement and fire protection in North Carolina. I have respect for not only the job they do but also their genuine concern for the welfare of the communities they serve.

My own belief is that solution for the problems of equal employment in the protective services, of building the confidence of the minority communities in law enforcement, depends on two factors.

The first is the need for an informed and sympathetic response on the part of city councils, county commissions, and other legislative bodies to the problems being raised by black citizens today. Law enforcement agencies too often take the rap for tensions developed because of the failure of legislative bodies not only to listen but also to respond to legitimate requests for action or reform. We cannot expect policemen to be both the bridge between the white and black communities and the wall that separates them.

With that as a given, I think that the problem of equal opportunity employment can be faced without all the distracting tensions that now exist. And the leadership for producing a realistic and significant change in employment practices should come not from without--from city managers or city councils, from legislatures, or even from governors; it should come from within the protective departments themselves. Such a change may require technical help from outside departments, but that can be provided. It will certainly require money, the better use of educational programs to overcome weaknesses in qualifications, and new approaches to departmental training. It may require rethinking of and alterations in the whole concept of promotion. But if there is no leadership to do this from within, then it will come from without--from the community system.

The adjustments will be difficult, even painful. But the tranquillity of our communities, the basis of community-wide respect for government as well as law enforcement, may depend on this sort of internal reorganization. Certainly the alternative, the prospect of communities on the verge of conflict, is unthinkable--but we are coming close to that in a few, a very few, North Carolina communities today.

### Administrative, Professional, Technical

Finally, let me comment briefly on the problem of equal opportunity for administrative, professional, and technical positions in government.

It is probably in this area, despite any changes you may make to open wider the doors to responsible jobs, that lack of qualifications constitutes the most difficult problem. Too many of our black citizens; who never believed that they would have the chance for professional and technical positions and who attended colleges and universities where such education was not available, lack the qualifications that many important jobs in state and local government require. Only in relatively limited programs--such as community action agencies that have experimented with on-the-job training, model cities programs, and health and welfare agencies--have members of minority groups begun to make substantial inroads on jobs in these classifications.

But we will not make significant changes in the future if we do not begin to take the first steps now. Some of these steps require money; all require imagination and persuasion and understanding; and all require initiative by governmental agencies.

1. First, of course, more young men and women from minority communities must be encouraged to seek both a college education and technical training. In North Carolina the proportion of black students going on to college, to junior college, to technical institutes, is much lower than that of white students. Somehow, we must begin in the school system to encourage education beyond the high school, to nurture motivation, and to open wider the doors of our institutions of higher learning.

2. We must exercise more outreach and imagination in our recruiting, including well-planned and supervised access to state and local government through internship programs while students are in college. Internship programs without adequate supervision are a disaster for all concerned, but the ingredients for successful and expanded internship programs are present in greater abundance in this state than in any other state in the region.

3. Finally, we must find new ways to upgrade people who now lack specific qualifications but want to obtain them. We must not merely utilize the New Careers concept within our agencies; we must also reach out for persons who are prepared to seek additional training and make that training possible. Thought must be given, in institutions like the Institute of Government, to programs that reach out for the ambitious but undereducated black

citizen and provide special mid-career training and internships that will qualify them for entry into responsible state and local governmental positions. But such an assignment will have no chance of success if it is not combined with effective recruitment, cooperation from governmental agencies with vacancies, and some assurance of a job at the end of the line.

4. Even in the professional area, I suspect that a restudy of job qualifications and job responsibilities will be helpful.

#### Conclusion

During the next two days you will be discussing many techniques involved in public personnel administration. You will be asked to take a long look at many things you have been trained to accept as gospel. You will be asked to try again some things that have not worked very well during the last few years. But remember how long it took to bring personnel administration to its present level of performance. You may be asked to decide that things you have been doing are not producing results, that in fact some of them are wrong and discriminatory, whether by intention or otherwise.

In all these efforts, and the weeks and months ahead in your jobs, I ask that you do two things:

1. Develop the capacity to put yourself into the prospective employee's shoes. Seek to understand him, to strengthen his talents, to shore up his weaknesses, to find new ways to make him productive; for in making him productive, you make your organization and community more productive.

It is of more than passing interest, I think, that a careful study for the National Civil Service League has applied benefit-cost analysis to the investment that government is asked to make in bringing unqualified employees up to productive standards. Let me quote from one of the significant findings:

We have estimated the present value of the direct social benefits from a public service job development to be between \$29,600 and \$36,300 per new worker employed, and the costs of training him to be \$3,000-\$7,000. The limiting benefit-cost ratios are thus:

$$\frac{\$29,600}{\$7,000} = \$4.23 \quad \frac{\$36,300}{\$3,000} = \$12.10$$

In other words, considering only the direct impact of a public jobs program on GNP over the next five years, a dollar invested now in a new worker from the urban ghetto may return anywhere from \$4.23 to as much as \$12.10 in extra GNP.

On these "efficiency" grounds, the policy would seem to represent a sound social investment. That it is also a desirable investment there can no longer be any doubt. We have seen that the urban economy is rapidly generating increased demands for public services which cannot be met by the existing labor force alone. We can, in other words, no longer afford the waste of productive resources which the underutilization of ghetto labor represents.

2. Remember that the task you are undertaking is not intended simply to respond to legal demands. The task you are undertaking is central to the task of the American people--to bring in the one-third who were left out, to bring them in quickly and productively, to restore their confidence in American institutions, and to demonstrate, for once and for all, that our institutions are not just designed for the white man, for the educated man, for the middle-class man. They are designed and work for all men, to assure all men equal opportunities, equal justice, and the full advantage of our constitutional freedoms.

1. The North Carolina Fund, How North Carolina Whites and Blacks View Each Other: Government and Police, Housing, Poverty, Education, and Employment. Summary of a 1968 Opinion Poll by Oliver Quayle and Company for The North Carolina Fund (Durham, N.C.: The North Carolina Fund, 1968).
2. The North Carolina Fund, North Carolina's Present and Future Poor, A Study Based on Interviews with 11,600 Families in 31 Low-Income Neighborhoods (Durham, N.C.: The North Carolina Fund, 1969).
3. The North Carolina Good Neighbor Council, Employment in State Government (Raleigh, N.C.: The Good Neighbor Council, 1968), pp. 37-38.
4. The United States Commission on Civil Rights. For ALL the People, By ALL the People, A Report on Equal Opportunity in State and Local Government Employment (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, OL-337-989, 1969), pp. 131-32.
5. Ibid., pp. 71-72.
6. Bennett Harrison, "Public Service Jobs for Urban Ghetto Residents," Good Government (Washington, D.C.: The National Civil Service League, Fall, 1969), p. 18.

# *The Small Discussion Groups*

## INTRODUCTION

The North Carolina workshop on public employment and the disadvantaged involved the participants as members of several groups organized as special study committees. Each study committee met three times, each session lasting about an hour. Two case studies had been set up, and each committee was assigned one of them. The case studies were:

Case Study I: The Buena Vista Study Committee on Manpower Development; and

Case Study II: The Governor's Special Study Committee on Manpower.

At the beginning of each of three sessions each committee was given a list of questions to discuss. The questions were directed to the specific case study to which they pertained, and the lists were numbered according to the number of the study session at which the questions were being discussed--Part I, Part II, and Part III. The first session (Part I) dealt primarily with career development; the second session (Part II) related to the legal, administrative, and budgetary considerations; and the third session (Part III) concerned recruitment, classification, testing, and training.

Several of the comments presented by the reporters in "reporting sessions" to the entire workshop group are summarized for each of the two types of committees. The coordinator requested the reporters to emphasize those points not pointed out by the earlier reports.

### Case Study I

#### THE BUENA VISTA SPECIAL STUDY COMMITTEE ON MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT

##### Introduction

The Mayor of Buena Vista has appointed a special study committee of nine officials and citizens to study the problem of manpower development in city government. The committee is (1) to determine whether there is a need for a manpower development program, and (2) to make such recommendations to the city council as it considers appropriate.

The committee includes the following persons:

- (1) City Personnel Director, ex officio chairman
- (2) Chairman, Buena Vista Fire and Police Civil Service Commission
- (3) Chief of Police
- (4) Director of Human Relations
- (5) Director of Public Works
- (6) Fire Chief
- (7) Manager, Buena Vista Employment Security Commission Office
- (8) President, Buena Vista Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO
- (9) President of a large corporation

Buena Vista is a city of approximately 100,000 population. The principal industries are hosiery and textiles, with some furniture and tobacco. The city has a Negro population of 22 per cent; according to the poverty index established by OEO, 20 per cent of its families are in poverty. Although the AFL-CIO has recently been active in the area, most manufacturing employees are not unionized.

With recent federal legislation and appropriations, several federal programs have come into the area seeking to deal with the question of poverty. A Model Cities application was made but not approved. Otherwise, antipoverty efforts have been discouraged or have received a mixed reception by city officials.

Buena Vista is said to have an efficient, honest, and conservative government. The city manager form of government was adopted many years ago. Under a personnel ordinance prepared in 1956 by the Institute of Government, the city manager is responsible for administering all personnel policies established by the council with one exception. All police and firemen are recruited, examined, and certified by a three-member Buena Vista Police and Fire Civil Service Commission. The Civil Service Commission has no jurisdiction over promotions but does have authority to hear appeals and issue binding decisions in cases of suspension, demotion, and discharge. A professional personnel director assists the city manager and serves as secretary of the Civil Service Commission. Sixty per cent of the firemen belong to the International Fire Fighters' Association, and some of the laborers in the sanitation and street departments reportedly have recently joined an affiliate of the AFL-CIO.

A chairman or discussion leader and a reporter have been assigned to each group. The group should assign roles to all members of the group. Your committee may make any reasonable assumptions necessary; however, every assumption should be recorded and reported. If committee opinion is divided, reporters should report both majority and minority opinions.

#### STUDY QUESTIONS

##### Part I

Analyze the Buena Vista personnel system as to its success and adequacy in manpower development. In your discussion answer you may wish to consider questions;

1. Are there positions in municipal government that are vacant, filled with great difficulty, or filled with persons whose services are usually less than completely satisfactory?
  - (a) List the class titles of vacant positions.
  - (b) In what agencies are the positions found?
  - (c) Because of anticipated turnover or expansion, how many persons will be needed to fill vacancies in each class of positions in each of the next three years?
2. Indicate whether the positions are administrative, professional, technical, subprofessional, skilled, semiskilled or unskilled.

3. Could classes of positions be restructured to permit present employees who are underemployed to be promoted to assume some of the duties?
4. Could some of the classes of positions be restructured to permit unskilled employees to assume the less difficult aspects of the positions?
5. If your committee finds a need for a manpower development program for any group of employees or classes of positions, what objectives would it set as a realistic and desirable goal for each of the next three years?

## Part II

On the basis of the findings of your special study committee and the other study committees, what legal, administrative, political, and budgetary problems would your committee anticipate in planning for and undertaking a manpower development program to reach the goals or objectives recommended in Part I?

In your analysis you may wish to consider the following questions:

1. What state statutes, charter provisions, and local ordinances, if any, would have to be changed to permit your committee's recommended manpower development goals to be implemented?
2. What civil service or personnel policies or rules would have to be altered to permit your recommended manpower development plans to be carried out?
3. What would be the political ramifications of efforts to achieve the goals proposed by your committee?
4. Would these changes meet resistance from any political, professional, or employee groups?
5. What administrative problems would you anticipate in implementing your committee's plans?
6. What would be the anticipated costs of implementing your committee's recommended manpower development plans (supervision, training, counseling, special services)?

7. What would be the possible sources of funds for implementing your committee's manpower development plans?

### Part III

On the basis of the findings of your special study committee and the other special study committees, what classification, recruitment, selection, training, human relations, and other problems would your committee anticipate in carrying out a manpower development plan for each of the classes of positions listed in Item 1(a)?

Summarize your committee's recommendations on each of these questions:

1. What type of program if any, should be undertaken?
2. How should such a program be implemented?
3. What public and private personnel, resources, and facilities should be used?

### REPORTS

Report 1. The participants assigned to this committee included a fire chief, a personnel director, a New Careers agency director, a sanitation superintendent, a police department officer, and several representatives of various manpower development agencies. Each was assigned a specific role to be played in the discussion sessions. He was asked to reflect the stereotype attitudes that the fictitious official he was playing might have. (His own actual position was often different from the role assigned. For example, a personnel director played the part of a union leader.)

The committee initially agreed that certain positions within the city administration required special recruiting programs to obtain an adequate number of applicants. These positions included clerk-typists, truck drivers, engineering aides, and other sub-professional and semiskilled classes. An investigation of the level of turnover indicated a need to evaluate the training programs of the city.

The police and fire departments were regulated by a civil service commission in this city. The committee saw no problem in the recruitment of applicants, but it agreed that the physical and mental requirements stipulated for the lower-level positions should be evaluated to determine the degree of correlation between adherence to various requirements and job performance. A major problem confronted by the police and fire departments in recruiting the disadvantaged was the prevalence of some type of criminal record among the applicants. The fire department representative noted the negative public reaction to hiring someone who had been convicted of a crime, regardless of severity.

Representatives of the several operating departments in the city administration were not enthusiastic about those programs operated by community action agencies that were designed to stimulate hiring of the disadvantaged. One official observed that people hired through the program would work for several days and quit or never come to work at all.

The committee concluded that efforts should be made to improve recruitment activities aimed at hiring the disadvantaged, simultaneously noting the problem of retaining personnel once hired.

The committee proposed that the governing body of the city request the city manager to implement all proposed changes. It further recommended that rather than change the laws and ordinances relative to the merit system, the administrative policies be changed to allow more flexibility in the job descriptions. Trainee programs were proposed in the police and fire services as well as for other semiskilled positions.

To recruit for these trainee positions as well as other positions, each department and the central personnel department were to be asked to adopt the following procedures:

- (a) Evaluation of personnel in other departments to determine potential capabilities.
- (b) Analysis of individuals previously rejected by the Civil Service Commission and the Personnel Department to determine causes.
- (c) Active use of personnel rosters made available by the Employment Security Commission.
- (d) Entrance into the disadvantaged community with different forms of recruitment techniques, such as newspapers, radios, and bulletins at local community centers.

The committee proposed that written tests be used as only one part of the selection criteria and not as a major factor. High school graduation was to be waived if the employee attended a learning laboratory while on the job. The lab was to be set up by the city and made available to incumbent personnel as well as new employees. The duties and responsibilities of the employee would be correlated with his progress in the learning lab. The possibility of promotion out of the trainee level to a police officer, fireman, or other regular position was to be available to each employee. The physical requirements of the police and fire departments were to be reviewed at a future date to evaluate their necessity. When the character of an applicant was reviewed, the committee recommended that points be given in his favor for positive societal traits, such as support of family. These factors were then to be weighed against the negative aspects, such as criminal histories. Anyone accused but not convicted of a crime was not to be penalized. The length of time since violation of the law was also to be considered.

When the employee began the job, the supervisor was to discuss with him his problems, both personal and job-related, and a special effort was to be made to provide whatever help was necessary.

The committee proposed that the Personnel Department set up programs on consumer education and invite bank officials, home economists, and others to serve as instructors.

Because hiring the disadvantaged would initially mean a white supervisor-black trainee relationship, the committee requested that an extensive human relations training program be developed for all supervisors. The program was to be aimed at eliminating racial myths about abilities and characteristics. Each supervisor was to be assured that the trainee was not a direct threat to his position; rather the training program was an effort to help each department provide more effective services to the public.

This committee recognized the potential political reaction after publication of its report. To overcome the uncertainty, it was recommended that the mayor and city council make a policy statement concerning the active role of the city administration in recruiting and training the disadvantaged.

(Dempsey E. Benton, Director of Finance, Rocky Mount, North Carolina, served as reporter.)

Report 2. This committee was concerned more with philosophy and methodology than with a workable program for employing the disadvantaged. The group members assumed that there was only a 2 per cent employment ratio in the community for the disadvantaged. This ratio was considered a disparity, but there were reasons for it. The committee felt that an accelerated and aggressive program of recruitment in hiring of the disadvantaged was necessary.

The two blacks and five whites in this group expressed conflicting ideas about such a program. One thought was that a report outlining the procedures that should be followed and the policies the city should set up in order to employ the disadvantaged should be widely publicized. This viewpoint emphasized the need to get widespread approval so that the local program could become a reality. But the minority opinion was that the report should not be spotlighted before the public. The point was made that to adopt a special budget or program to do something for the disadvantaged should not have to undergo intensive public scrutiny--this is something that should be done anyway, so why not just do it.

Another viewpoint was that the needs of the disadvantaged should be brought forcefully before the mayor as they really exist. The mayor should get together with the city manager, who would be encouraged to review the personnel policies with his department heads. An alternative suggestion was that the committee should report directly to the mayor and to the council in a regular session. If the cards were tactfully laid on the table, the officials would probably give serious consideration to the report. The white members on the committee seemed to feel that the second approach, bringing it before the regular session of the city council as a matter of statement of policy, was to be preferred.

A basic need is to get all the facts written in such a form that the news media could not possibly misprint or misunderstand the situation. As the report is made public, everyone could read it carefully and know exactly what the policy of the city would be, thereby keeping the half-truths, misstatements, misquotes, improper knowledge, and rumors to a minimum.

While there is no overnight solution to the problem, some progress is possible. First, the personnel director should be directed to make a five-year study delineating all of the probable jobs that will be available because of the city's growth, because of turnover in personnel, or because of increase in services and activities on the local government level. The personnel director should make listings of these probable jobs for the next three years available each year to the schools and the community action offices. He or his assistants should contact these

agencies and other groups, such as the community college and the universities that have an interest in the local area, about them.

The committee felt that the employment for the disadvantaged should be coordinated. The need is a long-range program. Many of these people must be trained so they will meet the minimum standards. Assistance should be available to help them get grants or funds to attend schools where necessary.

(Bill Britt, Town Manager, Carrboro, North Carolina, served as reporter.)

Report 3. Many of the things discussed by the other groups were discussed in this one. In the area of recruitment, the group members concluded that the need is to recruit actively in the disadvantaged communities. The local high schools, community action agencies, and other community-based organizations should be utilized in making contacts with the disadvantaged individuals.

The committee concluded that selection techniques need to be revised. One effective way to qualify individuals for government employment is the use of performance tests. Such tests can be used for various types of positions.

The need to train the people doing the training was emphasized. Special orientation sessions may be needed to help the trainers communicate effectively with the disadvantaged.

In the human relations area, perhaps the biggest job will pertain to the present employees. They must accept both the program for hiring the disadvantaged and accept the people coming in through the program.

There was a consensus that, as a symbol of commitment to any manpower program, the local government must invest money itself and not rely entirely on outside funding. Outside sources should be tapped, but the local government must be willing to spend a great deal of money and time for a program for the disadvantaged to be successful.

(John Smith, Administrative Assistant, Wilson, North Carolina, served as reporter.)

Report 4. Two points were especially emphasized in the group discussions. First, any reclassification of public positions to accommodate the disadvantaged must be followed up by career planning if dead-end jobs are to be eliminated. Second, in implementing a program of employment for the disadvantaged, a high degree of communication must exist between department heads and among the other personnel within the organization. Communication, in most cases, tends to change attitudes. There must be a high degree of acceptance of the person employed before such a program for the disadvantaged can be implemented. The orientation may involve human relations sessions and sensitivity-training types of sessions. Consultants from outside the community can be helpful in determining the effectiveness of such a program. Someone from a community that has implemented a program of this nature would be desirable. He can be a witness to the fact that opening up opportunities for the disadvantaged can be done.

All public officials--including personnel and staff specialists, public works officials, and others--have an advisory responsibility to the city manager or to the city council. In many North Carolina towns, the mayor has not set up a human relations committee. He has not asked for recommendations--not because he is insensitive to the problem, but because he is involved in other things that are his priorities at this point. Staff people have a responsibility to talk to the city manager, to bring the problem of the disadvantaged to his attention. Public officials have a responsibility to emphasize the need to develop meaningful employment programs for the minority groups. The crisis in the employment of the disadvantaged is here. The immediate need is to make people fully aware of the situation. However, the crisis requires action programs, not just committee meetings and more conferences regarding the plight of the disadvantaged.

(Julian Prosser, Administrative Intern, Asheville, North Carolina, served as reporter.)

Report 5. In the area of recruitment, the committee noted that the traditional methods of publicity often do not reach the disadvantaged. Two possible alternatives were suggested. The first is a mobile recruiting unit that operates in disadvantaged areas. The second method relates to maintaining recruitment lists with various community leaders, especially those in the low-income areas. The problems in recruitment involve the rigid civil service regulations and the department heads' reluctance to lower standards. A suggestion was made that department heads could be pressured to establish realistic employment requirements and the civil service commissions be abolished.

Under the topic of human relations, the group saw a need to create and expand human relations and community relations units within the cities, both in city government and in specific departments such as police. It felt that community relations units should pay more attention to individual needs. Such committees in the city should represent all aspects of the community.

The group members concluded that some classification plans are unrealistic and merit re-examination. Some professionals might be relieved of some of their routine duties and thereby provide employment opportunities for lower-status employees. Another possibility mentioned is a classification plan determined by collective bargaining between management and employees. In any event, the classification plans should be flexible and not confining. They should take into account the learning potential as well as educational backgrounds.

More training opportunities should be provided by the city employees. The city government should recruit high school students and offer them part-time employment, at the same time urging students to stay in school.

The group members could find no rationale for discriminating against whites in order to facilitate opportunities for the minorities. Neither could the members of the group justify the lowering of standards for entrance into the public service. It was felt that the latter approach would be detrimental to those people who need public services the most--namely, the poor.

No fault was found with the notion of using the resources of the "advantaged" in order to create opportunities for the "disadvantaged." Indeed, it is only this kind of assistance that society can ever hope to approach equal opportunity; thus public officials should not be afraid to support such actions.

(David Stephenson, graduate student, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, served as reporter.)

## Case Study II

### THE GOVERNOR'S SPECIAL STUDY COMMITTEE ON MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT

#### Introduction

The Governor has appointed a special study committee of nine officials and citizens to study the problem of manpower development in state government. The committee is (1) to determine whether there is a need for a manpower development program, and (2) to make such recommendations to the Governor as it considers appropriate.

The committee includes the following persons:

1. The State Personnel Director, ex officio chairman
2. Chairman of the Good Neighbor Council
3. Chairman of the North Carolina
4. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles
5. Commissioner of Social Services
6. Commissioner of Highways
7. Director of Mental Health
8. Executive Secretary, North Carolina State Employees' Association
9. President of a large corporation

A chairman and discussion leader and a reporter have been assigned to each group. The group should assign roles to all members of the group. Your committee may make any reasonable assumptions necessary, however, every assumption should be recorded and reported. If committee opinion is divided, reporters should report both majority and minority opinions.

## STUDY QUESTIONS

## Part I

Analyze North Carolina's state personnel system as to its success and adequacy in manpower development. In your discussion answer you may wish to consider the following questions:

1. Do the State Personnel Department and the individual departments periodically make short-range and long-range estimates of future manpower needs?
2. Are recruitment and promotional programs planned to fill the anticipated vacancies before the vacancies occur?
3. How extensive are efforts to assure trained replacement for vacancies occurring at all levels?
4. Are there positions in state government which are vacant, filled with great difficulty, or filled with persons whose services are usually less than completely satisfactory?
  - (a) List the class titles of vacant positions.
  - (b) In what agencies are the positions found?
  - (c) Because of anticipated turnover or expansion, how many persons will be needed to fill vacancies in each class of positions in each of the next three years?
5. Indicate whether the positions are administrative, professional, technical, subprofessional, skilled, semiskilled, or unskilled.
6. Could classes of positions be restructured to permit present employees who are underemployed to be promoted to assume some of the duties?
7. Could some of the classes of positions be restructured to permit unskilled employees to assume the less difficult aspects of the positions?
8. If your committee finds a need for a manpower development program for any group of employees or classes of positions, what objectives would it set as a realistic and desirable goal for each of the next three years?

## Part II

On the basis of the findings of your special study committee and of the other study committees, what legal, administrative, political, and budgetary problems would your committee anticipate in planning for and undertaking a manpower development program to reach the goals or objectives recommended in Part I?

In your analysis you may wish to consider the following questions:

1. What state statutes, if any, would have to be changed to permit your committee's recommended manpower development goals to be implemented?
2. What "merit system" or state personnel policies or rules would have to be altered to permit your recommended manpower development plans to be carried out?
3. What would be the political ramifications of efforts to achieve the goals proposed by your committee?
4. Would these changes meet resistance from any political, professional, or employee groups?
5. What administrative problems would you anticipate in implementing your committee's plans?
6. What would be the anticipated costs of implementing your committee's recommended manpower development plans (supervision, training, counseling, special services)?
7. What would be the possible sources of funds for implementing your committee's manpower development plans?

## Part III

On the basis of the findings of your special study committee and the other special study committees, what classification, recruitment, selection, training, human relations, and other problems would your committee anticipate in carrying out a manpower development plan for each of the classes of positions listed in Item 4(a) of Part I?

Summarize your committee's recommendations as to each of the following:

1. What type of program, if any, should be undertaken?
2. How should such a program be implemented?
3. What public and private personnel, resources, and facilities should be used?

#### REPORTS

Report 1. The special study committee felt that no statute would necessarily need to be changed in order to develop a good manpower program. Rather, employment opportunities could be greatly enhanced by relaxing certain civil service restrictions and regulations by the State Personnel Board. An example would be to allow the administrative agencies to use lapsed salaries to help support a manpower training program.

Another need in fostering equal employment opportunities is a more liberal educational policy that would allow employees to have leave with pay to study in a job-related area. This policy is not now clear to many public employees.

Another point was that the assistance of the State Personnel Department and the Budget Division is needed to implement progressive manpower programs for the disadvantaged.

(Ray Respass, Personnel Officer, Kinston, North Carolina, served as reporter for this group.)

Report 2. This group recommended the New Careers concept in restructuring jobs with built-in flexibility features. These features would include lateral mobility, job training, and re-evaluation of basic academic requirements and required practical experience. The area of merit examination should also be re-examined. Representatives from the Personnel Department, the operating agencies, the New Careers program, the Department of Labor, and possibly others should be assigned the task of restructuring various positions, including the determination of minimum qualifications and experience. The need is to update, to recognize, and to make relevant. There is work to be done and unemployed people who need the work.

(James W. McGinnis, Director, Religious and Moral Training, North Carolina Board of Juvenile Correction, Raleigh, North Carolina, served as reporter for this group.)

Report 3. The committee members discussed the broader aspects of the problems involving the unemployed. They concluded that qualification standards should not be lowered. Restructuring of jobs to obtain accurate qualification requirements in those cases in which they were too high to begin with may sometimes be necessary, but this does not constitute lowering the standards. The problem of job discrimination against the disadvantaged is one that has been with us but has not been fully recognized--a case of not seeing the forest because of the trees. It needs some government-sponsored attacks at its roots. These approaches would involve keeping people in school, making school more relevant, establishing a national-level income-maintenance program, better support of welfare programs at the state and local levels, and so on. If the search for a solution does not start with these basics, it is an attempt to solve the problem at the wrong end.

The difficulties facing the disadvantaged are much greater than just employment problems. If society were willing, many of them could be solved rather rapidly by making a broad social commitment to send disadvantaged people back to school--to give them an opportunity for training and acquiring adequate education and skills. A broad social commitment to help the disadvantaged is probably not possible. The alternative is to do what we can with what we have, which means that people like us must go back and work from within to improve the employment opportunities for the disadvantaged. Rather than just employ people, the need is to open up state government and society at large to the acceptance of this segment of society that has been largely excluded, which is the real goal of much of what is needed. To raise economic standards is one of the keys to the integration of the disadvantaged into society at large.

(Lew Brown, Budget Officer, Durham, North Carolina, served as reporter for the group.)

Report 4. The committee members felt that public officials should be serious about hiring the disadvantaged. Instead of giving lip service to the need, personnel staffs can exert much influence through their offices and in working on a one-to-one basis with the supervisors in the departments and agencies.

A statement from the chief executive, whether the Governor or the mayor, would allow the department or agency head to be more secure in telling his people to hire the disadvantaged. The approach would require some understanding on both sides of the

fence. When someone who has never had a job and has never had to report at 8:00 is employed and he does not show up the first day, the first inclination is to dismiss him. A supervisor who looks at the situation more closely may find out why the new employee did not report at 8:00. More understanding and more education are required for both the supervisor and the disadvantaged employee.

The administrative organization to hire the disadvantaged is already established. Perhaps a task force working out of the Governor's Office that has formal powers and authority and definite goals can be useful in gaining acceptance for such a program. More progress might be made if blacks hired blacks; thus a qualified black person should be employed in the personnel office. In recruiting the hard-core unemployed, the New Careers program can be a valuable resource. The CAP agencies can also render valuable assistance.

(Robert Noe, graduate student, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, served as reporter for this group.)

# *The Role of the State Personnel Department*

CLAUDE E. CALDWELL  
Director, North Carolina  
State Personnel Department

The State Personnel Department serves in a staff capacity to the operating state agencies, and it is the responsibility of personnel staffs and line officials to coordinate their programs and efforts in seeking to recruit and retain competent public employees. Being somewhat distant from the "line of fire," the central personnel agency can absorb much of the criticism of those persons employed by government, thus making it possible for the operating agencies to be more productive or creative.

But a major problem in personnel department/line agency relationship today is communication. For example, the state has a written policy, widely published over the past two years, which provides that any state employee, with the approval of his department head, may submit a proposal to further his education. Such educational efforts are to be related to his career, not to his job. This is an important distinction. If the educational opportunity is available to him during the regular work hours and not at other times, he is allowed without charge or accumulation of work time to take a course each quarter or semester. Although this is a two-year old policy, many employees are not familiar with it because we--personnel, the line agency, and the employee--are either not talking to each other or not listening to each other. We must do both.

Another problem in the area of personnel is this matter of opening up job possibilities suitable to the individual at or near his present stage of preparation. State officials have been discussing job opportunities for the disadvantaged for several years, but beyond theoretical talk, not much has happened.

For one thing, we often confuse ourselves and others with the language we use. People become confused by a lack of clarity and

understanding. Take the topic of "lowering standards." To many administrators, this phrase raises a red flag. What we are talking about is not lowering standards at all. We are talking about examining the work structure itself, questioning and perhaps changing our traditional ideas of what is acceptable or unacceptable and what is productive or not productive; we are talking about eliminating undue obstacles and arranging the duties in such a way that people who are either unemployed or underemployed can handle them.

It is essentially the line agency's responsibility, with the help of the personnel staffs, to do this in such a way that standards of service are not lowered, and in such a way that the agency makes use of the strength of each individual. This may involve restructuring particular positions to some extent, but it does not of itself mean that standards will be lowered; it may simply mean that new classes of positions are established. No laws, regulations, or policies prevent a realignment of work situations. Yet in staffing public welfare, public health, and other human service agencies, when a particular situation needs a particular kind of employee, all too often the reaction is, "Well, we can't plan a job like that because there is nothing in the classification book like that. We are not authorized to do this." This gets right back to the problem of communication. The classification book has nothing to do with what an agency can plan as a work assignment. This point is the absolute crux of the matter, and it simply is not well enough understood among personnel people.

Some progress has been made in the major state agencies. For example, the North Carolina Mental Health Department has done a professional job in rearranging position assignments. The primary task is analyzing what duties people perform and determining the lowest possible level at which that task can be performed satisfactorily. Some of the restructuring of positions is experimental in nature.

A questionable technique in the recruitment of the disadvantaged is the oral interview, which is used in the health and welfare agencies. The interview boards are made up of staff members from the state operating agencies (rather than highly skilled consultants, for economic reasons), who visit the rural areas "where the folks are." The problem is that while these interviewers are familiar with the duties of the positions to be filled, they may not be entirely objective or perhaps not even sympathetic to the program. The recruitment of disadvantaged people is not easy. Many must be persuaded to appear before an interview board, and they often have had no experience in being interviewed. Whether this type of individual recruitment is desirable remains to be seen. It may or may not help to solve the shortage problem.

We talk about hiring the disadvantaged with the very best of intentions. We label a man "disadvantaged," and we talk about the problem and then feel comfortable that we are going to do something about his situation. Yet weeks and months pass with no action taken. The pressure of our work means that no recruitment program is begun. And we use the term "disadvantaged people" without conceiving of them as human beings. We have not squared off with the fact that the "disadvantaged person" often will not be compatible with you and the others working in the office. He will have different views. He will behave differently. He may not show up for work. He will accept many things that are alien to you.

The intention to hire disadvantaged people means acceptance of the fact that they will not fit the normal groove as everybody else did. They may not conform to usual office practices. Many may not stay very long. We must make a commitment to meet these people on their own grounds. We cannot say to them, "You come and meet our standards; if you measure up, we will keep you." Today we have reached a point in the personnel situation when we must use available people to the greatest possible extent. This means planning work to fit people, and not necessarily measuring people to fit the work patterns with which we are accustomed.

## *Employing Well-Educated Minority Members*

GLORIA JOHNSON  
Personnel Director  
St. Augustine College  
Raleigh

When disadvantaged persons are employed, some type of orientation or training is needed to help them with administrative procedures and in getting along with the people in the office; and the people presently in the office also need some special help in understanding and working with these people. Often the new employees do not fail on the job as much as other employees fail them in their work situation.

Problems are encountered among those minority group persons who have college degrees. It is most difficult to interest the black college graduate in working with a government agency. Perhaps there are three reasons for this: (1) the salaries are not as attractive as those in industry or with other private agencies; (2) government, whether it is local or federal, does a poor job of selling the kind of activities government performs, explaining its importance, describing the range of assignments, discussing the kind of integrated programs within the agency, and creating excitement about the work that would interest young persons in working in these positions; and (3) many highly qualified graduates who would fit into the top-level positions of local governments are "turned off" immediately because of additional testing requirements. In general, many disadvantaged persons (not only blacks) have a mental block against the word "testing" or the idea of testing. They often feel that they should be considered on the basis of their college degree, the contents of their courses, and the grades received.

One experience concerning the minority group college graduates is worth noting. A major in business education at our college is a four-year degree. With the degree, two routes are open--teaching business courses at a high school or a junior high school, and assuming an administrative position. But when young women with this degree seek employment with state agencies in the clerical area,

either of two things happens--or maybe both: the salary is very low, or they are told that they are overly qualified for the kinds of positions available. Either way, they are "turned off."

## *The Need to Make Good on Promises of Equal Opportunity*

JAMES WILSON

Director, Model Cities Program  
Winston-Salem

The Model Cities Program is a new and fascinating program. Many officials in city government have commented that the Model Cities director has the toughest job in the community. Many have said that it is an impossible job. It is not impossible, because if it is, then the problems facing the disadvantaged individuals have no solutions whatsoever.

Legislative mandate requires that the Model Cities Program must solicit citizen participation. One of the biggest problems today is the "credibility gap" that exists between the average citizen and the average so-called disadvantaged person. From the beginning, certain elements of the disadvantaged groups have been systematically excluded. No one gives much thought to the possibility that the consumers of services, whether they be rich or poor and disadvantaged, need to participate in and be a part of the planning process for whatever is done.

Citizen participation can be interpreted several ways. It can be said that when people in the community are employed, they are participating. If people in the community are surveyed for their ideas and opinions, the survey is a type of participation. If public officials publicize the government programs, that involves a type of participation. However, these kinds of citizen involvement are not enough.

Nearly 200 years ago a Declaration of Independence was written that was supposedly applicable to all men. Since that time most of us have given only lip service to that set of ideals.

Despite the fact that the Constitution has not been practiced in my behalf, I am a constitutionalist. What makes this country what it is anywhere in the world is the things we discuss and do. What makes us less believable even at home is what we practice in contradiction of basic principles.

Some progress has been made in some cities in North Carolina toward treating the minority groups as equals. How or why is such progress made in certain cities? In some cities there has been better communication than in other cities. Bigger bricks, larger Molotov cocktails, more broken windows, and other such disturbances appear to lead to some progress. The miracle of miracles is that progress has been made under these conditions.

As a group of public officials with or without tremendous power, we are among those who could do the things that need to be done. If we really examine the situation, we can influence things rather creditably if not remarkably. What this whole exercise has been all about is to try to provide a positive alternative. Those cities that have made some progress to date should serve as models. Their experience should provide a more positive approach to making still more progress in hiring the disadvantaged.

The key word in improvement is power. Until there is a concerted effort, not necessarily just by the blacks but by whites as well, until power is generated that can and will change things, the institutionalized discrimination fostered in this country will remain for many, many years. Unless we decide to use that power the system will never be changed and the government, through a wide range of programs, is trying to get at this problem of institutionalized discrimination. The disadvantaged view such things as rules, regulations, state statutes, and ordinances as institutionalized forms of discrimination. The way in which the formal aspects are used depends on whether the person is in or out. Almost all personnel practices in public and private situations are designed to exclude. The need is to reverse that process now, not just because it is a good thing and makes a prettier picture, but also because the need is to preserve the whole structure of this country in keeping with the promise this country made to itself in 1776.

One could cite thousands of situations where arbitrary rules denied individuals employment opportunities. Any disadvantaged person can recount instances in which we should long ago have abolished unreasonable restrictions that amount to hypocritical, ridiculous situations. Yet we expect these people to respond with gratitude and patience.

As a constitutionalist, I believe that I am innocent until I am proved guilty. The system tells me I am guilty until I am proved white. There is a disadvantage in being black in the vertical sense as well as in the horizontal sense. The business of real integration in both senses needs attention. Median income in this

country for whites with a high school diploma is still higher than the median income of blacks with college degrees or better. There is more concern, when we talk about job qualifications, about compatibility and group pressures than about work performance and ability to get the job done.

One of the interesting breakthroughs in the last twenty years, and a meager one at that, is in the area of technology for blacks. We have had some personal experience in this area, and one of the things that the white management has found out when they started letting blacks work in laboratories and as technicians is that the equipment and the chemicals are unaffected by the color of the hand that works with them. The problem all along has been with people. Some astonished persons may come up and say in effect, "You know something, I've been in this business for many years, and I've never seen one of you doing this kind of work."

Most black persons by many white people's standards are myths. They do not exist. Yet they have existed for generations, not because of the system but in spite of it. The lack of imagination and the lack of ability to grapple with this relatively simple problem and the inability of us as a group or as a country to understand our own personal difficulties with this problem are amazing. No company in the world has a major problem integrating highly complex computer systems into their company process where necessary. But company officials simply sit and freeze when somebody says something about integration of black folks. Yet the same process of orientation, preparation, indoctrination, learning, training, and education is involved. It seems almost incredible that the most complex organism in the world, the human being, who yet is quite simple, has such difficulties in living as an integrated, equal society.

If such a thing as equal opportunity exists and if every man, woman, and child in this country has the inherent right to equality, then all that prevails is a simple, discouraging word--racism.

# *The New Careers Program*

ALBERT C. CAPEHART, JR.

Director, New Careers Program  
Operation Breakthrough  
Durham

In North Carolina there are eleven New Careers programs serving more than 40 counties and having a combined annual training capacity of 700 trainees. Nationally, this means that North Carolina has the greatest number of New Careers programs and the second largest training slot allotment. The Department of Labor is pumping more than \$3,000,000 a year into this state for the training of New Careerists.

New Careers programs are local programs with flexibility to work with both state and local agencies for the development of training that will produce trainees with the skills and abilities to perform the needed new jobs within state agencies. The training flexibility and capacity of New Careers programs can be shown from the experience in Durham. During its first year of operation, over half of its 100 trainees did not have their high school diploma or equivalency certificate; the average functional level of this group of trainees was seventh grade. After nine months of New Careers training, 90 per cent of those trainees had earned their high school diploma or equivalency. Through an arrangement with North Carolina Central University, 41 Durham New Careerists were accepted as special students, with the understanding that if they completed twelve semester hours with a C average or better, they would be automatically considered to have met the entrance requirement of the university and would be able to use the course work toward a Bachelor of Arts degree.

The approach that the New Careers concept suggests is based on a redesigning of the way work is done, not a lowering of quality of work performance. The redesigning of work must also be accompanied by built-in training for upgrade. This training insures that the worker can maximize himself and thereby increase the contribution he can make in the work situation. The New Careers approach is a blending in the work situation of skill training; and education.

This sort of system does not deny the entrance into the working situation through the traditional means of education, but it does make it possible for those who could not afford the luxury of continued education also to move up.

An example of work redesigning can be taken from the Durham New Careers staffing pattern. Originally there were ten professionals, but by redesigning the way work was to be done, there are now six professionals and six paraprofessionals. The program's over-all personnel costs are 10 per cent less than they were two years ago, and productivity has increased by 20 per cent, if that can be measured by the number of persons who are trained within a year's time. In spite of the apparent contribution New Careers can make, the frustration in development is in convincing the state government to take advantage of the New Careers resources available in the state. The New Careers concept requires a commitment on the part of the participating user agency to establish a new type of staffing pattern that accepts the use of paraprofessionals. Because the New Careers programs are local programs seeking to develop the New Careers concept with local human service agencies, they must deal with the local branch of the state agency. The New Careers director, in his effort to develop New Careers training opportunity, is usually given the run-around by the director of the local agency, who says, "I don't have the authority to initiate any new positions or different kinds of services. The State Department of personnel does that sort of thing." The New Careers director then has to look for the "fat cat," whom he must convince that the New Careers system is a more efficient and economical way of getting work done in a human service agency. Turning to the State Department of Personnel, he is told that they only provide personnel services for state agencies and consequently do not initiate new positions but respond to requests from local agencies.

There was once established a new category of worker which required only a minimum of three years of previous work experience or three years of post-secondary education. One local agency had 14 of these new positions assigned to it. The local New Careers director suggested a coupling of this new job category and New Careers training capacity to the director of the local agency. He was informed that several of the positions were already filled: the agency had hired college graduates who were interested in becoming case workers, and when a case worker left, the agency would have a ready replacement. This new position, which had been intended for a disadvantaged person to establish better communications between the clients and the agency, had been converted to a holding-ground for potential case workers.

Another example of the State Department of Personnel's attempt to open entry-level employment to the disadvantaged was the

examinations of oral interview boards rather than relying on written examinations. When the Work Incentive Program (WIN) was established in one community, there was an oral board to select a person for the position of coach. In this instance the coach was essentially a training position for a person from the poor community which the WIN program was established to serve. This coach was to help bridge the communication gap that exists between the deliverer of services and the recipients. The use of the oral board had screened out most of the poor people. The person who got the job was black, her husband had a nice job, and she had a nice car. The money she is earning because she was looking for something to do should be going to one of the people from the poor community who needs the money to put bread on the table and not a boat in the garage.

Where is the power? Who has the responsibility for the establishment of new categories of workers? Why is there not a coordinated effort between the personnel agency and the administrative agencies? How long can this abuse continue? How can we be talking about equity and justice in employment when we refuse to design our employment situations without opportunity for those who need it most?

Our workshop discussion group had personnel directors from several of the hospitals associated with the State Department of Mental Health. This group expressed creativity, imagination, and a willingness to "stretch and bend" the personnel regulations in order to get their work done. It is obvious that when we are all together we have this momentary inspiration about the creative role of personnel and its effects on the whole question of employment of the disadvantaged, but the daily humdrum of the work seems to dissipate all of our good intentions.

Let us explore the ramifications of what could happen if a personnel director decided to do something about the disadvantaged and their need for employment. He has more power than he is usually willing to use or assert. Some would want to call it influence. Whatever it is called, it is the ability to help bring about change.

The personnel director is not alone. In all of the institutions and agencies in which New Careers have been developed, people in positions of authority only need to be approached and given the opportunity to lend their support. The state is virtually covered with community action agencies that would be eager to aid in any effort to employ the disadvantaged. New Careers programs are natural allies to such efforts and have developed expertise in training the disadvantaged.

The personnel director could form a career development advisory board for his agency with input from administration, personnel services, the community, and New Careers. This board could then look at the existing staffing pattern, agency goals, and personnel regulations with an eye toward an employee development program based on the career development model. The board could then make suggestions about entry-level employment, training, and upgrade.

The resource available through the Department of Labor's New Careers programs could then be tapped during the initial phase-in of the program. The high risk of the initial phase is minimized by New Career's capacity for training and financial support.

The effects of New Careers can be shown from one program. After the first year of business, 35 women who had been welfare recipients are now productive taxpayers. The new jobs gained from one year of New Careers training increased the average family income of the program's 100 former trainees by \$1,700.

The New Careers concept is not really new. It does pull together in a unique way many of the concepts that we all know and sets them in a training frame related to work that has been redesigned. To develop a New Careers design on a statewide basis will require a lot of hard work and planning. It will require the effective blending of resources that have heretofore viewed themselves as separate but cooperative entities. Because of the magnitude of the effort and its repercussions, it would appear that the Governor would want to call a conference for career development. The state as the employer can set an example for career development. The resources are here. The question is when will the state respond!

# *The Concentrated Employment Program*

HOYLE MARTIN

Executive Director  
Concentrated Employment Program  
Charlotte

The term "disadvantaged" can be applied to many kinds of people. A disadvantaged person is any black American, educated or uneducated. He is any American with less than a high school education. She is any American with a child out of wedlock. He is any American who is an alcoholic, and he is any American who does not conform to the norms and values of our middle-class society. But the largest group of disadvantaged people are black. It is generally of them that we think when we talk about job opportunities for the disadvantaged, and one difficulty that we face in coping with this problem is that we are starting at the wrong end of the road.

In the end, the only way to get the ghetto hard-core disadvantaged person into the mainstream of society will be to improve his educational opportunity and work experience. A woman from a low socioeconomic level cannot get a reasonably good position if she uses very poor English, has a child out of wedlock, or perhaps is emotionally immature. She cannot work in an office and be expected to do a competent job if such problems exist. Even when the disadvantaged are educated, they must adopt middle-class values and habits in order to get along with other people with whom they work. The point is, to employ disadvantaged persons in an office, they must be trained in the mannerisms and behavior patterns necessary for that work situation. The trained black has a better prospect of getting a good job than the untrained. However, poverty studies show that education itself still does not make much difference in providing more and better job opportunities, especially for black people. Most public agencies still do not hire minority people except in the most low-level, low-paying, low-status jobs.

Those who are concerned about employing minority people are concerned because the labors of minority groups, just like others, are vital to the continued movement of the nation's economy, and

because disadvantaged people need jobs with meaning. They need to know that they are doing something worthwhile and making a necessary contribution.

This is where public agencies have often failed. Many local governments have large numbers of "disadvantaged" employees. One city in North Carolina boasted about the number and percentage of minority group employees that it had. Yet the statistics showed that all of these employees were either garbage collectors or janitors. Furthermore, this city had no scholarship funds or in-service training that such workers might use as a steppingstone toward a better job.

The right end of the road to start in dealing with the problem of job opportunities for the disadvantaged is not in theory or in red tape, but with the disadvantaged themselves. This is the purpose of the Concentrated Employment Program (CEP)--a federally funded agency designed to recruit, train, and motivate disadvantaged people and find jobs for them.

CEP has found that the people most successful in going out into the community and convincing the unemployed and unmotivated that there is a job opportunity for them are those who have themselves been convinced that they can and will be employed in meaningful jobs. This reality of employment prospects has been the result of the Concentrated Employment Program's philosophy and policy of employing disadvantaged people in 50 per cent or more of its agency jobs. This effort is helped by the exclusion of traditional written examinations and "no police record" as conditions of employment.

Unfortunately, this policy that allows disadvantaged people to be "screened in" to jobs in our agency--and we hope eventually into private industry--is being threatened by new Department of Labor policies that, will to some extent return us to the restrictions in employment imposed by the state merit system. Under the Department of Labor's Manpower Administrative Order 14-69, many of those employed by the CEP administration must become employees of the North Carolina Employment Service--under contract to provide certain manpower services for the Concentrated Employment Program. But the hitch is that the state merit system requires that the North Carolina Employment Service employ all personnel based on scores from the traditional merit examination, an examination that is culturally biased to the detriment of low-income disadvantaged persons so examined. Furthermore, a certain educational level is required even to be eligible to take certain tests in the merit system.

The Employment Service has made some attempt to rectify this situation by employing six CEP-ES "job coaches" via the oral

examination route, which is an important beginning to bring about needed change in a state agency's selection of personnel. Yet the lack of actual employment opportunities and the red tape in pursuing what opportunities do exist in the traditional public agencies are disturbing. This matter of the relationship of the Concentrated Employment Program and the Employment Service with the Department of Labor is a good example. Under the new policies of DOL MAO 14-69, CEP is required to transfer some of its employees to its major contractor, the Employment Service, because certain job functions are now the responsibility of that agency. As a result, some CEP employees will be required to pass a written examination; if employed, they will be placed in probationary employment and in some cases take a salary cut. These are people who have worked satisfactorily for a year or more in the job for the same program. What sense does it make to penalize them because of a bit of administrative red tape? (The Employment Service points out that these disadvantages are offset by the fact that such employees gain permanent employment with a long-established agency, which CEP is not.) The CEP recruiters and other subprofessional employees affected by the new policy are also discouraged because of the restrictive features of the traditional merit examination system. When jobs are obtained, even via the oral examination route, promotion possibilities are often limited.

In sum, the current merit system policies of North Carolina as related to the Employment Service's involvement in the Charlotte CEP is having the effect of denying employment opportunities even for people who have performed well in the same occupational area over the past year. The point is that "the system" discourages the very kind of people that CEP is suppose to motivate and "screen in" to jobs. The paradox of all this is that the CEP concept calls in part for getting employers to reduce, change, or eliminate the current system of written examinations as a condition of employment. Yet the Employment Service, the CEP contractor responsible for getting employers to change their policies, finds it impossible to change its own policies.

The merit system examination procedure and the examinations themselves are designed by and for middle-class people who have little understanding and often little concern for disadvantaged people. This applies equally well for both the well-educated and the uneducated minority. The consideration of a minority group person for meaningful employment too often involves the color of his skin, the contour of his nose, the texture of his hair, and the thickness of his lips. These are considerations that far too often override whether he can or cannot perform the tasks of the position applied for. Employers who lack the guts to hire purely

on the basis of ability, training, and experience use the excuse that they are concerned about employee (white) reaction or customer reaction if a black or an Indian is given a key position in their firm or agency, especially if that position involves supervising white people. It is not too hard to understand why some employers respond this way. There is evidence that employers who have hired without prejudice have had their business or agency efforts hurt by bigots and racists in our society.

How, then, can the disadvantaged person be motivated? How can he get a fair chance at securing a decent job? In some cases positions are created to appease a segment of the community by hiring a minority group member for a "nothing" type of job. This kind of effort is aimed at giving the illusion that others of that group may aspire to meaningful jobs. The minority group in question recognizes such tactics and is not fooled about their meaning. Their awareness of white society's attitude toward employment opportunities for minorities makes it even more difficult to convince uneducated, unskilled, and unmotivated people that they can get a good job. How can the black school teacher be expected to motivate the black youngster to believe that he will get a desirable job if adequate education is gained when the price that blacks pay in the quest for integrated quality education may be that the teacher herself loses her job?

What is your agency doing to hire disadvantaged people? Has a disadvantaged person been employed in your personnel office? This would be an important first step. Our need is to begin with the employment of the educated disadvantaged person. The majority group (white) will be able to communicate and carry on dialogue with the educated minority person because, in spite of racial differences, their values, intelligence, interest, and abilities will be similar. If the educated whites and blacks cannot work together in a harmonious way, the uneducated who lack motivation will not have any hope of being employed by your agency in any position.

When one talks about the disadvantaged, uneducated, and unmotivated, one is referring to the black man who said, "The first time in my life I felt like a man was when I was burning down that store." This person had never felt like a man before because he had continually been denied the most important symbol of manhood--a job. As Paul Jacobs has written, "Work, a job, an occupation, a profession, are central to American conceptions of masculinity; it is true for the whites in America as it is for Negroes and other minorities." To understand the feelings of the man who desires to "burn down the store," the white personnel management people of our public agencies must reach across the socioeconomic-psychological subculture

line as well as the racial lines. Reaching across these lines of understanding will be considerably easier if you start with the educated black or other minority group member because you can begin with much more in common at the outset.

To be sincere about giving disadvantaged people jobs in city, county, state, and federal government means opening up the top. To do otherwise is to give minorities more of the same kinds of low-status jobs that they have received in the past with no hope of climbing. The simple act of placing minority people in your personnel office will in itself attract others seeking employment.

In conclusion, in the words of C. Virgil Martin, President of Carson, Pirie, Scott Company of Chicago, Illinois:

We must stop thinking of the Negro, the drop-out, the unemployed, and the unemployable as nameless statistics. They are potential wage earners, taxpayers, customers and a rich source of energy, innovation, and contribution to our communities. To write them off as "hopeless" or content ourselves with "paying off" with welfare subsistence would be folly--it would be to cheat ourselves of their potential contributions.

This statement expresses well the kind of thinking that public agency personnel managers and society in general must adopt if we are to create the environmental conditions necessary to motivate the human resources that could increase our nation's gross national product by as much as \$14 billion per year.

# *The Concept of a Career Ladder*

**JAMES L. MONCRIEF**

Director of Career Programs  
North Carolina State  
Department of Mental Health.

About a year and a half ago two factors came together that resulted in a unique career ladder concept within North Carolina's Department of Mental Health. One of these is the enormous expansion of mental health services in recent years which has magnified the already acute shortage of personnel. Everyone has recognized that many of the time-consuming tasks being performed by professional workers could be performed by qualified people with less educational background, but this category of employee is also limited. At the same time, the Department became aware that the attendants in state mental hospitals felt that not enough was being done to provide for their upgrading. (These turned out to be rather remarkable people, and we will say more about them later.) As a result of these two elements--a need for trained people and people who wanted to be trained--the Department of Mental Health has arranged with institutions of higher education within the state to establish a career ladder training program that will involve all levels of manpower from the attendant trainee to the graduate student.

The first step in building the program will be to do a preliminary functional job description of subprofessional entry-level positions and a detailed job description of all mental health employees, plus comprehensive analysis of the needs of subprofessional personnel; the mental health personnel system and the state personnel system programs, policies, and practices; education and training resources, staff, faculty, and curricula; education and training problems of educators; and recruitment problems within existing state programs. For this purpose, a survey is being made of 100 attendants at each of four hospitals.

Before job descriptions can be redefined and a statewide educational program instituted, a functional job analysis of the system must be completed. The job analysis will be conducted through

interviews with the subprofessional employee in his working environment. The supervisor, unit nurse, psychologist, social worker, psychiatrist, and a representative from the administration will be interviewed, in addition to the subprofessional personnel. Sample questions include: What jobs are being carried out by the attendant? Should he be doing these tasks? Does he need additional training? If , what type? Should he be working at other tasks and should he perform tasks he is currently carrying out? An important part of this interview is a request for recommendations on how this person should be prepared for his job.

The survey is organized along various major task areas: physical care of patient, care of the ward, transporting and transferring patients, medical care of patients, making reports, observing patients, controlling patients, and working with other staff. Each task is grouped into a number of component parts; for example, physical (nonmedical) care of the patient--routine bath: undressing patients; transferring to bathrooms/wheelchairs; lifting; carrying patients; restraining; preparation of water--temperature and amount; placement of patient; washing patient; use of deodorants and disinfectants; checking for sores, skin conditions, blood; drying patient; issuing clothes; dressing patient, and so forth.

There will be a number of basic items brought out on each of the component parts under the major task of "physical care of the patient": purpose and consequence, instruction, standards, time, and skills and knowledge. The staff meets with the attendants in groups of eight to ten, with three interviewers working with the attendants in a group and as individuals. Representation was based on shifts--evening, day, and night--and cross-references were deliberate in order to have a breakdown on age, sex, race, longevity as an aide-attendant, length of time in other positions, and educational stratification. Each part is integrated to provide a comprehensive sample of the various types of employees in the aide-attendant classification.

The tasks were pulled together into a task-cluster description summarizing the 200 responses in the pilot survey, which was done at Dix and Cherry hospitals. There will be 400 responses from the over-all survey for the statewide study.

The attendant interviews are recorded on a form. Four other forms are being used which cover: the task-cluster description, the job task summary, the level of effort, and the decision-making and types of choice. A criterion sheet is given the attendant for his use in rating the decision-making opportunities, time required for the task, difficulty of the task, and importance and satisfaction of completing the task. In answering these questions, the

attendant has an opportunity to express himself completely and freely. It is emphasized that these sheets should be returned unsigned and that the interviews are confidential. Thus, the attendants are openly expressing themselves.

When the over-all task clusters at each institution are complete, a series of conferences will be scheduled to discuss the results of the composite interviews. The conference group will be composed of one representative from each discipline within the hospital and three from the aide-attendant group. From this conference should come the factoring of the basic job descriptions into which the aide attendant can be fitted at a new level with built-in advancement possibilities. There will be approximately five steps in the new classification of the mental health assistant, which is how the attendant will be designated under the new system.

Some of the general responses to the interviews are of special interest. The attendants are not greatly concerned, at least verbally, with salary at this point. The major complaint is that there is no chief aide-attendant with whom they can discuss problems. Even the U.S. Army recognized this necessity during the early phases of the Vietnam War by appointing a top enlisted man to an office in the Pentagon. The aides do not want a nurse nor anyone who is now in the hierarchical structure of the hospital for consultation purposes. Currently, they must go to a professional person to ventilate their opinions and discuss their problems, and they feel their views are being short-circuited. Their problems are personal, marital, and financial, and they would like someone who is independent of the power structure to discuss these with. This is one product of the survey, and the recommendation is that the request be honored and an effort made in this direction.

The survey detected that the attendants have a strong sense of group identity. This is a large and potentially powerful group (3,652 out of 7,631 Department of Mental Health employees). However, they do not realize this fact. They have a deep dedication to patient care, which somewhat surprised us; they are concerned about possibly hurting the patient and want additional knowledge to provide better care for their patients.

This is a genuine desire for more education and training. One aide told about being in charge of the admitting ward and having less than a week's experience when five deputy sheriffs brought a patient in for admission. His account: "These five deputies came in with a patient in handcuffs. They had blackjacks and pistols on their hips, and this guy had beaten hell out of four of them. They took the handcuffs off, pushed him into the room, and said, 'Here he is, he's yours.' Now what am I going to do! I don't have anything in here with me but my hands and these five burly men pushed

this guy in and said, 'Here he is, he's yours.'"

When asked how he reacted to this, he said, "I looked at him, he looked at me, I looked at him, he looked at me, and I said, 'Ah, sir, would you like to get up and go downstairs?' and the man did."

Another attendant said that when you are standing in front of a patient who is 6'2"--215 pounds, holding a chair in his hand and you are alone, there "ain't no time for no therapeutic group conferences."

These are self-taught reactions to an employment situation which these people have developed into learning experiences by themselves, yet they are concerned about hurting the patient! And we ask if these people would take an educational program! They would; they want to know more.

Three major areas have emerged from this survey; however, final judgment must not be made until complete verifications have been made. Discrimination based on racial characteristics is present, but in the area of rule-breaking and not so much in prestige or privilege-granting. It is felt, and this has been documented on a provisional basis, that rule-breaking is dealt with more harshly for the black aide than for the white aide. When the employees are on the same personnel level, the black aide is given tasks to which the white aide is not assigned.

The second major area of concern is communications. Until a few months ago, the attendants felt that communications were quite poor. This is improving, but at a price. Inconsistency in policy from unit to unit becomes especially observable at the aide representative meetings, with their new opportunities for exchange of ideas and concepts, and dissatisfaction will be a problem until the application of policies is consistent. The Department of Mental Health received a vote of confidence from the attendants because it is attempting to establish better communications.

To use a hip phrase, the aides are "turned on." They strongly support programs for their upgrading. They are beginning to develop an identity with the Department of Mental Health through the survey project, for they feel that something concrete is now being done for them. They are interested not only in the survey, but also in what comes out of it in terms of results. They are "turned on"; therefore, we must respond or they may resort to strikes and other measures to vent their frustrations.

The training program that has been devised to meet these needs has several phases:

I. The training educational thrust during this period will be structured around courses taken from junior college and technical school curricula. These will cover the general education field, but the type of course offered will be determined by the specialized need of the particular institutions and its personnel. The aim is to increase occupational competence. However, the courses will carry collegiate credit and will be applicable toward an associate degree, thus giving the aide-attendant a mechanism to move up.

II. The second phase of the program will permit the attendant who has the initiative to enroll in the regular associate degree program of the community college. Simultaneously, the graduates from the two-year mental health curricula will be brought into the system. The educational activities will be conducted at the local mental health institution. As he achieves intermediate plateaus, the employee will be eligible for job reclassification and should receive salary benefits, and when he finishes this level of training, he can move into phase III.

III. Graduates of associate degree programs in mental health and transfer students from related programs can pursue the baccalaureate level of training with phase III of the career ladder program. Students will receive full credit for previous work toward a degree in mental health. The program of study will give the student an opportunity for professional advancement through a recognized academic program that fosters both greater applied skills and higher command of theory. Graduates completing this training phase will have an opportunity to enter phase IV.

IV. Advanced training in the field of mental health is needed to provide a new reservoir of graduate manpower recruited from within the mental health ranks. Many of the people who undertake graduate training in this area will have moved up the career ladder from the attendant level through an associate degree, baccalaureate, and into a master's degree program. Full acceptance of credits earned through this progression will be guaranteed, and opportunity for part-time employment while working for the degree should be afforded.

The representatives of the Department of Mental Health must ask some basic questions about our nonprofessional employees:

- (1) From what source will funds be derived for salary increases for the aide who qualifies for a higher position?
- (2) As he finishes each educational step, what positions will be available for the attendant to move into?

- (3) How will the unit be covered while the attendant is in class?
- (4) Do you mind losing some of your better attendants when they complete their education, for many will receive offers of higher-paying positions?
- (5) What steps are you as a chief administrative officer taking to assure the acceptance of this person by your professional staff?

These are questions the staff must come to grips with and resolve locally and statewide if a program like this is to succeed.

The Division of Community Colleges of the North Carolina Board of Education, the individual community colleges, the technical schools, the Board of Higher Education, and the individual senior colleges and universities have been contacted and have agreed to participate in this educational venture. The State Personnel Department is involved in the planning and has been apprised of each activity in the job analysis, and representatives from that department will participate in the conference covering the program of job analysis.

The career ladder program provides a twofold benefit for the North Carolina Department of Mental Health and the nation. It is a means of meeting employee demands currently being articulated through protest and passive-resistance campaigns, for it provides an avenue for advancement and financial rewards, and it restores to the individual, through his work status, his sense of dignity and worth. It will also provide for the rapid delivery of high-quality health care to the patient, for he is receiving competent care from someone who is trained as a "people worker" and not from a stop-gap employee thrown into the system to fill critical personnel needs on an ad hoc basis.

# *Some Observations on Personnel Ideas and Practices*

JEAN COUTURIER

Executive Director  
National Civil Service League  
Washington, D. C.

The dialogue in the small-group discussions during the workshop on "Public Personnel Management and the Disadvantaged" centered on several major areas. One dealt with the whole problem of the "lock-out" of the disadvantaged in the public service. The discussion here concentrated on what can be done in adjusting and ameliorating the personnel system. Job analysis, position reclassification, or restructuring of positions--depending upon where one stands in the generation gap--was analyzed. Obviously different words are used to mean the same thing.

A second area of discussion related to the changing of job requirements. There were differing views as to whether personnel standards should be lowered or whether the need is to make the standards more rational and realistic.

Outreach measures in recruiting the disadvantaged were also mentioned. Whether public employers should reach into the local communities--using the churches and administering tests in the communities and other means of mobile recruiting--was argued. Still other areas of concern dealt with the selection process, educational requirements, and the testing program. Whether written tests are valid or invalid and whether performance tests are more meaningful were areas of concern. The use of a probationary period as a form of testing and the training period as a form of job qualification were other considerations.

The discussion dealing with training and job development seemed to assume incompetence on the part of the poor. However, the fairly extensive studies of this nature by the National Civil Service League reveal some significant facts. First, one of the fundamental problems is underemployment. This means that the concern in part should be about people who are employed and employable. There are, of course, hard-core unemployables who need special kinds

of training, but giving people with ability the opportunity to use it is the critical issue.

A second finding of the National League studies is that the educational level in the ghetto is the same as in the society at large. In other words, a twelfth-grade education is the average level of education in the American ghetto.

Another fact concerns education vis-a-vis pay in particular places. Evidence seems to be that a year of high school education adds about \$1.50 a week to the paycheck of a worker in the ghetto. For the worker who lives elsewhere, some \$22.00 a week is added to the weekly earnings for the same level of education. In seven out of ten ghettos, one year of college adds nothing to the paycheck of the person who lives there. If education has no economic value, how are the young people from the disadvantaged group going to be motivated to remain in school? Some of the youngsters may conclude, "I'd better get out in the street now and get what I can while I can, however I can."

Another topic of broad discussion in the small-group sessions dealt with systematic change. The studies tend to reinforce some of our preconceptions. The assumption is that there would be little need for drastic changes in the civil service and merit system laws throughout the United States. This assumption has not been documented, however. Almost uniformly the consensus in small-group discussions is that there is no need for change in the law itself. More important, there is a need for change in attitudes. There is not even a need for change in the detailed civil service regulations or major changes in stated personnel policies. In this connection, the discussion deals with training, job requirements, job restructuring, reclassification of positions, and recruitment outreach. In point of fact, some areas of personnel regulation probably do need some attention.

Still another barrier is the concept of the rule of one or the rule of three. In most jurisdictions the rule of five is used. Newly recruited employees must be taken from near the top of the list. More recent proposals involve a pass-fail or qualified and highly qualified categories, so that people are not rated by minor decimal points.

Another issue in terms of systematic change is the problem of lateral entry. This policy is seldom discussed when the interest is mostly about lower-level jobs. Yet lateral entry deserves careful consideration. Closed systems that prohibit entry from outside the system at anything but the lower levels should be opened up. Also, the concept of the closed promotional system prevails in most of our civil service systems. The policy is that promotional

opportunities are reserved for insiders. Opportunities to move from one agency to another--to "transfuse talent"--should also be available. In many public jurisdictions, the employee is locked into a closed system. He cannot move to another agency within his government.

In summary, the small groups discussed a wide range of barriers relating to the employment of the disadvantaged. In some instances the artificial barriers can be changed without additional funds, without major changes in laws and regulations, and without drastic changes in policy statements. A most important need is for public employers to accept the need to recruit and train disadvantaged people for government positions. The challenge is to enlarge job opportunities for the disadvantaged in government without lowering necessary job standards.

C. E. Adams  
Assistant Chief of Police  
Charlotte, North Carolina

Cloyce B. Alford  
Highway Personnel Officer  
Highway Commission  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Robert L. Andrews  
Personnel Officer  
State Board of Education  
Raleigh, North Carolina

\*Arnold Aspden  
Personnel Director  
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

T. L. Barnett  
Rehabilitation Supervisor  
Department of Correction  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Edgar L. Bass, Jr.  
Assistant Business Manager  
Greenville, North Carolina

Harvey B. Beard  
Chairman  
Civil Service Commission  
High Point, North Carolina

D. E. Benton  
Director of Finance  
Rocky Mount, North Carolina

Walter Black  
Chief  
Charlotte Fire Department  
Charlotte, North Carolina

Mrs. Etta Bradley  
New Careers Project Director  
Southern Pines, North Carolina

A. W. Britt  
City Employee  
Lumberton, North Carolina

Bill Britt  
Town Manager  
Carrboro, North Carolina

C. T. Brown  
Civil Service Chairman  
Charlotte, North Carolina

Lew Brown  
Budget Officer  
Durham, North Carolina

T. K. Bruce  
Assistant Director  
Department of Water Resources  
Durham, North Carolina

R. L. Bunn  
Personnel and Training  
Raleigh Police Department  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Judy J. Burgess  
Personnel Assistant  
State Board of Health  
Raleigh, North Carolina

T. S. Burgess  
Personnel Officer  
Durham, North Carolina

Robert M. Burns  
Chief Field Coordination  
MA-U.S. Department of Labor  
Washington, D.C.

Ronnie Byers  
Graduate Student, MPA Program  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Claude Caldwell  
Personnel Director  
State of North Carolina  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Ralph Campbell, Sr.  
Director, New Careers  
Kaleigh, North Carolina

## ROSTER OF PARTICIPANTS

Doris Canada  
Personnel Officer  
A & T State University  
Greensboro, North Carolina

William H. Cape  
Visiting Professor  
Institute of Government  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Albert C. Capehart, Jr.  
Director, New Careers  
Operation Breakthrough  
Durham, North Carolina

R. N. Carroll  
Raleigh Police Sergeant  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Roy Cashion  
Department of Motor Vehicles  
Raleigh, North Carolina

\*J. Levonne Chambers  
Attorney  
Charlotte, North Carolina

Ross B. Cheairs, Jr.  
Manpower Development Specialist  
U.S. Department of Labor  
Atlanta, Georgia

David Chesson  
Personnel Technician  
Cherry Hospital  
Goldsboro, North Carolina

Robert H. Choate  
Personnel Officer  
Western Carolina Center  
Morganton, North Carolina

\*Morris Cohen  
Associate Professor  
School of Social Work  
University of North Carolina

Joseph Collins  
U.S. Department of Labor  
Washington, D.C.

Joseph W. Collins, Jr.  
Assistant Chief, Special  
Manpower Problems Research  
U.S. Department of Labor  
Washington, D.C.

\*Milford L. Coor, Jr.  
Program Associate  
National Civil Service League  
Washington, D.C.

Jean J. Couturier  
Executive Director  
National Civil Service League  
Washington, D.C.

Ruth B. Cowan  
Personnel Director  
Greensboro, North Carolina

Paul Crim  
Fire Chief  
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Betsy Crone  
National Civil Service League  
Washington, D.C.

George Culbreth  
Personnel Officer  
Cherry Hospital  
Goldsboro, North Carolina

E. Allen Culverhouse  
Personnel Director  
Virginia Beach, Virginia

John E. Damerel  
Director of Personnel  
Richmond, Virginia

Rita Dean  
Administrative Assistant  
National Civil Service League  
Washington, D.C.

Jean Deter  
Graduate Student, MPA Program  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Troy B. Dodson  
Highway Personnel Officer  
State Highway Commission  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Bob Dominick  
Assistant Personnel Officer  
North Carolina Department of Mental  
Health  
Raleigh, North Carolina

\*E. Clark Edwards  
Personnel Officer  
State Board of Health  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Dan Eller  
Assistant to the Manager  
Gastonia, North Carolina

Gerald Elston  
Deputy Director  
Charlotte, North Carolina

\*George H. Esser  
Program Adviser for the South  
The Ford Foundation

Gordon B. Fearing  
State Personnel Department  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Robert L. Ferguson  
New Careers  
Durham, North Carolina

Tom Fisher  
Good Neighbor Council  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Charles O. Forbis  
Acting Personnel Director  
Guilford County  
Greensboro, North Carolina

\*James C. French  
Personnel Director  
Durham, North Carolina

Robert A. Geeter  
University Research Corporation  
Washington, D.C.

R. T. Geile  
Assistant Personnel Director  
North Carolina State University  
Raleigh, North Carolina

J. S. Grissom  
Personnel Officer  
N.C. Revenue Department  
Raleigh, North Carolina

John Griswold  
Assistant Personnel Officer  
State Board of Health  
Raleigh, North Carolina

\*Frank Hall  
Personnel Officer  
Department of Correction  
Raleigh, North Carolina

E. J. Hamlin  
Director, Administrative  
Services  
State Department of Social  
Services  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Grace M. Hartzog  
Personnel Officer  
State Dept. of Social Services  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Donald Hayman  
Assistant Director  
Institute of Government  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

David L. Haywood  
Project Manager  
Wake County Opportunities, Inc.  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Alvin H. Hill  
Project Director  
Coastal New Careers Project  
New Bern, North Carolina

Mrs. Grace T. Hodges  
New Careers Director  
Guilford County  
Greensboro, North Carolina

Wayne Horn  
City Employee  
Lumberton, North Carolina

W. Calvin Horton  
Personnel Technician  
Charlotte, North Carolina

Mrs. June Ingram  
Associate Director  
New Careers  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Phyllis Inman  
Project Director  
New Careers  
Robeson County

William Janssen  
Graduate Student, MPA Program  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Gloria Johnson  
Personnel Director  
St. Augustine College  
Raleigh, North Carolina

J. P. Johnson  
Assistant Personnel Officer  
State Board of Health  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Howard A. Jones  
Personnel Director  
Shelby, North Carolina

Captain R. E. Keith  
Training Officer  
Raleigh Fire Department  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Preston Kennedy  
Manpower Corporation  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Paul B. Kennedy  
U.S. Department of Labor  
Raleigh, North Carolina

John Knight  
Personnel Director  
Burlington, North Carolina

Ben Kootsher  
Assistant Director  
Charlotte, North Carolina

C. Oral Lambert, Jr.  
General Services Director  
Virginia Beach, Virginia

C. Norman Larkin  
Manpower Development Specialist  
U.S. Department of Labor

David Larson  
Graduate Student, MPA Program  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Mrs. Alya P. Little  
Personnel Assistant  
Durham, North Carolina

Chief Everette Lloyd  
Chapel Hill Fire Department  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Annie Loftin  
Counselor, New Careers  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Reginald D. Luper  
Personnel Analyst  
Forsyth County  
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

L. L. McDaniel  
Assistant City Manager  
Fayetteville, North Carolina

James W. McGinnis  
Director, Religious and Moral  
Training  
N.C. Board of Juvenile Correction  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Larry N. McGinnis  
Personnel Director  
Monroe, North Carolina

Denny McGuire  
Graduate Student, MPA Program  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Martin M. Mackie  
Administrative Assistant  
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Edward Macrae  
Employment Services Representative  
N.C. Employment Security Commission  
Raleigh, North Carolina

George Marshall  
Youth Director  
New Careers  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Hoyle Martin  
Executive Director  
Concentrated Employment Program  
Charlotte, North Carolina

Francis P. Matthews  
Assistant Business Manager  
O'Berry Center  
Goldsboro, North Carolina

\*Boyce Medlin  
N.C. Good Neighbor Council  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Garland T. Mitchell, Jr.  
Assistant Personnel Director  
Durham, North Carolina

H. L. Mitchell  
New Careers Director, EIC  
Edenton, North Carolina

James L. Moncrief  
Director of Career Programs  
Department of Mental Health  
Raleigh, North Carolina

R. F. Moore  
Sanitation Superintendent  
Burlington, North Carolina

J. P. Noble  
Administrator  
Reynolds Memorial Hospital  
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Robert Noe  
Graduate Student  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Al Page  
Personnel Officer  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Philip K. Powell  
Personnel Officer  
N.C. Department of Agriculture  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Julian B. Prosser  
Administrative Intern  
Asheville, North Carolina

Janet B. Pruitt  
Personnel Technician  
State Department of Social Services  
Raleigh, North Carolina

G. W. Ray  
City Manager  
Fayetteville, North Carolina

Ray Respass  
Personnel Officer  
Kinston, North Carolina

Dr. Bob Rollins  
Superintendent  
Dorothea Dix Hospital  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Larry Rose  
Graduate Student, MPA Program  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

C. G. Rosemond, Jr.  
Director of Training  
Durham Police Department  
Durham, North Carolina

\*Charlie B. Shapard  
Personnel Director  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Randal H. Shields  
Director  
New Careers  
Andrews, North Carolina

John Smith  
Administrative Assistant  
Wilson, North Carolina

Joseph F. Snider  
Secretary  
High Point Civil Service Commission  
High Point, North Carolina

F. E. Spellman  
Manpower Director, EIC  
Edenton, North Carolina

David Stephenson  
Graduate Student, MPA Program  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Mrs. Louise Thomas  
Assistant Personnel Officer  
John Umstead Hospital  
Butner, North Carolina

W. W. Tillman  
Personnel Officer  
John Umstead Hospital  
Butner, North Carolina

W. L. Tunstall  
Personnel Officer  
Murdoch Center  
Butner, North Carolina

\*Frank Turner  
Training Development Coordinator  
N.C. State Personnel Department  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Rita Valeo  
U.S. Department of Labor  
Washington, D.C.

Marianne Wachtel  
State Placement Officer  
North Carolina State University  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Malchus Watlington  
Graduate Student, MPA Program  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Kathy H. Watson  
Personnel Technician  
State Department of Social  
Services  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Richard Webster  
Personnel Technician  
Charlotte, North Carolina

John W. Whitener  
Personnel Officer  
Broughton Hospital  
Morganton, North Carolina

R. B. Whittington  
New Careers Director  
Green Lamp, Inc.  
Kinston, North Carolina

Ernest V. Wilkie  
Assistant Fire Chief  
Durham, North Carolina

Wylie Williams  
Graduate Student, MPA Program  
University of North Carolina  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Carl D. Wills  
Director Public Works  
High Point, North Carolina

James Wilson  
Director  
Model Cities  
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Leonard Wilson  
Supervisor  
Chavis Heights Center  
Raleigh, North Carolina

J. Ronald Wolfe  
Personnel Analyst  
State Highway Commission  
Raleigh, North Carolina

Susan Womble  
Personnel Officer  
Employment Security Commission  
Raleigh, North Carolina

\* Speaker or Discussion Leader

Program Planning Committee

Claude Caldwell, North Carolina State Personnel Director, Raleigh

William H. Cape, Institute of Government, Chapel Hill

Milford L. Coor, Jr., Program Associate, National Civil Service  
League, Washington, D.C.

Albert Capehart, New Careers, Operation Breakthrough, Durham

Donald Hayman, Institute of Government, Chapel Hill

Jimmy Keck, Director of On-the-Job Training Program, Department of  
Local Affairs, Raleigh

Dorothy Kiester, Institute of Government, Chapel Hill

Boyce Medlin, Good Neighbor Council, Raleigh

Robert Peck, Town Manager, Chapel Hill

Charlie B. Shapard, Personnel Director, Raleigh

Charles Turner, Piedmont Council of Governments, Charlotte

Richard Woodward, Human Relations Council, Durham

THE INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT, an integral part of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, is devoted to training and research in the fields of state and local government.

Since 1931 the Institute has been conducting schools and short courses for city, county, and state officials. Through guidebooks, special bulletins, and a monthly magazine, the research findings of the Institute are made available to thousands of other officials throughout the state.

The Legislative Service of the Institute records daily the activities of the North Carolina General Assembly while it is in session, both for members of the General Assembly and for other state and local officials who need to follow the course of legislative events.

Over the years the Institute has served as the research agency for many study commissions of the state and local governments.