ABSTRACT
        A study investigated the nature of communication
related to the Individual Program Planning (IPP) client servicing
system at a rehabilitative vocational training research institute.
Respondents included family members, staff, and other professionals
who work on IPP teams. The questionnaire measured respondent
attitudes toward the frequency, completeness, understandability,
usefulness, and formality of communication; preferences for
communication types, formality, and frequency; and understanding of
the IPP process. Results showed overall uncertainty as to the
adequacy of IPP-related communication. Problem areas were confusion
resulting from team member changes; definition of team member
responsibilities; comprehensibility and completeness in conference
setting; knowledge of function of general referral form; frequency of
meetings and telephone calls; completeness of memo information;
general outlook of communication; and team member awareness of
clients' status in other environments. Meetings and telephone
communication were the most preferred methods of communication.
Slight preference was given to informal communication. (Appendixes,
amounting to almost one-half of the report, include tables, responses
to open-ended questions, and the instrument.) (YLB)

ED289028

AN INVESTIGATION INTO TEAM MEMBER PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNICATION

IN THE INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM PLANNING SYSTEM

AT THE VOCATIONAL AND REHABILITATION RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Ted Hermary

Research Assistant

The Vocational and Rehabilitation Research Institute
Calgary, Alberta

October, 1987

Running Head: IPP AND COMMUNICATION

Key Words: Individual Program Plan
Communication

CE049186

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Since **any** project of this magnitude could never be completed singlehandedly, acknowledgements are certainly in order. I wish to extend my deep appreciation to Bonnie LeVangie for her encouragement, patience, and sound advice; to Phyllis Parker and Terri Zander for their important work in processing and formatting this report; to Edith Voszler for her help in the final typing and revising; and of course, to all I.P.P. team members who participated in the survey, without whom this report would not be possible.

Abstract

Survey research was carried out at a rehabilitative vocational training research institute. The purpose of the study was to investigate the nature of communication which was related to the Individual Program Planning (I.P.P.) client servicing system in place at the institute. The potential respondents (257 total) included family members, staff, and other professionals, who work together on I.P.P. teams. Of the 257 individuals approached, 120 responded. The questionnaire used in the survey includes measurements of respondent attitudes toward the frequency, completeness, understandability, usefulness, and formality of communication. Questionnaire items were also used to determine preferences of respondents for communication types, formality and frequency, as well as to determine respondent understanding of the I.P.P. process. Comments, suggestions and elaborations from respondents supplemented the predesigned measures. Results show overall uncertainty as to the adequacy of I.P.P. related communication. Problem areas (i.e., where evaluations are mixed or negative) include: confusion resulting from team member changes, and definition of team member responsibilities; comprehensibility and completeness in the conference setting, as well as the raising of new material; knowledge of the function of the general referral form; frequency of meetings and telephone calls; completeness of memo information; the general outlook of communication; and team member awareness of clients' status in non-V.R.R.I. environments. Meetings and telephone communication were nearly equal in being the most preferred method of

communication. Slight preference was given to informal communication although formal and informal communication were preferred almost equally; preferences indicated that formal communication should occur once or less a month, whereas informal communication should occur once or more a month. Throughout the results section, I also discuss important differences between responses from "internal" (staff) and "external" (non-staff) team members. Finally, recommendations and supportive results were presented to front line staff, and obtained feedback is recorded here.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

6

List of Tables

List of Appendices

I.   INTRODUCTION

The Individual Program Plan (I.P.P.) system is the method of client servicing in place at The Vocational and Rehabilitation Research Institute. As established by the Individual Program Plan (IPP) Information Package (LeVangie & Ward, 1987), the I.P.P. system -- adopted by The V.R.R.I. in October, 1983 -- is one which "[utilizes] the least restrictive environment [to] provide the client with services to maximize his [or her] potential for independence" (p.4). Additionally, "an INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM will assist the client to achieve measurable and obtainable GOALS AND OBJECTIVES" (p.4); the information package specifies that the team shall include the client (and/or his or her representative) as well as relevant individuals from the following disciplines: residential training, recreation (formerly leisure), social education, and vocational training or placement. The team may also include: medical professionals, representatives from other (external) agencies, relevant family members, guardians, consultants, and citizens' advocates. A representation of client movement within the I.P.P. system is shown in Figure 1 (p. 2).

In August of 1985, an evaluation of the I.P.P. system was undertaken (LeVangie, 1985). Within the report, communication among I.P.P. team members (TM's) was cited as important for the effectiveness of the I.P.P. system. For example, three of the recommendations (pp. 33-34) were that:

Figure 1. Client Movement in The IPP Process *

START

↓

Intake and Assessment –
Client's functioning level
over all domains is
established

↓

Intake Conference –
Long term goal and short term
goals/objectives established

↓

Follow Up –
by the appropriate staff
for a specified period

↓

IPP Review –
held every six months to update
on the individual's progress and
to modify individual training
program if necessary

↓

Annual IPP Conference –
new short term goals are established,
with reference to long term goal

↓

Exit IPP Conference –
held once the client has reached
the long term goal and is ready
to leave the program

↓

STOP

---

* Adapted from Levangie and Ward, 1987.

1. A follow-up system should be designed for I.P.P., such that all team members are informed of the status of conference goals, objectives, and recommendations.

2. There should be a person (or group) responsible for communicating global client needs to management personnel.

3. Lines of communication between all departments and levels of management could be cleared, so that I.P.P.-related information would flow more efficiently between team members, resulting in a more interdisciplinary team approach.

In addition to these recommendations, the very definition of I.P.P. procedure -- especially the cooperative team approach to serving clients -- implies the crucial function of effective communication. Despite the central role played by communication, detailed knowledge of its character in the V.R.R.I.-I.P.P. context is, where it exists at all, very limited. This lack of knowledge suggested that a fuller understanding of communication and related concerns was needed. In order to acquire this better understanding, a survey was undertaken

II. METHODOLOGY

A. Informal Interviews

Largely as a means for developing questionnaire items, unstructured and informal interviews were conducted with I.P.P. team members (TM's), to ascertain what they felt to be important

issues and concerns with the I.P.P. method and communication.
Interviews were very open and -- aside from an introduction of
the interviewer and an explanation of the general purpose of the
interviews -- they essentially consisted of a single question,
namely, "What do you feel are the important concerns or issues of
I.P.P., in the way of communication?"

With an aim to having breadth and diversity in the sample,
interviews were planned for staff members (6), clients (2),
external agencies (2), and one family member.[1] Names of staff
who were to be interviewed were drawn from The V.R.R.I. phone
list; managerial and front line staff were involved and
representation included vocational, residential, social work, and
social education units. External agencies were selected from a
list of agencies which are currently involved with I.P.P. at The
V.R.R.I. Clients and family members were chosen who would very
likely be articulate, interested, and willing to discuss their
feelings and observations. Consultation with the I.P.P.
researcher and chairperson helped to reduce the list of potential
interviewees to its eventual size and composition.

Of the eleven potential interviewees, only two (one staff
and one external agency representative) could not be contacted.
Of those who were contacted, all consented to an interview. All
but one interview (the one with the family member) were carried
out in person, one being conducted via telephone. Approximate
interview length ranged from 20 to 85 minutes.

B.   **The Survey**

   1.   **Sampling**

   Team members (TM's) were considered as three
subpopulations: "internal" TM's (staff), "external" TM's
(non-staff), and clients. Internal TM's were further classified
as staff from the following units: Residential, Vocational,
Social Work, Social Education, the Program Resource Team,
Recreation, Employment Program, and Health Services. For
external TM's, subclassification produced categories of:
parents, siblings, guardians, advocates, client service
co-ordinators, professionals at external agencies, client
representatives and (residence) proprietors.[2] The I.P.P.
chairperson was also surveyed. With the assumption that the two
major sub-populations differed markedly in certain
characteristics,[3] it was decided that the survey would demand two
different questionnaires (see section 2) and, correspondingly,
two different sampling procedures.

   In the case of the internal TM's, potential respondents
(both front-line and management staff) were identified by way of
the Day Training and Residential monthly staff statistics (June,
1986). Part-time employees -- who would be only superficially
involved in I.P.P. -- and staff who had terminated employment
were not included in the sample. Since the size of the resultant
population (a total of 103) was not unwieldy, a survey of all of
the internal TM's was a reasonable course of action. Proportions

in which the various service units were represented are indicated by the figures in the totals column in Table 1.

In the case of the external TM's, conversely, a population survey was not feasible since their total number well-exceeded 350. Thus, a sample survey, which seemed the more reasonable approach, was undertaken. Because the particular relationship to the client held by an external TM (parent, guardian, etc.) would likely be an important factor in communication, random selection from within each of the various client-relationship categories was the most logical alternative, ensuring an opportunity for between-group comparisons.

Lists of external TM's were available to the researcher from V.R.R.I.'s Client Records Department, under the heading of "Interested Parties". It became clear that, for the purposes at hand, the general categories used for the "Interested Parties" list were somewhat inadequate as considerable numbers of parents and siblings were also involved as guardians. The researcher conjectured that having more than one type of relationship with the client could be significantly related to perceptions of communication; consequently, random selection was performed on the subcategories (e.g., parents versus parent-guardians) as if each were a separate interest category altogether.

When the necessary sampling operations had been completed, there were 154 potential survey respondents, present in the numbers shown in the total column of Table 2.

2. The Questionnaire Form

As mentioned in the previous section, differences between internal and external team members necessitated the development of two questionnaires.[4] The questionnaire (Appendix C) shows the questions from both forms, indicating where the two differed.

PART I of the questionnaire was aimed at gathering basic information on individual respondents: i.e., the nature of the client-respondent relationship, and whether or not they have had an orientation to I.P.P. PART II of the questionnaire dealt with TM perceptions of the I.P.P. system or, more specifically, TM knowledge of the same. (Accurate and complete knowledge of what is relevant to communicate, of course, is fundamental to effective and efficient communication in any organizational setting.)

PART III was designed to determine the respondents' attitudes and evaluations concerning the various kinds of I.P.P. communication. To accomplish this, the questions were clustered, firstly, according to the time and place of the communication, secondly, according to the mode of communication (telephone,

written, face-to-face), and thirdly, according to type and
frequency overall. As evaluative dimensions of communication,
the questionnaire considered utility, comprehensibility, rate,
intensity, importance, formality, completeness, relevance and
system flexibility. In the main, these dimensions were selected
from a comprehensive list of similiar criteria, from
Communication Yearbook 2 (Farace, Taylor, and Stewart, 1978, p.
276).

The method by which the information in PART III was sought
merits a brief discussion. For many of the questions, statements
were provided with which the respondents were to indicate their
agreement or disagreement, and the degree to which they agreed or
disagreed. Rather than using the orthodox numerical (Likert)
scale (where 1 = strongly agree, 2 = somewhat agree, etc.), the
researcher used the scaling method suggested by Payne (]·   .·
98). This method uses a scale of "Yes/yes/no/No" to offer
alternatives for expressing agreement or disagreement, indicating
a strong agreement (YES), a slight agreement (yes), a slight
disagreement (no), or a strong disagreement (NO).[5]

A second point concerning the opinion statements involves
their connotative difficulties. Since creating clearly defined
opinion statements necessitates establishing a positive or
negative stance on an issue, measures were taken to control for
the 'leading' qualities of the statements, with statements being
worded positively or negatively according to random assignment.[6]

17

PART IV of the questionnaire concerns the types and
frequency of communication overall. Here, "types" refers both to
the mode (e.g., telephone versus memos) of communication and the
level of formality. This section also re-addresses -- but in a
quantifiable way -- the issue of the rate of communication.

The outlook of communication is the theme of PART V. The
respondents were asked to evaluate the connotations of I.P.P.
communication in terms of optimism or pessimism. PART VI
investigates the level of interdepartmental awareness for I.P.P. team
members.

PART VII attends to the important yet controversial issue of
confidentiality as it relates to the information-sharing process.
Presumably, both confidentiality and information sharing are
priorities for all TM's. The particular wording of question 15 (#16
on the internal form) poses a dilemma, thereby evaluating the
relative importance of each for the respondent. By attempting to tap
into the interaction effect of confidentiality and information
sharing, the questionnaire more closely approximates real life
situations. The items for the confidentiality and
information-sharing section consisted of six statements which
advocated certain information sharing strategies under various
conditions. Respondents were instructed to indicate their agreement
with each statement, employing the YES/yes/no/NO scale (discussed
above).

Although one may refer to the actual questionnaire items, we may summarize the underlying structure of the confidentiality section. Three different levels of perceived confidentiality were included in the various statements: information which is confidential (statements a and b), information which is non-confidential (c and d), and information regardless of its confidentiality (e and f). In all cases, respondents were asked to imagine information such that it could help the client. Also, the statements can be subdivided according to whether the information is to be openly shared (statement a) or not openly shared (statements b-f). The latter of these subdivisions may be further broken down into those statements which advocate restricted or selective information sharing (b, d, f) versus those advocating unrestricted information sharing (c, e).[7]

PART VIII of the questionnaire is devoted to gathering final comments and suggestions by (1) inquiring into the respondents' satisfaction/dissatisfaction with the present state of communication between team members, with an opportunity to elaborate; (2) asking for any suggestions the respondent may have for improving communication; and (3) providing an opportunity for the respondent to raise topics or issues which they felt were not adequately dealt with (if at all) by the questionnaire.[8]

3.   Delivery of the Questionnaire

Basically, delivery was accomplished in one of two ways, contingent upon certain conditions.

1. For the "external" participants, the most time-efficient means available was that of a mail-out, mail-back approach. The research packages which were sent out included a cover letter explaining the purpose and procedure of the questionnaire (see Appendix D), the questionnaire form itself, and a stamped, self-addressed return envelope. Each of the questionnaires was given a three digit code which corresponded to a code recorded on the Interested Parties list, for the purposes of non-response control.

2. For The V.R.R.I. Day Training and Residential staff, the questionnaires were hand-delivered. Thus, cover letters were not needed for these participants. Questionnaires for these respondents were also coded as above.[9]

III. SURVEY RESULTS

In this section, I will first present the response rates for the survey, followed by a detailed examination of response content. In the case of response rates, it will be necessary to look at overall rates, as well as those for different TM subclassifications. In presenting the response content, I will proceed by question, according to the internal (the most complete) questionnaire form. In both cases, I will consider absolute differences in response frequencies, as well as whether or not these differences are statistically significant. In the latter case, the chi-square statistic will be used. Where total

results are analyzed (i.e., not distinguished by
internal/external or other divisions), statistical information
will usually be presented in corresponding tables. In other
cases, overall results are concise enough to be treated in the
text and, along with the statistical information, will be dealt
with there. Also, additional chi-square tests have been
performed where differences between responses from various
subclassifications appeared to be significant; statistical
information, in these cases, is also presented in the text.

It should also be noted that, as a rule, the results from
the YES/yes/no/NO scale were collapsed (dichotomized) before the
chi-square analysis was undertaken. This procedure, in addition
to simplifying interpretations of the results, permitted analysis
in cases where the detailed results would have provided
insufficient frequencies. Both the detailed and the dichotomized
results appear in the Tables section.

A.   Response/Non-Response Rates
As one means of placing the content of the survey responses
in a meaningful context, we should first examine the response
rate. For the survey sample as a whole, the response rate was
47%, with 120 of the 257 potential respondents returning the
questionnaire. For the external survey, the response rate was
31%, with 48 of the 154 questionnaires being returned.[10] The
internal TM response rate was 70% (72 of 103 surveys returned).

Thus, we note that the internal response rate was significantly higher (X^2 = 35.68, df = 1, p $\leq$ .001) than that for the external sample.

Looking more closely at the external response rates (summarized in Table 2) we notice that there is a great deal of variation between interest categories. This variation is especially great when considering the public guardian (the only one surveyed did not respond), the siblings (only a nine percent response rate), and the foster parent (one surveyed, one responded). Unfortunately, due to the small sample sizes for guardians, citizen's advocates, and client service coordinators, the response rate differences cannot be fully assessed. However, by collapsing the remaining categories (with parent/guardians and foster parents considered as "parents", and sibling/guardians grouped with "siblings") we may analyze at least some of the differences. Upon doing so, we find that the analyzed groups differ significantly in their response rates (p $\leq$ .01), due mainly to siblings' (14.29%) and proprietors' (16.67%) comparatively lower response rates.

Testing the hypothesis that response characteristics would be influenced significantly by the extent to which the respondent was associated with the client, the researcher controlled for whether the respondent was identified with the client in one or more than one way. Thus, response rates for parent/guardians and sibling/guardians

were collectively compared to the overall response rates for the remainder of the external respondents. Despite the fact that single-interest parties' response rate (42.42%) was greater than that for double-interest parties (28.10%), this difference is not a statistically significant one ($X^2 = 2.45$, df = 1).

Just as the external response rates were broken down according to interest category, a similar procedure was undertaken for the internal response rate data. As shown in Table 1, there was a slightly greater response rate by the Day Training (72.73%) versus the Residential (69.90%), but it is not a significant difference. A more profound response rate discrepancy appears when the figures for front line staff are compared to the response rates for Managers and Co-ordinators (including P.R.T., Social Education, Social Work, Employment Program, Support Staff). Front line staff shared a lower response rate (68.24%) as compared to Managers/Co-ordinators (87.50%). However, due to small group sizes, Chi Square analysis cannot be performed to evaluate statistical significance.

B.   Response Content

First, we may discuss the matter of the ratio of client-respondent involvement. For the external respondents, from Question 2, the mean number of clients with whom they are involved is one. However, the results range from those who report not being involved with any clients (4 respondents), to involvement with seven clients (1 respondent). A similar question (number two) on the internal form asked for the number of clients currently on the

respondent's caseload. Again, responses varied greatly (from 1 to 350 clients) with the average (mean) being about 24, and the median -- probably the best indicator in this instance -- being ten.11

1. I.P.P. Orientations

In order to discover the extent to which TM's were formally oriented to the I.P.P. system and TM's evaluations of the orientation, the followng two questions were asked "Have you received an orientation to I.P.P.?" and "Was this adequate or not?". We discovered that 53 (75%) of the internal respondents had orientations; with 40 (75%) of these reporting it was helpful. Also, 23 (50%) of the external respondents, reported having "an orientation" to I.P.P. It is unclear whether or not every respondent understood "orientation" as referring to an official I.P.P. orientation (versus, say, a brief orientating phone call)-- a possible explanation for the unexpected high numbers of external participants reporting orientation experience. Because of this apparent ambiguity, only internal TM responses can be safely used in further analyses involving Question 3.

Although a lower proportion of "oriented" external TM's is somewhat understandable (given that extensive attempts to regularly orient external TM's is only just beginning at the time of writing this report), non-oriented internal TM's pose a different problem. One reason for non-oriented internal TM's could be the length of time (i.e., insufficient for an orientation) that they have been staff at

the V.R.R.I. The only indicator to assist in this task is question
1(c), which asks how long the internal respondent has been in his or
her present position at the V.R.R.I.[12] When looking at the
non-oriented staff respondents as a group, we note that their tenure
ranges from two to 21 months (median time = 6.5 months) with four of
the 18 non-oriented respondents having held their current position
for at least one year. Eleven of them have been at the V.R.R.I. at
least six months. Thus, it is questionable as to whether length of
time employed is the most important factor influencing the
presence/absence of an orientation.

2.   The I.P.P. Concept

Question 4 was designed to check on TM definitions of I.P.P. by
asking "Please outline, briefly, your understanding of I.P.P." (see
Appendix B for transcribed responses). The model response to the
question, and thus one source of evaluative criteria, would
presumably touch on the three guiding principles of I.P.P., namely,
(1) the interdisciplinary/team approach, (2) client centredness, and
(3) the importance of accountability (identified by LeVangie and
Ward, 1987, p. 6). As well, on the basis of results, the researcher
planned to see whether or not respondents restricted the I.P.P.
system to the annual conference setting. Both internal and external
participants were most often correct in terms of the continuity
principle (67%), second-most in mentioning client centeredness (53%),
third-most in mentioning I.P.P.'s holistic outlook (45%), and least
often included 'accountability' into their written understanding of

I.P.P. (8%).13 Only five of the respondents explicitly demonstrated knowledge of all four I.P.P. principles (see asterisked responses in Appendix B). For each principle, internal TM's displayed a greater technical understanding than did external team members.

To test whether or not an orientation to I.P.P. would have an effect on the number of principles explicitly mentioned in responding to Question 4, the results were broken down according to the orientation variable (see Table 4). Only internal respondents were used, due to the possible ambiquity of the word 'orientation' as it appeared for external respondents. The results for accountability were again not used as they yielded insufficient cell sizes for statistical analyses. Contrary to the researcher's expectations, the "with orientation" group did not score dramatically higher on each part of the question; in fact, the differences in the scores between the two groups is non-significant.

3. General Concerns of Communication

. Designed to be responded to by all participants regardless of their specific roles in the I.P.P. process, Question 5 asked about general communication concerns. Respondents indicated their attitudes by agreeing or disagreeing with several statements. Results are presented first, in their most complete form (Table 5) and secondly, with responses collapsed (dichotomized) into sii ple "Yes" and "No" categories (Table 5(a)).

Results for Question 5 reveal that, as a whole, TM's sometimes feel confused due to changes in team membership (61%), genuinely feel part of their teams (67%), and feel that their comments and suggestions are valued as much as other team members' (87%). However, mixed feelings were reported overall with respect to how clearly the responsibilities of TM's are defined; the slight tendency for agreeing that they are, is not a significant one. Moreover, when one compares internal and external responses, significant differences exist as to the extent to which confusion occurs due to changing team members ($X^2 = 6.01$, df = 1, $p \leq .02$) and how much the respondent feels part of his or her I.P.P. team ($X^2 = 6.81$, df = 1, $p \leq .01$).

4. Annual Conferences

All of Question 6 was devoted to information about conferences. Twenty-seven (56%) of the external TM's indicated that they had attended a conference versus 14 (29%) who indicated they had not, while the remaining respondents did not answer. In the case of the internal TM's, 48 (67%) reported that they had attended a conference (24 or 33%, had not). Overall, then, 75 (63%) of all TM's have attended an annual conference. On the average (mean), external participants attended the last conferences six months prior to the survey (i.e., February, 1986). Internal respondents had attended a conference on the average 3 months prior (i.e., May, 1986).

Question 6c (parts i - x) sought respondent attitudes with respect to certain aspects of the conference itself by agreeing or

disagreeing with related statements (see Tables 6 and 6(a)).

According to the respondents, conferences are useful for them (94%),

are held often enough (77%), are well-organized (87%), do not try to

accomplish too much (71%), are neither too formal (79%) nor

jargon-filled (76%), and are focussed on the client or I.P.P. (77%).

The only aspect of the conference negatively evaluated by TM's was

comprehensibility (66%): according to respondents, there are some

things that go on at the conferences that not everybody understands.

The two remaining aspects -- comprehensiveness and whether or not new

material is raised -- showed mixed reports, with no significant

trends in either direction.

External team member's responses to Question 6c differ

significantly (df = 1, and $p \leq .01$ in all cases) in several respects

from the internal TM responses. In comparison to staff responses,

external TM's:

1. indicated more comprehensibility in the conference setting

but, as a group, provided mixed evaluations ($X^2 = 8.81$);

2. more often reported conferences as focussing on clients and

I.P.P.'s ($X^2 = 8.16$); and

3. were more likely to view conferences as too formal, but were

uncertain as a group ($X^2 = 7.10$).

In other parts of Question 6c, internal and external responses were

not significantly different.

Question 6d, investigating the level of perceived equality on the I.P.P. teams, found the results shown in Table 7. The results indicate that team members overall significantly agreed that all TM's share equally at the conferences. This result is especially due to the attitudes of the external TM's (X^2 = 6.15, df = 1, $p \leq .02$).[14] Reasons given for responding "NO" to Question 6(d) have been compiled in Appendix B.

5. <u>After the Conferences</u>

Question 7 looked at the events which are scheduled to regularly occur after the conference. Each of the four introductory questions (7A, B, C, and Dl) were intended as "screening" questions, such that only TM's who were familiar with these four kinds of after-conference forms would need to be questioned about them. Unfortunately, by screening with a question that asked about forms related to the <u>last</u> conference which the respondent had attended, potential comments are foregone both from respondents who are familiar with the forms in other ways and those whose conferences were too recent such that inadequate time had passed for the forms to be circulated. The consequence of using these screening questions is decreasing response rates for each after-the-conference section, as indicated in the results from the four introductory questions (see Table 8). When examining the results from these four sections then, it would be wise to recognize the shrinking sample size; this becomes especially important in the case of the Six Month Reviews.[15]

For four of the five major parts to Question 7, respondents were able to express their opinion on the "YES/yes/no/NO" scale. The results of this are summarized in Table 9 and 9(a). All scales dealing with the conference summaries (Part A) yielded positive evaluations from both internal and external respondents. The responses suggest that the summary is useful to the respondent (73%), important for the success of I.P.P. (95%), comprehensive (81%), and is not too formal (88%). One month I.P.P. follow-ups (Part B), similarly, were evaluated as useful (78%), not being too formal (95%), and as necessary for I.P.P.'s success (76%). For the sections on I.T.P. follow-ups (Part C) and on Six Month Reviews (Part D), significant and positive evaluations were given: both forms are regarded as useful (89% and 100%), necessary/important (86% and 100%), and not too formal (93% and 83%) (refer to Table 8a for figures and confidence levels on all parts of Question 7).

Comprehension of the general referral form's function was the subject of Question 7E. Quite stringent criteria were used to evaluate the responses and completeness of the response was necessary for coding it as 'correct'. In order to be considered 'correct', the response was required to mention that the general referral form was used

1. to implement changes to a clients' program, that

2. were not agreed upon at the conference, and

3. require the signature of other TM's in order to be realized.

Three (11%) of external TM's who responded to this question provided
responses which satisfied these three criteria. In the case of the
internal TM's, 38 (54%) provided "correct" answers.

6. Face-to-Face Meetings

Question 8 gathered information on face-to-face meetings that
had occurred in the year prior to administering the survey (between
July, 1985 and July 1986). Twelve (38%) of the external TM's and 57
(83%) of the internal TM's who responded to part A, reported having
face-to-face meetings during that time. Sixty-one of these
sixty-nine respondents indicated the approximate frequency with which
these meetings had occurred, as shown at the left of Table 10. Based
on these results, most meetings for internal and external TM's
occurred, at most, once per month.

Respondent attitudes toward past face-to-face meetings were
dealt with in part A as well, and the results of these scaled
questions are summarized in Tables 11 and 11(a). We note that,
despite differences in sample size and composition, the external and
internal TM groups were fairly comparable in their attitude-response
patterns. Unfortunately, due to insufficient external responses,
this comparability cannot be more accurately assessed. Overall, we
note that TM's find that the meetings are useful (70%), that they are
not too formal (94%), and that they are easy enough to set up (83%).
However, mixed feelings were evidenced with respect to meeting
frequency: as a group, TM's seem uncertain as to whether meetings
occur often enough or not.

Allowance was made in Question 8C for the respondent to indicate the general purpose of the face-to-face meetings. We may speak of both first-mentioned and total frequencies. For the internal group, the most common first response was "special concerns" (11 responses out of 54); however total frequencies placed "crises/behavioral difficulties/problems/problem solving" (16 of 97 responses) ahead of "special concerns". For the external TM's, the most common first responses were "information sharing/general discussion" and "special concerns", though each of these had only two responses (jointly representing 40% of the first-mentioned responses). The total external meeting-purpose responses show information sharing/general discussion as the leader (three responses). Additional purposes as expressed by both internal and external TM's (including their frequencies), as well as comments concerning meetings, are listed in Appendix B.

7. Telephone Communication

Question 9 probed for information from all respondents concerning telephone communication. Turning to the reported frequency of phone calls for all team members, we discover this distribution shown at the right of Table 10. The overall response distribution is quite flat and, in spite of the greater number of responses in the "twice a month" category, the difference is not a major one. In order to find real differences, we need to consider external and internal team members' responses separately. When we do, we find that the majority of phone calls for internal TM's

occurred at least twice a month, while in the case of external TM's
the majority occur, at the most, once per month.

Similar to the section on face-to-face meetings, respondent
attitudes to previous telephone communication they had produce the
results presented in Tables 12 and 12(a). As we note, both part 1
and part 3 -- i.e., usefulness to respondent, and importance to
I.P.P. -- yielded positive results. However, part two --
appropriateness of frequency -- indicated overall uncertainty as to
whether or not meetings occur often enough. As in the instance of
face-to-face meetings, general purposes for telephone communication
were recorded. All responses are reported in Appendix B but, again,
modal frequency for first-mentioned and overall responses should be
discussed here. "Updates" was most frequently the first-mentioned
purpose of telephone communication in both the external group (3 out
of 14 responses) and the internal group (18 out of 49 responses).
"Updates" also remained the most frequently cited purpose of
telephone communication when all the responses were considered; for
external respondents, though, "problems/behavioural
difficulties/crises" was cited just as often. Comments on the
Telephone Communication Section are reproduced in Appendix B.

8. Memos

Question 10 on memos was applicable only to the internal
respondents. Speaking in terms of the previous year, 46 staff TM's
(68%) recalled receiving a memo regarding clients and/or their

I.P.P.'s. As a means of communication, significantly more respondents
(34, or 79.07%) suggested in part B that they are about right as far
as communication formality goes, than that they are too formal or too
informal (X^2 = 40.03, df = 2, p $\leq$ .001). Fifty four percent (25
respondents) also felt that memos should be used as often as they are
being used at present, significantly more than those who preferred
them being used more or less often (X^2 = 13.09, df = 2, p $\leq$ .01).
Attitudinal scales [part A(i), A (ii)] provided statements about the
usefulness of memos ("memos are not very useful for me") and the
completeness/comprehensiveness of memoed information ("usually cover
all the important points"). For the former statement, 33 (78.57%) of
the respondents disagreed, indicating that memos are indeed a useful
means of communication (X^2 = 12.60, df = 1, p $\leq$ .001). However, mixed
feelings are evident in the results from the latter statement where
there were no significant differences between those who agreed (23
repondents, or 54.76%) versus those who disagreed (19, or 45.24% of
the respondents) that memo information is usually complete enough.

The main purposes of memos revealed varied responses. All of
them are listed in Appendix B, but it may be noted that simple
"information sharing" was the most frequently mentioned purpose --
both as a first-mentioned one (11, or 24.44% of the responses) and
overall (13, or 23%).

9. <u>Modes of Communication</u>

The results from Question 11 give an indication of respondents' prioritization of the different modes of communication.[16] To gain an overall picture, we may consider the average rank (1 high, 4 low) given to a particular means of communication, for external, internal and TM's overall (see Table 13).

Overall results do not clearly indicate which mode of communication is most preferred; the difference between the average ranks for telephone and meetings are very slight. This ambiguity is present in the internal TM preferences as well, but external TM's appear to prefer telephone communication most of all. In both the internal and the combined samples, Memos/Written Communication and "Other" modes, respectively, hold the third and fourth ranks. External respondents as a group, however, were more inclined to rank "written" communication as second.

10. <u>Formality and Frequency</u>

In Question 12, the respondents were asked for their preference as to the <u>formality</u> of communication. The results are shown in Table 14. These results suggest that there is a tendency in the direction of informal communication.[17] Reasons given by the respondents for their preferences for formality or informality of communication are shown in Appendix B.

Asking about how often formal and informal communication should occur (Question 13) yielded the results shown in Table 15. For both formal and informal communication, the overall results for the predesignated responses indicate that "once a month" is the most preferred frequency. This is particularly true in the case of informal communication where "once a month" is quite clearly preferred (25 of 97 responses) more than any other. For formal communication, on the other hand, the preference for "once a month" (29 of 95 responses) is not as clear, as 27 respondents indicated "less than once a month". Overall response patterns, then, indicate that for formal communication, this preference is for at most once a month (56 responses total), as opposed to informal communication where the general preference is for at least monthly communication (62 of 97 responses).

However, this brief of an analysis overlooks two important facts. Firstly, to consider only categories 1-5 blurs the considerable number of "other" responses -- indeed, accounting for more responses than any other category in the case of informal communication. Although all of the "other" responses to Question 13 are listed in Appendix B, we may note that "as necessary/as needed" was the response most often cited (for formal communication, five times; for informal, twelve times). Secondly, slight differences exist between internal and external responses with respect to informal communication frequency. Judging from the distribution of TM responses shown above, the general tendency in external TM

preference is between "once a month" and "less than once a month",
whereas internal TM responses show a tendency between once a month
and once every two weeks.

11. Outlook of I.P.P. Communication

Question 14 was designed with the intention of testing the
general outlook (i.e., pessimism versus optimism) of I.P.P. team
members' communication; the question asked: "For the most part, do
you find that the communication in I.P.P. (from all sources, in and
out of conferences) deals with problems and crises, or would you say
that most of the communication deals with progress and
accomplishments?" Ideally, according to the I.P.P. mandate (LeVangie
& Ward, 1987), the clients, and his or her situation should be
presented in a positive light -- emphasizing their strengths and
needs (a positive approach to qualities/ skills which are lacking).
It was conjectured by the researcher that, while this optimism may
hold largely true for the conference setting, certain structural
(e.g., caseloads or scheduling constraints) and interpersonal
elements could predispose TM's toward a more negative and reactive
approach to communication.

Overall, the results (see Table 16) suggest that the significant
majority of communication is about problems and crises. However,
because of strong differences between external and internal response
patterns, a separate consideration of each group is justified. For
external TM's, the tendency to choose any one response over any other

is non-significant suggesting that, for external respondents, the 'optimistic/ pessimistic' qualities of communication are more or less randomly distributed.[18] The results of the internal sample clearly indicate that respondents feel that communication is usually about problems/crises (41 responses, 59% of the responding internal TM's): in fact, this category garnered more responses than the other three categories combined.

12. Interenvironmental Awareness

Question 15 sought to describe the amount or level of awareness of the client's situation, as it exists between areas or environments. The results are summarized in Tables 17 and 17(a). Ideally, given the guiding I.P.P. principles of holism and accountability, the respondents should have indicated high awareness for all those environments which were applicable to their son(s)/daughter(s)/ward(s)/ client(s), (e.g. V.R.R.I. vocational, V.R.R.I. residential). Deviation from this ideal response would, then, be an indication of deviation from those guiding principles, since the TM would have possessed an unbalanced, if not one-sided, view of the client.

Overall responses for all but the "other" environments show a greater number of "Aware"/"Very Aware" responses (278, or 77.22%) than "Unaware"/"Very Unaware" responses (82, or 22.78%). In fact, this holds true for each of the five predesignated environments. However, significant differences between the two basic kinds of

responses (see Table 17(a)) exist only for the "Vocational/VRRI",

"Residential/VRRI", and "Familial" areas; results for

"Vocational/Non-VRRI" and "Residential/Non-VRRI" failed to yield

significant differences between the numbers of aware versus unaware

respondents. Results concerning "other" areas (listed in Appendix C)

also showed significant differences in favour of aware responses.

13. Confidentiality

An analysis was performed on Question 16 (see Tables 18 and

18(a)), which dealt with confidentiality and information sharing.

The questions asked the respondent to consider hypothetical

information that "could help the client" under a variety of

circumstances, and the respondent was to agree or disagree with a

statement. Regarding respondents as a whole, it could be said that

they feel that:

a.   "Confidential information should not be completely concealed
      from all team members;

b.   "Confidential" information should be conveyed to selected team
      members only;

c.   "Non-confidential" information should be passed along to all
      team members; and

d.   (As a corollary) "non-confidential" information should not be
      passed along in a selective fashion.

However when one considers the statements regarding all helpful

information (regardless of its confidentiality), uncertainty is

expressed in the results as a whole. Whether the statement said that

such information should be passed along selectively or

indiscriminately did not ultimately matter. Also, a comparison

between the external and internal TM responses shows that external

respondents were significantly more likely than internal respondents to favour the withholding of "confidential" information ($X^2 = 5.73$, df = 1, $p \leq .02$), but as a group displayed uncertainty as to what one should do.

The final pre-coded question (Number 17) asked the survey participant for an overall evaluation of I.P.P. communication. Results are shown in Table 19. These results indicate of mixed feelings towards current I.P.P. communication. Overall, there is little difference between the number of satisfied versus dissatisfied TM's. A difference begins to emerge if we consider the external responses by themselves. However, even this difference is not significant.

Perhaps a clearer idea of why such mixed evaluations exist might be ascertained from the comments which are reproduced in Appendix B. Some of the typical reasons given for satisfaction with the present state of I.P.P. communication are that: amount is adequate; TM's are easily accessible; it happens as its needed; or that TM's are friendly, useful, supportive, and helpful. In contrast, some typical reasons given for dissatisfaction are: problems of frequency/amount, problems of initiative, too problem-centered, a lack of communication up and down the administrative hierarchy, and current or complete information.

When the respondent had completed the questionnaire, opportunity was given for them to suggest changes which could improve communication, as well as an opportunity to comment on any unattended issues/concerns. No attempt will be made to either summarize or classify the responses; to do so would obscure the rich variety of ideas and feelings. Instead, the reader directed to Appendix B, where these responses have been reproduced in their entirety.

IV DISCUSSION: METHODOLOGY

Having now discussed some of the most salient aspects of the survey results, it is appropriate to set forth some limitations on these results, and some cautions for their interpretation. To accomplish this, we will take the approach of a discussion of the survey procedure. This discussion will serve the dual purpose of: (a) providing a more complete and accurate context within which to assess the survey phase of this research, and (b) indicating some of the potential difficulties with the survey, which could be profitable if further research in this area is conducted.

1. Sampling Concerns

The way in which the sampling, and subsequent, portions of the research were conceived and carried out raises a crucial issue, arising as a consequence of using "internal" and "external" lists and samples. To the extent that the researcher was justified in making this distinction between the two TM Groups -- a distinction which was

maintained throughout this study -- a boundary may be seen to exist, which could likely impede the smooth, holistic functioning of the I.P.P. team.[19] Although this issue has not been _directly_ addressed by this report, it remains an important area for investigation.

In addition to this more-or-less implicit point regarding the sampling methods, explicit statements may be forwarded which are supported by more trustworthy evidence. Mostly, these comments revolve around the _nature and the condition of the external lists_ that were used for the external participants. Overall, the lists were inadequate for the purposes of this survey. First, the files were _not current_, a conclusion supported by the fact that 10 (6.0%) survey packages were returned unopened. One had a note, stating that the TM had moved from that address _two years_ previously! While this was extreme, the remainder of the unopened packages were returned because of incorrect, outdated, or (in some cases) non-existent addresses. Since all team members are, at least theoretically, equal members in I.P.P., the negative effects of this missing information must be considered as severe as if it had taken place for the so-called internal population (or, at least, as an average effect over the survey as a whole).

A second reason for population list inadequacy concerns the _manner in which personal information is listed_ in the files. To be sure, an alphabeticizing process is used; however, this is done according to the first character of the first name or title. To illustrate the difficulties which may occur, consider the fictitious

couple, Mr. & Mrs. Doe. They could have been listed in a variety of ways, including:

1. Mr. & Mrs. Doe (alphabeticized as "Mr..")

2. John Doe - guardian (listed under "Jo...")

3. Jane Doe - guardian ("Ja")

In fact, not only could they be listed in any of these ways, but they could be listed (individually, or as a couple) in more than one way, therefore in more than one place in the lists (provided they fall under more than one interest category). Considering the size of the master Interested Parties list (52 pages), a manual process of eliminating all duplicate entries is, at best, problematic. Consequently, although such an elimination process was attempted by the researcher, some error resulted.[20]

Also on the topic of generalizability, we may now address what may be the most serious limitation in respect to sampling method: the absence of client input into the survey research. This is especially serious when considering the I.P.P. principle of client-centeredness. The reason why the researcher opted not to involve client input into the survey results was affected by time and manpower restrictions. Structured interviews would have to replace the questionnaire format used for the other TM's, since a representative sample of client respondents would include all levels of functioning. The severe lack of client input (except indirectly, through other TM responses) in this report should not be taken as an indication of the researcher's belief that it would not be valuable.

It was merely practical considerations which resulted in its being excluded here. As meager compensation, it can only be urged that research be directed at this aspect of I.P.P. communication.

2. Concerns With the Questionnaire Form

At this time it may be profitable to discuss the methodology of the questionnaire design (Please refer to Appendix C). In the first place, two typographical errors were overlooked in proof-reading the finished questionnaire. The first typographical error lies in an inconsistency for external respondents between the deadline return dates stated (1) on the questionnaire itself (July 31), and (2) in the covering letter (August 13). Although this may have caused some initial confusion, it seems reasonable to surmise that this inconsistency would not significantly affect results, either in terms of the rate or content of responses. The second typographical error, which affected both internal and external participants, involves the question-omission (skip pattern) instructions which appear in the question on the general referral form [question #7.E(i)]. There, respondents who indicate that they are not aware of the form are then instructed to proceed to Question 11; the intention, however, was to direct the respondent to question 8.

Another problem in the questionnaire format concerned the nature of the second question, which asks for the number of clients with whom the respondent is involved. This question potentially gives rise to two difficulties. First, external non-professional

participants may have felt that this implied a professional-type
relationship and that they received the questionnaire in error.[21]
Second, staff members may have found ambiguity in the word
"involvement", wondering whether the researcher meant being
integrally and intensively involved with clients' I.P.P.'s, or merely
being involved in a supervisory fashion.

Another focus for this methodology discussion is the nature of
the communication assessment questions (PART III) in which, it will
be remembered, the YES/yes/no/NO scale was employed. Randomly-
assigned negative statements were introduced as a control for
possible "leading" statements. When it became necessary for the
respondent to employ a double-negative statement in order to express
their opinion they may have become confused.[22] Manifestly, three
respondents were either unwilling or not readily able to perform this
abstract task; how many others had similar difficulties, and the
summary effect(s) of this on the results, is something which is not
readily assessable. One can only recommend that if used in future
research, similar methods take precautions to minimize this problem,
perhaps by incorporating a concrete element within the
instructions.[23]

In continuing this discussion, I also wish to raise the issue of
"formality", as the term is employed in the questionnaire. Strictly
speaking, formality denotes attention to constitution, structure, or
form as distinguished from concern with content. Considered in its

dynamic as well as its static element, then, formal communication would concern itself with regularity (i.e., according to established intervals of time) and structure. Indeed, this is the definition which was settled on by the researcher, and it was included as a parenthetical note on several occasions when "formality" was used, in order to ensure a common understanding of the term, hence maintaining the comparability of the results. However, it is difficult to establish that for some respondents the terms "structure" and "regularity" are any clearer (or less intimidating) than the problematic term "formal". Nevertheless, no alternative was discovered by the researcher which would satisfy needs for comparability, clarity, and precision.

A final concern in this methodology discussion involves two points in regards to PART VII, on confidentiality and information-sharing. In the first place, "confidentiality" itself is a somewhat nebulous notion. Thus, despite the urgency of the issue examined in Section 7, it is very difficult to gather some comparable and generalizable data. Respondents seeking further clarification of the concept used in this question were told by the researcher that they should consider "confidentiality" to be that information which TM's would designate as private or personal. It is difficult to say whether this further clarification was successful or, granting that it was, whether or not this had any implications for response comparability. Nonetheless, it was, practically speaking, the only alternative available to the researcher to increase clarity without

detracting from the TM's response in terms of its universal and "normative" character (i.e., that everyone on the team should follow a particular ethical procedure).

Another problem with the confidentiality question is the ignorance on the part of the researcher in terms of how respondents may have broken down the issue itself. One respondent indicated different attitudes regarding confidentiality depending on whether or not the dilemma was posed within (during) or outside of (before or after) the I.P.P. annual conference setting. In the event that the issue is pursued in future research, consideration may be given to permitting this distinction to be made by the respondent.

IV SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

An analysis of the response rates for the survey showed that external response was significantly lower than that for internal TM's. In partial explanation, it may be recalled that different procedures were used in distributing and returning the survey (hand-delivered versus mailed); it could very well be that the degree of personal contact may have contributed to a higher response rate for the internal survey. Moreover, as indicated earlier, the currency (or lack thereof) of the external population lists could be a factor in the different response rates. Also, it is likely that 'pressure' is present for internal TM's, who might perceive completing the survey as an aspect of their job, therefore leading to higher response rates for them. None of these potential factors could be verified by the present data.

External response patterns show differences between parents, siblings, and proprietors -- principally because of lower response rates from the latter two. Also related to the external response rates it was found, contrary to the researcher's expectations, that the respondents being associated with the client in more than one way did not significantly affect the response rates. Internal response rates failed to reveal significant differences between the two main units at The V.R.R.I. (i.e., Residential and Day Training). Disproportionate response rates, favouring management over front-line staff, could not be assessed for significance.

Perhaps predictably, internal TM's reported being involved with more clients than external TM's, and overall revealed a greater range in the number of clients they served.

That roughly half of responding external team members reported having an I.P.P. orientation was taken as a misunderstanding on their part, since orientations for external TM's were only beginning to occur at the time of the survey. The majority of the internal respondents reported having an orientation, with most of these reporting that it was helpful. In an attempt to account for what seemed like a considerable number (25%) of non-oriented internal TM's, job tenure was used as a control; but, the average tenure for non-oriented internal TM's was more than six months, suggesting it was not a factor.

In terms of TM knowledge of the I.P.P. principles, it was noted
that respondents were more likely to know that the I.P.P. process is
not temporally restricted to the annual conference setting;
accountability, conversely, was least frequently mentioned in the
respondents' definitions. Internal TM's were more able to explicitly
state the principles than external team members. While it might be
argued that this is primarily due to a lack of an orientation to
I.P.P. for external TM's, there is evidence that an orientation (at
least a formal or official one) does not make a significant
difference in the ability to state I.P.P. principles. These results
could suggest either that (a) something is lacking in the I.P.P.
orientation's attempt to instill the principles in its participants,
or (b) "networking" or other informal means of communication can
effectively disseminate knowledge of I.P.P. principles, such that
non-orientated staff members reap the benefits of the orientation.
Given that, in the three testable areas, both groups had a
greater-than-chance success rate, the latter explanation is more
reasonable.

By inquiring into some general communication concerns, it was
found that TM's really feel part of their team, and feel that their
comments and suggestions are valued as much as those from others on
their team. Uncertainty exists, though, as to whether or not TM
responsibilities are clearly understood by all members of the team.
Also, external respondents were likely to indicate that changes in
the team roster left them confused, although this was also the
overall sentiment.

The section devoted to the annual conference showed a positive evaluation for eight of the eleven aspects which were studied. Uncertainty characterized responses concerning both the comprehensiveness of conference activities, as well as whether or not new material is raised. Negative evaluations were the rule for the how comprehensibility of conferences was viewed.

The events after the conference were represented by way of the five major forms which are completed after the annual conference: i.e., the conference summary, the I.P.P. and I.T.P. one month follow-ups, the six month review, and the general referral form. Respondents indicated a positive evaluation of the first four forms for each of the aspects which were studied. Of those who indicated familiarity with the general referral form, less than half demonstrated unqualified knowledge of it. For internal respondents, this amounted to uncertainty regarding the function of the form; for external TM's, results indicated no appreciable knowledge of it. In all fairness, it must be conceded that there exist degrees of knowledge about the general referral form; however, the coding procedures used for this study were concerned only with measuring complete and competent knowledge of the form's function. In all items in the after-the-conference section, drop-out rates due to the respondent screening process provided problems for generalizing the results. In addition, the researcher was often unable to compare internal and external TM's; where this was undertaken, no significant differences were found.

The section on face-to-face meetings revealed that most of the internal TM's and more than a third of external TM's had attended meetings in the previous year -- according to respondents, once per month at most. In general, meetings were evaluated positively, except that mixed attitudes surround the question of whether or not they occur often enough. Purposes of meetings proved to be varied but the most common response overall was "crises/behavioral difficulties/problems/problem-solving".

Results from the section on telephone communication indicate that most respondents have used telephone communication to discuss I.P.P. concerns, and the numbers for both internal as well as external groups are higher for telephone communication as opposed to face-to-face meetings. Approximate frequency of telephone calls was twice per month. In terms of usefulness, phone calls were rated very positively, and they were seen as necessary to I.P.P.'s success. Uncertainty existed among the respondents as to whether or not phone calls happen often enough. The overall most frequently mentioned purposes for telephone calls were "updates" and "problems/behavioral difficulties/crises".

The section on memos yielded results that showed that most internal team members use memos for I.P.P. purposes. As well the results indicate that memos are not generally viewed as about right in terms of formality and should be used about as often as they are being used at present. Results from attitudinal scales suggest that

memos are **quite** useful for individual team members, but respondents, overall, seemed undecided as to whether or not memo information was comprehensive/complete. The main purpose of memos was simply cited as "information sharing", though many other more specific purposes were mentioned.

Preferences for different modes of communcation were examined separately for internal and external respondents. External TM's preferred telephone communication over any other communication mode, with meetings and written communication quite evenly matched for second rank. For internal TM's, both meetings and telephone communication were closely matched for first ranking, with memos definitely ranked lower.

In general, it was found that both internal and external respondents preferred a balance between formality and informality in communication, with perhaps a slight tendency towards the informality end of the spectrum. When asked how often formal communication should occur, internal and external TM's generally agreed that, at most, once a month was sufficient. For informal communication, on the other hand, some differences arose: internal TM's overall indicated a range between once per week and once per month, whereas external team members seemed to feel that once a month maximum was sufficient.

Results from Question 14 indicated that, generally speaking, I.P.P. communication is about 'problems and crises' rather than 'progress and accomplishments'. This was supported especially by internal results; external TM's did not indicate one outlook significantly more often than any other.

When questions of interdepartmental awareness were examined, it was found that those areas linked with The V.R.R.I. (either vocationally or residentially) in addition to the family setting, scored highest in terms of respondents' awareness. Non-V.R.R.I. environments showed less respondent awareness (perhaps due primarily to reports of less awareness of these areas by internal team members, though this was not able to be verified statistically).

Questions concerning confidentiality and information sharing showed some interesting results as well. As far as confidential information itself is concerned, respondents generally disagreed that it should be censored from all team members, and generally agreed (at least somewhat) that it should be told to selected team members only. Blanket statements, attempting to establish TM attitudes toward communication without regard to its confidential status, only yielded uncertainty.

Overall, it was found that respondents from both inside and outside The V.R.R.I. are unsure as to whether I.P.P. communication is satisfactory or not.

53

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, recommendations for action in seven I.P.P.-related areas are justified (the character of the relevant evaluation is included in parentheses):

1.   Confusion Due to TM Changes (Negative)

(a) To include, as part of the orientation for a new TM (whether new staff or newly assigned former staff), a familiarization with other TM's. Responsibility (and accountability) for establishing contact should rest with the new team member.

(b) Familiarization should not be limited to external TM's, although team member changes were most clearly a problem for them.

(c) Contact should not be limited to any one communication mode, though accountability must be maintained, irrespective of the mode chosen.

2.   Clarification of TM Responsibilities (Negative)

(a) To devote special attention to the clarification of specific responsibilities of each TM.

(b) Role clarification should be ongoing, and not limited to the conference settings.

(c) If a general source of confusion (especially one which is eventually resolved) is identified, it should be communicated to the I.P.P. Chairperson immediately, to be used as a problem-solving resource for I.P.P. teams generally.

3.   Inclusion of External TM's (Mixed)

(a) Results suggest that problems exist for team solidarity; attention must be paid to this difficulty in order to fulfill the I.P.P. mandate for interdisciplinary action.

(b) Again, attention to this problem needs to be ongoing, over the whole I.P.P. process.

(c) Again, general problems and resolutions should be reported to the I.P.P. Chairperson or social worker, so it may be used as a resource for problem-solving by all teams.

4.   Conference Comprehensibility (Negative)

(a) To establish, via further research and/or team member discussion, exactly how comprehensibility in the annual conference setting is hampered. (Note: analysis of results failed to identify technical language as a problem in this respect.)

(b) (Since this recommendation is based largely on internal TM responses) internal feedback on this issue would be especially helpful.

5.   Conference Comprehensiveness (Uncertainty)

(a) To establish, at least on a case-by-case basis, what issues are (in the opinion of TM's) neglected during the annual conferences.

(b) If time does not permit their resolution, to give these issues top priority for future (and accountable) contact between the relevant TM's.

6.   Communication Frequency (Uncertainty)

(a) That TM's remain sensitive to the particular circumstances and demands of their teams, regarding the frequency of meetings and telephone contact.

(b) One way to accomplish this would be to routinely set up 'contact schedules' at the annual conference, suitable to the needs of each team and client. In a sense, contact schedules would be I.T.P.'s for team communication and could be formulated and evaluated in much the same way.

(c) In light of the value of informal communication, such schedules should be regarded with flexibility in mind, perhaps by qualifying them with the clause "at least...".

7.   Communication Outlook (Negative)

(a) (Recognizing practical limitations) extra effort should be made to communicate client progress and accomplishments to other TM's (by definition, including the client him or herself). In this way, information of which the client becomes, or is made, aware will be more consistent with information shared in the annual conferences (and, thus, presumably more in line with the I.P.P. mandate).

(b) One means by which this could be facilitated would be a communication workshop; in this way TM's could learn to be more conscious of ways in which communication may be construed as negative, as well as ways in which communication may become more constructive and positive.

These recommendations and the supporting results were presented

to front line staff at The V.R.R.I. Their feedback -- in the form

of evaluations (of the recommendations), explanations (of the

results), and alternative strategies with which to confront problem

areas -- was recorded and is presented in Appendix E.

In conclusion, it is hoped that this study has resolved some basic questions about I.P.P. communication, especially questions which may pave the way for improvement of the I.P.P. system. Some necessary questions have, unfortunately, only been superficially understood, and as usual clarification awaits further investigation. Where they have been deemed appropriate, comments about the procedure used herein and some of the potential difficu ties with it have been periodically raised. The intention behind this is that further investigations may also use this study as a foundation.

REFERENCES

Farace, Richard V., Taylor, James A., and Stewart, John P.
(1978). "Criteria for Evaluation of Organizational
Communication Effectiveness: Review and Synthesis"
Communication Yearbook 2, pp. 271-292.

LeVangie, Bonnie M. (1985, August). "An Evaluation of Individual
Program Planning at The Vocational and Rehabilitation Reserach
Institute". Calgary: The V.R.R.I. Resource Centre Holdings.

LeVangie, Bonnie & Ward, Cindy (February, 1987). The Vocational
and Rehabilitation Research Institute Individual Program Plan
(IPP) Information Package.

Payne, Stanley, L. (1973) The Art of Asking Questions.
Princeton: Princeton University Press.

NOTES

1. Clearly, the sample for interviewing was neither random nor strictly representative. The ratio of staff to external agencies to clients to family members in the sample is 6:2:2:1, respectively, which is surely not the ratio in the I.P.P. - TM population. However, two points merit mentioning: first, some breadth was attained in the selection process and, second, the basic purpose of the interviews -- i.e., the generation of testable hypotheses -- did not necessitate randomness nor representativeness. Nonetheless, these points must be tempered by the realization that <u>no sound generalizations may be drawn directly from interview information and applied to the I.P.P. system as a whole</u>. The results are herein presented (Appendix A) for consideration <u>only</u>.

2. For the purposes of the survey, proprietors were judged to be more similar to external TM's (e.g., having had no orientation at this time) than internal TM's; thus, they were included in this more appropriate sub-population.

3. The external population differs from the internal one both in terms of its size, as well as because of its non-concern with memos.

4. The resultant "internal form" was longer and slightly more extensive in scope than the "external form". For example the section on memos was not applicable to external TM's. In addition to deleting this section from the external form, the word "memo", which was used on the internal form, was replaced on the external form with "written communication". It may be argued that the inclusion of a "written communication" section on the external questionnaire would have been justified. Be that as it may, the researcher judged that: (a) for the purposes at hand, such a section would be less important than those questionnaire items which were ultimately kept for the external form, and (b) if such a section were included, the resulting length of the questionnaire may have jeopardized return rates for external TM's.

   As well, on the external questionnaire "clients" were referred to as "sons/daughter/wards/clients". Also the "Basic Information" questions differ for internal and external TM's.

5. Although such a scale is not widespread in its use, the researcher judged that it would facilitate the completing of scaling questions: firstly, because it approximates the natural response to opinion statements and, additionally, because it is easier to distinguish the meaning of each alternatives -- especially in the midst of a lengthy series of statements. Disadvantages for coding raw data were, in the opinion of the researcher, outweighed by these advantages.

6. An alternative, or supplementary, measure which could be taken would be the "split-ballot" technique (Payne, 1973, p. 72), which involves the creation of a mirror-image questionnaire (i.e., where positive statements would be changed to a negative wording, and vice versa) and the random assignment of the mirror-image questionnaire to one-half of the survey participants, using the original version for the remaining half. This latter method was considered for the present project, but was abandoned due to restrictions of time and manpower.

7. Three condition-statements which were not included on the questionnaire were:
    a) information that could help the client but which is "confidential", should still (?) be made known to all team members;
    b) information that could help the client, and which is not "confidential" should not be made known to any team members;
    c) information that could help the client whether it is "confidential" or not should not be made known to any team member.
    Given the implications of these condition-statements, it is clear that the responses would be highly predictable and would not have provided any useful data.

8. In addition to providing information which, by itself or correlated with other data, could bring out richness and subtleties not evident in responses to the closed-ended questions, these last few open-ended questions allow the respondent virtually unrestricted expression of relevant information and/or opinions (intended as a token of courtesy).

9. Besides the advantages of hand-delivery already mentioned, it was intended by the researcher that this delivery would implicitly convey the seriousness with which the study was being undertaken -- since the procedure would obviously involve some trouble on the part of the researcher. The degree to which this intention was successfully conveyed and effective would be reflected in the staff response rates.

10. The 106 "non-responders" included questionnaires which had been returned by postal service, due to incorrect mailing information, as well as those respondents who (according to a brief follow up procedure done by the researcher) had received their packages but did not return them.

11. In analyzing the results for this report, no attempt was made to examine the responses with regard to client involvement. However, this was ignored for practical reasons only and remains a viable starting place for further analysis of the present data.

12. This is not a perfect measure for our purposes, since the respondent may have earlier occupied a different position, also at the V.R.R.I. Yet, it should provide some useful information on the matter.

13. It could be, however, that TM's do not view accountability and (say) holism as being that distinct and, thus, might have ommitted explicit coverage of the accountability principle, believing it to be implied. As probable as this alternative explanation may sound, it is unfortuantely not one which can be readily tested with the information at hand.

14. The results for internal staff, taken alone, only approach significance ($X^2 = 1.82$, $.10 \leq p \leq .20$).

15. Also, the decrease in eligible respondents is more severe for external TM's than for internal ones. Consequently, results for Parts C and D do not allow for comparisons between these two groups.

16. Beginning with this question, all question numbers will be given with reference to the internal form (the most complete), which is one number greater than that for the same item on the external form.

17. By assigning arbitrary values to the various response categories external TM preferences yield an average (mean) value of 3.63 (i.e., between "equal amounts" and "mostly informal"). Preferences expressed by internal TM's average about 3.10 (approximately the same).

18. The fourth alternative -- neither problems/crises nor progress/accomplishments is stressed at all -- was included only for purposes of logical completeness; thus, it was not included in the chi-square calculations for either of the response groups. Exactly what these responses mean is not clear at present. In some, but not all, cases it was used

by respondents to express an overall lack of communication. Perhaps, also, it is intended as meaning the same as the third response (neither is stressed more) but this assertion is not readily testable.

19. It may also be noted that several comments on the questionnaires (at present, undocumented), in the informal interviews, and in casual conversations at The V.R.R.I. suggest that al least some TM's see this internal/external division as a basic I.P.P. reality. While it may be argued that this distinction is only verbal, one cannot deny the danger that these may be the terms in which many TM's think of, and behave towards, each other.

20. While no duplicates were actually selected for the survey sample, three TM's were duplicated in the population list from which the sample was drawn, introducing a small error into the random selection procedure. The error in this instance was probably not significant; still, the present organization of the files presents an obstacle for future I.P.P. research.

21. Indeed, one respondent telephoned for clarification on this concern, and the difficulty was resolved.

22. And _did_ arise, as verbally reported to the researcher in one case, and evident in the responses on _at least_ two other questionnaires.

23. For example, the respondent could be instructed to assume (for the purposes of the survey _only_) that the statements are opinions held by the researcher. They could then be asked to state their agreement/disagreement with that _person_ (as opposed to the abstract relations between statements) by way of the scale.

TABLE 1

RESPONSE RATE BREAKDOWN (INTERNAL)

BY DEPARTMENT AND POSITION

DEPT./POSITION	RESPONSE(%)	NON-RESPONSE(%)	TOTALS
Day Training			
Front Line	*18(66.67)	9(33.33)	27
Coordinators	3(100.00)	0(0.00)	3
Other	2(100.00)	0(0.00)	2
PRT/Soc. Ed./Emp.** Prog./Soc. Wk.	* 9(75.00)	3(25.00)	12
Total Day Training	32(72)	12(27)	44
Residential			
Front Line	*31(67.39)	15(32.61)	46
Coordinators	4(80.00)	1(20.00)	5
Program Workers	* 5(62.50)	3(37.50)	8
Total Residential	40(67.80)	19(32.20)	59
TOTAL RESPONDENTS	72(69.90)	31(30.10)	103

*   Considered as front-line staff in the response rate analysis.
** Categorized as such by the researcher, using internal population list information.

TABLE 2

RESPONSE RATE BREAKDOWN (EXTERNAL)

ACCORDING TO INTEREST CATEGORY

CATEGORY		RESPONSE(%)	NON-RESPONSE(%)	TOTALS*
1.	Parents	22(37.93)	36(62.07)	58
2.	Siblings	2(8.70)	21(91.30)	23
3.	Parent/Guardians**	12(42.86)	16(57.14)	28
4.	Sibling/Guardians***	2(40.00)	3(60.00)	5
5.	Guardians only+	2(33.33)	4(66.67)	6
6.	Public Guardians+	0(0.00)	1(100.00)	1
7.	Citizen's Advocates+	2(40.00)	3(60.00)	5
8.	Client Service Coordinators+	1(33.33)	2(66.67)	3
9.	Foster Parents*	1(100.00)	0(0.00)	1
10.	Proprietors	4(16.67)	20(83.33)	24
	N=	**48(31.17)**	**106(68.83)**	**154**

* Totals represent one third of the total interested parties population except for the proprietors who were surveyed in their entirety.
** Categorized as "parents" for the chi-square analysis.
*** Categorized as "siblings" for the chi-square analysis.
+ Could not be included in the chi-square analysis due to cell sizes.

x^2 overall = 9.44, df 2, $p \leq .01$

TABLE 3

THE I.P.P. CONCEPT

Client Centeredness[a]	INT(%)	EXT(%)	TOTAL(%)
Present	52(72.22)	12(25.00)	64(53.33)
Absent	20(27.78)	36(75.00)	56(46.67)
Holism/Team Approach[a]			
Present	46(63.89)	8(16.67)	54(45.00)
Absent	26(36.11)	40(83.33)	66(55.00)
Accountability*			
Present	7(9.72)	2(4.17)	9(7.50)
Absent	65(90.20)	46(95.83)	111(92.50)
Continuity[a]			
Not Restricted	54(75.00)	13(27.08)	67(55.83)
Restricted	18(25.00)	35(72.92)	53(44.17)
N=	**72**	**48**	**120**

* Was not included in the chi-square analysis due to insuffient cell size.

X^2 overall = 38.17, $p \leq .001$

[a] Differences significant at the .001 level.

TABLE 4

KNOWLEDGE OF I.P.P. PRINCIPLES

CONTROLLING FOR ORIENTATION

PRINCIPLE	WITH ORIENTATION(%)	WITHOUT ORIENTATION(%)	TOTAL(%)
Client Centeredness			
Present	40(75.47)	11(61.11)	51(70.83)
Absent	13(24.53)	7(38.89)	20(29.17)
Holism/Team Approach			
Present	31(58.49)	14(77.78)	45(63.38)
Absent	22(41.51)	4(22.22)	26(36.62)
Accountability*			
Present	5(9.43)	1(5.56)	6(8.45)
Absent	48(90.57)	17(94.44)	65(91.15)
Continuity			
Unrestricted	40(75.47)	13(72.22)	53(74.65)
Restricted	13(24.53)	5(27.78)	18(25.35)
N=	53	18	71

* Was not included in the chi-square analysis due to insufficient cell size.

x^2 overall = 3.55, df = 5, p $\geq$ .05

TABLE 5

GENERAL CONCERNS OF COMMUNICATION

STATEMENT		AGREE/DISAGREE				
		YES(%)*	yes(%)*	no(%)*	NO(%)*	N=
A. Changes in TM's leave me confused						
	INT	12(17)	24(35)	27(39)	6(9)	69
	EXT	12(35)	15(44)	4(12)	3(9)	34
	TOTAL	24(23)	39(38)	31(30)	9(9)	103
B. I don't really feel part of my I.P.P. team						
	INT	5(7)	12(17)	31(44)	23(32)	71
	EXT	13(37)	5(14)	9(26)	8(23)	35
	TOTAL	18(17)	17(16)	40(38)	31(29)	106
C. Input valued as much as others'						
	INT	30(42)	33(47)	6(8)	2(3)	71
	EXT	17(50)	11(32)	2(6)	4(12)	34
	TOTAL	47(45)	44(42)	8(8)	6(6)	105
D. Responsibilities are clearly understood						
	INT	8(12)	28(41)	20(29)	12(18)	68
	EXT	11(37)	8(27)	8(27)	3(10)	30
	TOTAL	19(19)	36(37)	28(29)	15(15)	98

* Percentages, calculated according to row totals, are rounded; therefore some row totals may not equal 100 percent.

TABLE 5(a)

GENERAL CONCERNS OF COMMUNICATION:

DICHOTOMIZED RESULTS

STATEMENTS	RESPONSE Yes*(%)	No**(%)	TOTAL	x^2
A. Changes in TM's leave me confused				
INT	36(52.17)	33(47.83)	69	
EXT	27(79.41)	7(20.59)	34	
TOTAL[a]	63(61.17)	40(38.83)	103	4.70
B. Don't really feel that I am part of my I.P.P. team				
INT	17(23.94)	54(76.06)	71	
EXT	18(51.43)	17(48.57)	35	
TOTAL[b]	35(33.02)	71(66.98)	106	11.56
C. Input valued as much as others'				
INT	63(88.73)	8(11.27)	71	
EXT	28(82.35)	6(17.65)	34	
TOTAL[b]	91(36.67)	14(13.33)	105	55.00
D. Responsibilities are clearly understood				
INT	36(52.94)	32(47.06)	68	
EXT	19(63.33)	11(36.67)	30	
TOTAL	55(56.12)	43(43.88)	98	1.23

* Includes both "YES" and "yes" responses
** Includes both "NO" and "no" responses
[a] Differences in column totals are significant at .05 level (df = 1).
[b] Differences in column totals are significant at .001 level (df = 1).

TABLE 6

ANNUAL CONFERENCES

	AGREE/DISAGREE				
STATEMENT	YES(%)*	yes(%)*	no(%)*	NO(%)*	N=
1. Conferences are useful for me					
INT	26(47)	26(47)	2(4)	1(2)	55
EXT	17(59)	10(34)	2(7)	0(0)	29
TOTAL	43(51)	36(43)	4(5)	1(1)	84
2. Not everything understood					
INT	12(22)	31(56)	8(15)	4(7)	55
..XT	1(4)	11(39)	7(25)	9(32)	28
TOTAL	13(16)	42(51)	15(18)	13(16)	83
3. Try to accomplish too much					
INT	9(17)	14(26)	22(41)	9(17)	44
EXT	1(3)	7(24)	13(45)	8(28)	29
TOTAL	10(12)	21(25)	35(42)	17(20)	73
4. Held often enough					
INT	24(44)	21(39)	4(7)	5(9)	54
EXT	13(48)	4(15)	5(19)	5(19)	27
TOTAL	37(46)	25(31)	9(11)	10(12)	81
5. Are well-organized					
INT	19(35)	26(48)	8(15)	1(2)	54
EXT	14(48)	13(45)	2(7)	0(	29
TOTAL	33(40)	39(47)	10(12)	1(1)	83

---

* Percentages, calculated according to row totals. have been rounded;
therefore some totals may not equal 100 percent.

TABLE 6

ANNUAL CONFERENCES
(continued)

STATEMENT		AGREE/DISAGREE				
		YES(%)*	yes(%)*	no(%)*	NO(%)*	N=
6. Everything is related to client or I.P.P.						
	INT	12(23)	23(43)	16(30)	2(4)	53
	EXT	15(52)	13(45)	1(3)	0(0)	29
	TOTAL	27(33)	36(44)	17(21)	2(2)	82
7. Are not comprehensive						
	INT	6(11)	15(28)	26(48)	7(13)	54
	EXT	4(15)	7(26)	7(26)	9(33)	27
	TOTAL	10(12)	22(27)	33(41)	16(20)	81
8. Too formal						
	INT	2(4)	4(7)	34(63)	14(26)	52
	EXT	7(20)	6(17)	12(34)	10(29)	27
	TOTAL	9(10)	10(11)	46(52)	24(27)	79
9. New material brought up						
	INT	7(13)	19(37)	23(44)	3(6)	54
	EXT	3(11)	10(37)	4(15)	10(37)	35
	TOTAL	10(13)	29(37)	27(34)	13(16)	89
10. Language is too technical						
	INT	4(8)	6(12)	30(58)	12(23)	52
	EXT	3(11)	6(22)	7(26)	11(41)	27
	TOTAL	7(9)	12(15)	37(47)	23(29)	79

* Percentages, calculated according to row totals, have been rounded; therefore some totals may not equal 100 percent.

TABLE 6(a)

ANNUAL CONFERENCES:

DICHOTOMIZED RESULTS

STATEMENTS	RESPONSE		TOTAL	x^2
	YES(%)	NO(%)		
1. Conferences are useful for me				
INT	52(94.55)	3(5.45)	55	
EXT	27(93.10)	2(6.90)	29	
TOTAL[b]	79(94.05)	5(5.95)	84	63.44
2. Not everything understood				
INT	43(78.18)	12(21.82)	55	
EXT	12(42.86)	16(57.14)	28	
TOTAL[a]	55(66.27)	28(33.73)	83	8.14
3. Try to accomplish too much				
INT	13(29.95)	31(70.05)	44	
EXT	8(28.59)	21(72.41)	29	
TOTAL[b]	21(28.77)	52(71.23)	73	12.33
4. Held often enough				
INT	45(83.33)	9(16.67)		54
EXT	17(62.96)	10(37.04)	27	
TOTAL[b]	62(76.54)	19(23.46)	81	21.78
5. Are well-organized				
INT	45(83.33)	9(16.67)	54	
EXT	27(93.10)	2(6.90)	29	
TOTAL[b]	72(86.75)	11(13.25)	83	43.37

[a] Differences in column totals are significant at the .01 level (df = 1).
[b] Differences in column totals are significant at the .001 level (df = 1).

TABLE 6(a)

ANNUAL CONFERENCES:

DICHOTOMIZED RESULTS
(continued)

STATEMENTS	RESPONSE YES(%)	NO(%)	TOTAL	x^2
6. Everything is related to client or I.P.P.				
INT	35(66.04)	18(33.96)	53	
EXT	28(96.55)	1(3.45)	29	
TOTAL[b]	63(76.83)	19(23.17)	82	22.55
7. Are not comprehensive				
INT	21(38.89)	33(61.11)	54	
EXT	11(40.74)	16(59.26)	27	
TOTAL	32(39.51)	49(60.49)	81	3.16
8. Too formal				
INT	6(11.11)	48(88.89)	54	
EXT	13(37.14)	22(62.86)	35	
TOTAL[b]	19(21.35)	70(78.65)	89	28 09
9. New material brought up				
INT	26(50.00)	26(50.00)	52	
EXT	13(48.15)	14(51.85)	27	
TOTAL	39(49.37)	40(50.63)	79	0.00
10. Language is too technical				
INT	10(19)	42(81)	52	
EXT	9(33)	18(67)	27	
TOTAL[b]	19(24)	60(76)	79	20.25

[a] Differences in column totals are significant at the .01 level (df = 1).
[b] Differences in column totals are significant at the .001 level (df = 1).

TABLE 7

PERCEIVED EQUALITY OF PARTICIPATION

IN THE CONFERENCE SETTING

| Type of TM | RESPONSE | | TOTAL |
	Yes(%)	No(%)	
External	25(86.21)	4(13.79)	29
Internal	33(60.00)	22(40.00)	55
TOTAL	58(69.05)	26(30.95)	84

X^2 for column totals = 11.44, df = 1, p ≤ .001

TABLE 8

DECLINE IN RESPONSE RATES FOR THE AFTER-THE-CONFERENCE SECTION

(AS SHOWN BY ANSWERS TO 'SCREENING' QUESTIONS FOR EACH PART)

Screening Question (Type of Form)	TEAM MEMBER RESPONSE		
	INT (%)	EXT (%)	N=
A. Conference Summaries	41(85.42)	20(74.07)	61
B. (One Month) I.P.P. Follow-Ups	28(58.53)	12(44.44)	40
C. (One Month) I.T.P. Follow-Ups	26(54.17)	3(11.11)	29
D. Six Month Reviews	10(20.83)	3(11.11)	13

TABLE 9

AFTER THE CONFERENCES

STATEMENTS	AGREEMENT/DISAGREEMENT				
	YES(%)*	yes(%)*	no(%)*	NO(%)*	N=
A. Conference summaries					
1. Summary not useful to me					
INT	4(10)	6(15)	13(33)	17(43)	40
EXT	4(21)	2(11)	8(42)	5(26)	19
TOTAL	8(14)	8(14)	21(36)	22(37)	59
2. Important for I.P.P. success					
INT	29(71)	10(24)	1(2)	1(2)	41
EXT	12(63)	6(32)	0(0)	1(5)	19
TOTAL	41(68)	16(27)	1(2)	2(3)	60
3. Too formal					
INT	0(0)	3(8)	17(43)	20(50)	40
EXT	2(11)	2(11)	9(47)	6(32)	19
TOTAL	2(3)	5(8)	26(44)	26(44)	59
4. Includes all main points					
INT	18(45)	12(30)	9(23)	1(3)	40
EXT	12(67)	5(28)	1(6)	0(0)	18
TOTAL	30(52)	17(29)	10(17)	1(2)	58

* Percentages, calculated according to row totals, are rounded; therefore some totals may not equal 100 percent.

TABLE 9

AFTER THE CONFERENCES
(continued)

	AGREEMENT/DISAGREEMENT				
STATEMENTS	**YES(%)***	**yes(%)***	**no(%)***	**NO(%)***	**N=**
B. One month follow-ups					
1. Important for I.P.P. success					
INT	3(11)	4(15)	10(36)	10(36)	27
EXT	1(9)	1(9)	3(27)	6(55)	11
TOTAL	4(10)	5(13)	13(33)	16(41)	38
2. Too formal					
INT	1(4)	0(0)	19(66)	8(28)	28
EXT	0(0)	1(8)	4(33)	7(58)	12
TOTAL	2(5)	1(2)	23(56)	15(37)	40
3. Not useful to me					
INT	1(4)	5(19)	10(36)	11(39)	27
EXT	1(10)	1(10)	2(20)	6(60)	2
TOTAL	2(5)	6(16)	12(32)	17(46)	37
C. Individual training plans					
1. Too formal					
INT	1(4)	0(0)	17(65)	8(31)	26
EXT	1(50)	0(0)	0(0)	1(50)	2
TOTAL	2(7)	0(0)	17(61)	9(32)	28
2. Useful to me					
INT	8(32)	14(56)	2(8)	1(4)	25
EXT	1(33)	2(67)	0(0)	0(0)	3
TOTAL	9(32)	16(57)	2(7)	1(4)	28

* Percentages, calculated according to row totals, are rounded;
  therefore some totals may not equal 100 percent.

TABLE 9

AFTER THE CONFERENCES
(continued)

STATEMENTS		AGREEMENT/DISAGREEMENT				
		YES(%)*	yes(%)*	no(%)*	NO(%)*	N=
C. Individual Training Plans (continued)						
3. Necessary for I.P.P.						
	INT	12(48)	9(36)	2(8)	2(8)	25
	EXT	3(100)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	3
	TOTAL	15(54)	9(32)	2(7)	2(7)	28
D. Six Month Reviews						
1. Useful to me						
	INT	5(42)	7(58)	0(0)	0(0)	12
	EXT	1(50)	1(50)	0(0)	0(0)	2
	TOTAL	6(43)	8(57)	0(0)	0(0)	14
2. Too formal						
	INT	0(0)	2(20)	8(80)	0(0)	10
	EXT	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	2(100)	2
	TOTAL	0(0)	2(17)	8(67)	2(17)	14
3. Important for I.P.P.'s						
	INT	5(50)	5(50)	0(0)	0(0)	10
	EXT	2(100)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	2
	TOTAL	7(58)	5(42)	0(0)	0(0)	12

* Percentages, calculated according to row totals, are rounded; therefore some totals may not equal 100 percent.

TABLE 9(a)

AFTER THE CONFERENCES:

DICHOTOMIZED RESULTS

STATEMENTS	Yes(%)	No(%)	TOTAL	x^2
A. Conference Summaries				
1. Summary not useful to me				
INT	10(25.00)	30(75.00)	40	
EXT	6(31.58)	13(68.42)	19	
TOTAL[c]	16(27.12)	43(72.88)	59	11.46
2. Important for I.P.P. success				
INT	39(95.12)	2(4.88)	41	
EXT	18(84.74)	1(5.26)	19	
TOTAL[c]	57(95.00)	3(5.00)	60	46.82
3. Too formal				
INT	3(7.50)	37(92.50)	40	
EXT	4(21.05)	15(78.95)	19	
TOTAL[c]	7(11.86)	52(88.14)	59	32.81
4. Includes all conference's main points				
INT	30(75.00)	10(25.00)	40	
EXT	17(94.44)	1(5.56)	18	
TOTAL[c]	47(81.03)	11(18.97)	58	31.12

[a] Differences in column totals are are significant at the .05 level (df = 1).
[b] Differences in column totals are are significant at the .01 level (df = 1).
[c] Differences in column totals are are significant at the .001 level (df = 1).

TABLE 9(a)

AFTER THE CONFERENCES:

DICHOTOMIZED RESULTS
(continued)

STATEMENTS	Yes(%)	No(%)	TOTAL	x^2
B. (One month) I.P.P. Follow-Ups				
1. Not important for IPP success				
INT	7(25.93)	20(74.07)	27	
EXT	2(18.18)	9(81.82)	·11	
TOTAL[c]	9(23.68)	29(76.32)	38	11.61
2. Too formal				
INT	1(3.57)	27(96.43)	28	
EXT	1(8.33)	11(91.67)	12	
TOTAL[c]	2(5.00)	38(95.00)	40	30.63
3. Not useful to me				
INT	6(22.22)	21(77.78)	27	
EXT	2(20.00)	8(80.00)	10	
TOTAL[b]	8(21.62)	29(78.38)	.37	10.81
C. (One Month) I.T.P. Follow-Ups				
1. Too formal				
INT	1(3.85)	25(96.15)	26	
EXT	1(50.00)	1(50.00)	2	
TOTAL[b]	2(7.14)	26(92.86)	28	8.58

continued...

---

[a] Differences in column totals are are significant at the .05 level (df = 1).
[b] Differences in column totals are are significant at the .01 level (df = 1).
[c] Differences in column totals are are significant at the .001 level (df = 1).

TABLE 9(a)

AFTER THE CONFERENCES:

DICHOTOMIZED RESULTS
(continued)

STATEMENTS	Yes(%)	No(%)	TOTAL	x^2
C. (One month) I.T.P. Follow-Ups (continued)				
2. Useful to me				
INT	22(88.00)	3(12.00)	25	
EXT	3(100.00)	0(0.00)	3	
TOTAL[c]	25(89.29)	3(10.71)	28	15.75
3. Necessary for I.P.P.				
INT	21(84.00)	4(16.00)	25	
EXT	3(100.00)	0(0.00)	3	
TOTAL[c]	24(85.71)	4(14.29)	28	12.89
D. Six Month Reviews				
1. Useful to me				
INT	12(100.00)	0(0.00)	12	
EXT	2(100.00)	0(0.00)	2	
TOTAL[b]	14(100.00)	0(0.00)	14	12.07
2. Too formal				
INT	2(20.00)	8(80.00)	10	
EXT	0(0.00)	2(100.00)	2	
TOTAL[a]	2(16.67)	10(83.33)	12	4.08
3. Important for I.P.P.				
INT	10(100.00)	0(0.00)	10	
EXT	2(100.00)	0(0.00)	2	
TOTAL[b]	12(100.00)	0(0.00)	12	10.08

[a] Differences in column totals are are significant at the .05 level (df = 1).
[b] Differences in column totals are are significant at the .01 level (df = 1).
[c] Differences in column totals are are significant at the .001 level (df = 1)

TABLE 10

REPORTED RATES OF COMMUNICATION:

FACE-TO-FACE MEETINGS AND TELEPHONE

Face-To-Face Meetings				Telephone Communication			
Frequency	INT(%)	EXT(%)	Total(%)	Frequency	INT(%)	EXT(%)	Total(%)
1. More than once/week	7(13.21)	0(0.00)	7(11.48)	1. More than once/week	9(19.57)	1(7.14)	10(16/67)
2. Once/week	7(13.21)	1(12.50)	8(13.11)	2. Once/week	10(21.74)	2(14.29)	12(20.00)
3. Twice/month	10(18.87)	0(0.00)	10(16.39)	3. Twice/month	13(28.26)	2(14.29)	15(25.00)
4. Once/month	12(22.64)	2(25.00)	14(22.95)	4. Once/month	7(15.22)	3(21.43)	10(16.67)
5. Less than once/month	17(32.08)	5(62.50)	22(36.07)	5. Less than once/month	7(15.22)	6(42.86)	13(21.67)
TOTALS	53	8	61	TOTALS	46	14	60

80

TABLE 11

FACE-TO-FACE MEETINGS

Agreement or disagreement with statements concerning face-to-face meetings (held approximately between July 1985 - July 1986).

STATEMENTS		YES(%)*	yes(%)*	no(%)*	NO(%)*	N=
				AGREEMENT/DISAGREEMENT		
1. Not useful						
	INT	11(20)	7(13)	11(20)	27(48)	56
	EXT	1(10)	1(10)	4(40)	4(40)	10
	TOTAL	12(18)	8(12)	15(23)	31(47)	66
2. Happen often enough						
	INT	13(23)	15(27)	18(32)	10(18)	56
	EXT	3(30)	3(30)	1(10)	3(30)	10
	TOTAL	16(24)	18(27)	19(29)	13(20)	66
3. Too formal						
	INT	0(0)	0(0)	26(45)	32(55)	58
	EXT	0(0)	1(10)	2(20)	7(70)	10
	TOTAL	0(0)	1(1)	28(41)	39(57)	68
4. Easy to set them up						
	INT	20(35)	26(46)	6(11)	5(9)	57
	EXT	2(22)	7(78)	0(0)	0(0)	9
	TOTAL	22(33)	33(50)	6(9)	5(8)	66

* Percentages, calculated according to row totals, are rounded; therefore some totals may not equal 100 percent.

TABLE 11(a)

FACE-TO-FACE MEETINGS:

DICHOTOMIZED RESULTS

STATEMENTS	Yes(%)	No(%)	TOTAL	x^2
1. Not useful				
INT	18(32.14)	38(67.86)	56	
EXT	2(20.00)	8(80.00)	10	
TOTAL[a]	20(30.30)	ᴬᐧ(69.70)	66	9.47
2. Happen often enough				
INT	28(50.00)	28(50.00)	56	
EXT	6(60.00)	4(40.00)	10	
TOTAL	34(51.52)	32(48.48)	66	0.02
3. Too formal				
INT	0(0.00)	58(100.00)	58	
EXT	1(10.00)	9(90.00)	10	
TOTAL[b]	1(1.47)	67(98.53)	68	62.13
4. Easy to set up				
INT	46(80.70)	11(19.30)	57	
EXT	9(100.00)	0(0.00)	9	
TOTAL[b]	55(83.00)	11(16.67)	66	28.02

[a] Differences in column totals are are significant at .01 level (df = 1).
[b] Differences in column totals are are significant at .001 level (df = 1).

TABLE 12

TELEPHONE COMMUNICATION

Agreement or Disagreement with various statements concerning phone calls that occurred approximately between July, 1985 and July, 1986.

		AGREEMENT/DISAGREEMENT				
STATEMENTS		YES(%)*	yes(%)*	no(%)*	NO(%)*	N=
1. Phone calls are useful to me						
	INT	33(66)	16(32)	1(2)	0(0)	50
	EXT	11(73)	4(27)	0(0)	0(0)	15
	TOTAL	44(68)	20(31)	1(2)	0(0)	65
2. Do not happen often enough						
	INT	10(20)	19(38)	16(32)	5(10)	50
	EXT	1(8)	3(25)	5(42)	3(25)	12
	TOTAL	11(18)	22(35)	21(34)	8(13)	62
3. Necessary if I.P.P. is to succeed						
	INT	29(57)	19(37)	3(6)	0(0)	51
	EXT	6(43)	6(43)	1(7)	1(7)	14
	TOTAL	35(54)	25(38)	4(6)	1(2)	65

* Percentages, calculated according to row totals, have been rounded; therefore some totals may not equal 100 percent.

TABLE 12(a)

TELEPHONE COMMUNICATION:

DICHOTOMIZED RESULTS

STATEMENTS	Yes(%)	No(%)	TOTAL	x^2
1. Useful to me				
INT	49(93.00)	1(2.00)	50	
EXT	15(100.00)	0(0.00)	15	
TOTAL[a]	64(98.46)	1(1.54)	65	59.14
2. Happen often enough				
INT	29(58.00)	21(42.00)	50	
EXT	4(33.33)	8(66.67)	12	
TOTAL	33(53.23)	29(46.77)	62	0.15
3. Necessary for I.P.P.				
INT	48(94.12)	3(5.88)	51	
EXT	12(85.71)	2(14.29)	14	
TOTAL[a]	60(92.31)	5(8.06)	65	44.86

[a] Differences in column totals are significant at the .001 level (df = 1).

TABLE 13

AVERAGE RANK-PREFERENCE OF COMMUNICATION MODES

	Average Rank		
MODE	INT	EXT	OVERALL
Meetings	1.71	2.17	1.83
Memos/Written	2.67	2.16	2.55
Telephone	1.71	1.96	1.79
"Other"	3.63	3.45	3.58

TABLE 14

PREFERRED FORMALITY OF COMMUNICATION

		Ext(%)	Int(%)	Total(%)
1.	Formal	2(5.71)	9(13.24)	11(10.68%)
2.	Some of each; mostly formal	3(8.57)	7(10.29)	10(9.71)
3.	Equal amounts, formal and informal	12(34.29)	22(32.35)	34(33.01)
4.	Some of each; mostly informal	7(20.00)	28(41.18)	35(33.98)
5.	Informal	11(31.43)	2(2.94)	13(12.62)
	Total Respondents	35(100)	68(100)	103(100)

TABLE 15

PREFERRED FREQUENCY OF TM COMMUNICATION

Frequency	Formal			Informal		
1. More than once/wk	1(3.33)	2(3.08)	3(3.16)	0(0.00)	4(5.63)	4(4.12)
2. Once/week	0(0.00)	2(3.08)	2(2.11)	1(3.85)	13(18.31)	14(14.43)
3. Twice/month	0(0.00)	6(9.23)	6(6.32)	2(7.69)	17(23.94)	19(19.59)
4. Once/month	7(23.33)	22(33.85)	29(30.53)	7(26.92)	18(25.35)	25(26.80)
5. Less than once/mo.	9(30.00)	18(27.69)	27(28.42)	5(19.23)	3(4.23)	8(8.25)
6. "Other"	13(43.33)	15(23.08)	28(29.47)	11(42.31)	16(22.54)	27(27.84)
N =	30	65	95	26	71	97

TABLE 16

GENERAL OUTLOOK OF I.P.P. COMMUNICATION

Nature of Communication	EXT(%)	INT(%)	TOTAL(%)
1. Communication usually about problems/crises	9(26.47)	41(58.57)[b]	50(48.48)[c]
2. Usually about progress/ accomplishments	13(38.24)	11(15.71)[b]	24(23.08)[c]
3. Neither stressed more than the other	7(20.59)	11(15.71)[b]	18(17.31)[c]
4. Neither stressed at all	5(14.71)	7(10.00)	12(11.54)
N =	34[a]	70[a]	104

[a] Differences between these two figures are significant at the .001 level
$(X^2 = 10.36, df = 1)$

[b] Differences between these three figures are significant at the .001 level
$(X^2 = 28.57, df = 2)$

[c] Differences between these three figures are significant at the .001 level
$(X^2 = 18.86, df = 2)$

TABLE 17

INTERDEPARTMENTAL AWARENESS

A rating by the respondent of how aware they feel they are with the client's status, with respect to various areas/environments.

AREA/ENVIRON.	LEVEL OF AWARENESS				
	VERY AWARE(%)*	AWARE(%)*	UNAWARE(%)*	VERY UNAWARE(%)*	N=
1. Voc/VRRI					
INT	18(26)	41(60)	6(9)	3(4)	68
EXT	6(24)	16(64)	2(8)	1(4)	25
TOTAL	24(26)	57(61)	8(9)	4(4)	93
2. Voc/Non-VRRI					
INT	6(13)	21(47)	9(20)	9(20)	45
EXT	3(25)	6(50)	2(17)	1(8)	12
TOTAL	9(16)	27(47)	11(19)	10(18)	57
3. Res/VRRI					
INT	32(48)	23(35)	6(9)	5(8)	56
EXT	9(60)	5(33)	1(7)	0(0)	15
TOTAL	41(51)	28(35)	7(9)	5(6)	81
4. Res/Non-VRRI					
INT	0(0)	19(53)	10(28)	7(19)	36
EXT	5(38)	5(38)	3(23)	0(0)	13
TOTAL	5(10)	24(49)	13(27)	7(14)	49

continued...

* Percentages, calculated according to row totals, are rounded; therefore some totals may not equal 100 percent.

TABLE 17

INTERDEPARTMENTAL AWARENESS
(continued)

AREA/ENVIRON.	LEVEL OF AWARENESS				
	VERY AWARE(%)*	AWARE(%)*	UNAWARE(%) *	VERY * UNAWARE(%)	N=
5. Familial					
INT	13(21)	32(52)	11(18)	5(8)	61
EXT	9(47)	9(47)	1(5)	0(0)	19
TOTAL	22(28)	41(51)	12(15)	5(6)	80
6. Other					
INT	5(42)	4(33)	3(25)	0(0)	12
EXT	3(100)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	3
TOTAL	8(53)	4(27)	3(20)	0(0)	15

* Percentages, calculated according to row totals, are rounded; therefore some totals may not equal 100 percent.

TABLE 17(a)

INTERDEPARTMENTAL AWARENESS:

DICHOTOMIZED RESULTS

AREA/ENVIRON.	Aware(%)	Unaware(%)	TOTAL	x^2
1. Voc/VRRI				
INT	59(86.76)	9(13.24)	68	
EXT	22(88.00)	3(12.00)	25	
TOTAL[b]	81(87.10)	12(12.90)	93	49.72
2. Voc/Non-VRRI				
INT	27(60.00)	18(40.00)	45	
EXT	9(75.00)	3(25.00)	12	
TOTAL	36(63.16)	21(36.84)	57	3.44
3. Res/VRRI				
INT	55(83.33)	11(16.67)	66	
EXT	14(93.33)	1(6.67)	15	
TOTAL[b]	69(85.19)	12(14.81)	81	18.51
4. Res/Non-VRRI				
INT	19(52.78)	17(47.22)	36	
EXT	10(76.92)	3(23.08)	13	
TOTAL	29(59.18)	20(40.82)	49	1.31
5. Familial				
INT	45(73.77)	16(26.23)	61	
EXT	18(94.74)	1(5.26)	19	
TOTAL[b]	63(78.75)	17(21.25)	80	25.32
6. Other				
INT	9(75.00)	3(25.00)	12	
EXT	3(100.00)	0(0.00)	3	
TOTAL[a]	12(80.00)	3(20.00)	15	4.27

[a] Differences in column totals are significant at .05 level (df = 1).
[b] Differences in column totals are significant at .001 level (df = 1).

TABLE 18

CONFIDENTIALITY AND INFORMATION SHARING

Agreement/Disagreement with statements which deal with the status of confidentiality in different situations. In all cases, information is considered such that it "could help the client".

		LEVEL OF AGREEMENT/DISAGREEMENT				
STATEMENTS		YES(%)*	yes(%)*	no(%)*	NO(%)*	N=
a) "Confidential" info to no TM's						
	INT	0(0)	9(13)	30(42)	32(45)	71
	EXT	4(13)	7(23)	9(29)	11(35)	31
	TOTAL	4(4)	16(16)	39(38)	43(42)	102
b) "Confidential" info to selected TM's						
	INT	15(21)	27(39)	17(24)	11(16)	70
	EXT	14(47)	6(20)	6(20)	4(13)	30
	TOTAL	29(29)	33(33)	23(23)	15(15)	100
c) "Non-confidential" info to all TM's						
	INT	44(63)	16(23)	7(10)	3(4)	70
	EXT	25(71)	8(23)	1(3)	1(3)	35
	TOTAL	69(66)	24(23)	8(8)	4(4)	105
d) "Non-confidential" info to selected TM's						
	INT	6(9)	8(12)	26(38)	28(41)	68
	EXT	3(10)	1(3)	9(30)	17(57)	30
	TOTAL	9(9)	9(9)	35(36)	45(46)	98

* Percentages, calculated according to row totals, are rounded; therefore some totals may not equal 100 percent.

TABLE 18

CONFIDENTIALITY AND INFORMATION SHARING
(continued)

	LEVEL OF AGREEMENT/DISAGREEMENT				
STATEMENTS	YES(%)*	yes(%)*	no(%)*	NO(%)*	N=
e) All info to all TM's					
INT	14(21)	23(34)	16(24)	14(21)	67
EXT	9(28)	5(16)	7(22)	11(34)	32
TOTAL	23(23)	28(28)	23(23)	25(25)	99
f) All info to selected TM's only					
INT	10(14)	15(22)	28(41)	16(23)	..69
EXT	5(17)	9(31)	8(28)	7(24)	29
TOTAL	15(15)	25(25)	36(36)	23(23)	98

* Percentages, calculated according to row totals, are rounded; therefore some totals may not equal 100 percent.

TABLE 18(a)

CONFIDENTIALITY AND INFORMATION SHARING:

DICHOTOMIZED RESULTS

STATEMENTS	Yes(%)	No(%)	TOTAL	x^2
a) "Confidential" info to no TM's				
INT	9(12.68)	62(87.32)	71	
EXT	11(35.48)	20(64.52)	31	
TOTAL[b]	20(19.61)	82(80.39)	102	36.48
b) "Confidential" info to selected TM's				
INT	42(60.00)	28(40.00)	70	
EXT	20(66.67)	10(33.33)	30	
TOTAL[a]	62(62.00)	38(38.00)	100	5.29
c) "Non-confidential" info to all TM's				
INT	60(85.71)	10(14.29)	70	
EXT	33(94.29)	2(5.71)	35	
TOTAL[b]	93(88.57)	12(11.43)	105	60.95
d) "Non-confidential" info told to selected TM's				
INT	14(20.59)	54(79.41)	68	
EXT	4(13.33)	26(86.67)	30	
TOTAL[b]	18(18.37)	80(81.63)	98	37.97

continued...

a Differences in column totals are significant at .05 level (df = 1).
b Differences in column totals are significant at .001 level (df = 1).

TABLE 18(a)

CONFIDENTIALITY AND INFORMATION SHARING:

DICHOTOMIZED RESULTS
(continued)

STATEMENTS		Yes(%)	No(%)	TOTAL	x^2
e)	All info to all TM's				
	INT	37(55.22)	30(44.78)	67	
	EXT	14(43.75)	18(56.25)	32	
	TOTAL	51(51.52)	48(48.48)	99	0.04
f)	All info to selected TM's				
	INT	25(36.23)	44(63.77)	69	
	EXT	14(48.28)	15(51.72)	29	
	TOTAL	39(39.80)	59(60.20)	98	3.68

TABLE 19

OVERALL TM EVALUATION OF COMMUNICATION

	EXT(%)	INT(%)	TOTAL(%)
Satisfied	20(64.52)	29(44.62)	49(51.04)
Dissatisfied	11(35.48)	36(55.38)	47(48.96)
	31	65	96

X^2 overall = 2.59, df = 1, $p \geq .05$

APPENDIX A

RESULTS OF INFORMAL INTERVIEWS

As was pointed out in the methodology section of this report, the informal interviews were conducted in order to explore the opinions of TM's and to identify the relevant issues for the current state of I.P.P. communication at The V.R.R.I. The following is a summary of some of the most pertinent comments and observations recorded during the interviews with team members. They are listed in descending order, according to the frequency with which they occurred:

1. Staff Turnovers were noted by three TM's as contributing to feelings of unfamiliarity amongst TM'S. The issue of responsibility was raised - namely, whose duty is it to notify the rest of the team of changes in TM's.

2. Three TM'S noted a serious lack of client participation in the communication process. Moreover, two of these added that much client communication which did occur was in the form of agreeing or disagreeing to alternatives offered by other TM's.

3. Two inteviewees cited a need for adequate orientations. In addition to alerting TM's as to what types of information would be relevant to I.P.P., orientations would instruct TM's to present information in order to maximize its utility (e.g., use of forms).

4. Two TM's suggest that extra-institutional conferences could be beneficial by: (a) providing symbolic or actual system flexibility, and/or (b) facilitating greater TM attendance and participation (hence, a more holistic effort).

5. According to two interviewees, conferences were, at times, too unprofessional, degenerating into "chit-chat" or an anecdotal setting.

6. Two TM's remarked that scheduled informal communication would allow for better time-management and greater accountability. One of these two suggested that times and/or procedures for communication could, and should, be established during the conferences.

7. <u>Two</u> interviewees suggested that animosity between
    Residential and Vocational staff was a major inhibitor to
    effective communication and continuity in the client's
    lifestyle (i.e., the client's life becomes fragmented).
    <u>One</u> of these two suggested that disparate schedules (with
    only 1 1/2 hours overlap) may have been a significant
    factor, even to the extent that one schedule is seen as
    preferable to the other and that this characteristic is a
    reflection upon those staff.

8. <u>Two</u> interviewees were concerned with the degree of
    <u>formality</u> involved with client-staff relationships, which
    implies (for one of these TM's) a greater dependence of the
    individual on "the system".

9. Also related to formalness, <u>two</u> TM's expressed concern over
    the <u>language</u> (i.e., jargon) used in I.P.P. communication -
    e.g., test scores and names - especially during the
    conference sessions (although one of these interviewees
    addressed the issue of jargon in written communication as
    well).

10. Another related concern, touched on by <u>one</u> interviewee, may
    be termed "the professional-exclusionist" attitude, which
    this TM perceived as inherent in the conference <u>goal
    setting</u> procedures. By demanding formal and precise
    wording for objectives, this TM felt that others present
    were alienated from the group. [Researcher's Note: This
    problem has since been addressed by I.P.P., with conference
    procedure being changed accordingly]

11. <u>One</u> TM expressed concern over the <u>increasing reliance</u> on
    the <u>client</u> to <u>initiate communication</u>. While this
    interviewee did not view this reliance to be bad in itself,
    the concern was in regards to possible effects this may
    have on staff accountability -- that is, that this reliance
    may increase to the point where staff TM's might neglect
    their responsibilities for initiating communication.

12. <u>One</u> TM expressed a difficulty with <u>preconceptions</u> and their
    effect(s) on the conference setting. The interviewee felt
    that other TM's, who held preconceptions about objective
    and strategy priorities, sacrificed valuable opportunities
    for brainstorming (which, ideally, is initially open and
    non-evaluative).

13. According to <u>one</u> of the interviewees, The V.R.R.I. system
    does not freely offer a <u>rationale</u> for its demands while the
    clients are expected to account for their behavior.

14. <u>One</u> interviewee sensed a general confusion amongst TM's in
    terms of I.P.P. roles. Questions arise as to who must be
    contacted before programming decisions are made, and who -
    if anyone - is granted a "veto vote".

15. A <u>lack of client centredness</u> was cited by <u>one</u> TM as a **subject** of concern.

16. <u>One</u> interviewee suggested that more attention be paid to conveying the <u>reasoning behind official forms</u> to non-professionals.

17. <u>One</u> TM pointed to the benefits of developing the client's decision making skills.

18. A concern which was touched upon by several of those interviewed, but which was emphasized most strongly by <u>one</u> in particular, is the issue of <u>confidentiality</u>: in sum, who should be told what, when, and why?

19. One TM pointed to the attitudes of territoriality, suggesting the possibility that information/responsibility sharing may be seen as a threat to professional status - e.g., 'if everybody else (collectively) assumes my responsibilities, why will they need me?' According to this interviewee, this sentiment may even manifest itself at the organizational level, where The V.R.R.I. 'claims' responsibility for clients [its <u>raison d'etre</u>].

While these results obviously do not exhaust the information provided by the interviewees, it summarizes in paraphrased form those remarks which were alluded to as being most relevant and important to the research in the area of I.P.P. communication. In addition to these remarks, the researcher noted on several occasions, interviewees used the concepts "I.P.P." and "I.P.P. (annual) conference" synonymously, as in the following statement: "and (name) had an I.P.P. coming up the following week".

APPENDIX B

RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

The following are written responses given by the respondents
to the open-ended questions. By virtue of their uniqueness,
these responses did not lend themselves to a coding procedure (as
was the case with those open-ended responses which were recorded
in the results section). All the responses presented below were
recorded verbatim from the individual questionnaire forms,
excepting for four kinds of alterations, viz.:

1. Corrections were made for _spelling_ errors where these
   were detected.

2. Changes in _grammar_ (punctuation and usage).

3. The _addition of words_ which were otherwise implicit, or
   which would provide essential elements of context
   (i.e., the antecedent to a vague pronoun reference such
   as "they") when these elements were not given in the
   original response. These additions are indicated by
   "[ ]".

4. Where it has been appropriate (i.e., when responses
   were identical or nearly identical), only the first
   response encountered was written word for word.
   Subsequent occurrences were tallied, with the total
   given after the comment in square brackets [ ]. This
   change was made only for questions 6d (on the
   conferences) and question 17 (satisfaction/
   dissatisfaction with present communication).

It must be emphasized that in all four of these instances no
alterations were made which would detract from any statement, nor
any which would cause a statement to express more than what was
intended. In each case, the purpose was to _clarify_ the
respondent's remarks, thereby making them most accessible to the
reader.

Three additional abbreviations have also been introduced
here for the sake of space and simplicity:

info. - information

res. - residential (most often indicates residential staff
members, individually or as a whole).

voc. - vocational; similar in use to res.

The question number, as well as the question itself (or a
paraphrased version of it) appears at the head of each of the
following subsections. The initial question number is for the
internal form; where it is different, the question number for the
external form appears in parentheses.

FROM
QUESTION 4:   Please outline briefly your understanding of what
IPP is.

Blank = 15
"None" = 11
Other Notes = 1

011   Program built around the client.

014   A review of the level of functioning of the trainee.

018   Time to share information, concerns by all individuals
involved with the client in order to establish a "plan" to
further meet the client's needs.

028   An organized team approach to client rehabilitation
involving client, parents, approved homes supervisor (etc.)
and staff.

030   This is a program planned for each individual. They are
able to work at their own speed.

031   Communication about the client (good or bad). Information
about progess and daily work behaviour, etc.

047   My understanding of IPP is that it is an effort at a
holistic approach to the development of a client -- all
persons, including the client of course, come together to
look at strengths and weaknesses so that we can work as a
team for the benefit of the client and with full input from
the client.

048   We didn't receive one.

050   To set goals and programs.

051   A program best suited for the client to progress to their
maximum ability.

053   Sorry, I do not understand anything about this. [Client's]
social worker is [name] and I asked her to attend [client's]
next IPP conference is our absence.

054   Don't know what IPP stands for so I'm not filling it out.

056   I don't know what IPP stands for.

061   To find out the progress of my client. To bring up weak
areas that need more attention. To bring out special
concerns.

065   Whole team has input into planning and setting goals to meet
the needs of the individual in his training.

FROM
QUESTION 4: (cont'd)

066 IPP is a program designed to develop the full potential of
the client.

070 A meeting of all people involved with the client's case to
discuss past and future activities.

075 A program designed as close as possible that would help our
son according to his special needs.

077 A personal assessment of the client as to past achievements
and accomplishments, and for future goals and wants to be
mastered.

095 A conference of VRRI staff, residential staff, client and
client's parents and social worker to plan a program to meet
the client's needs. An opportunity for the client to hear
some positive things about himself.

101 Program for a client to meet his needs with the whole team
working along with him.

103 I understood but [name] did not. Goals to achieve.

104 A group of people that say a lot of things and never carry
them through.

106 It is a gathering of all the people involved with a client
from all the areas of training and consultation at the VRRI
to discuss the goals and objectives best suited for the
client.

123 It is a review of the client's programs, and the progress
the client is making, and how [they] should be altered to
achieve desired goals.

127 A method of bringing together all concerned individuals to
facilitate the "meeting of needs" of a disabled consumer.
This needs to be done with the consumer and/or guardian as
central to the process.

141 Individual Program Planning - once a year conference with
all interested persons for client's best interests in mind
(work and social areas).

144 The client's conference? Unsure of what IPP means.

146 To help the client maintain a family atmosphere and [for]
them to be able to function as well as they can on their own
within time. Not really familiar with [the] program.

200 It's a system set up to identify, prioritize and set up
specific goals for individual clients by using the team
approach, the team being all appropriate persons,
i.e., vocational, residential, staff, guardians, social
education, etc.

204 The process by which an indivdiual's life level is reviewed
and systematically planned for.

205 Individual Program Plan. Team members/client involved meet
to prioritize designed goals and objectives to be
implemented and worked on over the year.

206 Individual program planning for a person's future. The team
(staff, client, guardian, advocate) meet to develop goals,
objectives, and tasks to work towards.

209 An integrated plan to develop consistent training (both
short and long term) for the clients in all areas of their
lives.

211 An annual conference, in which all team members involved
with the client discuss the client's strengths and needs and
outline training priorities for the coming year. This is
the basis for program planning.

212 Stands for Individual Program Plan. It is a process
involving the client, the family, and an interdisciplinary
team. The purpose of the process is to help the client
reach [his or her] defined goals in life.

214 [It] is an individualized system that ensures the client's
needs and desires are accounted for in service provision to
that individual. It ensures accountability in terms of
skill developments and tasks agreed on.

216 The IPP is a program plan specifically designed for an
individual with input from the entire team, aimed at helping
a client [to arrive] at a desired goal.

218 To plan with team members individual programs to be worked
on in the following year. This programming should consist
of goal and behavioural objectives.

219 A gathering of all concerned and responsible people to
develop priority training programs with the client in
question.

220 This is an opportunity for the client, Res. and Voc. staff,
guardians, and significant others to meet and review the
client's progress, to develop a program plan with him/her
for the coming year and share information which will
directly benefit the client.

FROM
QUESTION 4: (cont'd)

222 Individual Program Plan for the client, involving planning 6-month - 1-year goals inclusive of all team members.

223 Team approaches to decisions on programming and goals of individual clients.

227 A process whereby concerned individuals from different areas of a client's life (i.e, Voc., Res., parents, health professionals, etc.) meet with the client to plan and set goals for the upcoming year. Review past goals and identify strengths and needs.

228 (1) Conference held on client's behalf to exchange info on progress of programs, well-being, future, referrals... (2) outlook from past living to future living -- independent.

229 Team members meet to discuss client strengths/weaknesses and to determine goals with client. Allows team members [a]   . chance to unify goals in the best interest of client.

230 Individual program for an individual utilizing all the people on the client's IPP team as well as the client in planning and establishing training goals (a very holistic approach).

231 Individual Program Plan (individually designed for each client).

233 Communication between team members to discuss progress/problems and future approaches and program planning for individual clients.

234 Discuss progress with team members and problems. Also plan new goals and strategies for the next year.

235 An Individualized Program Plan whereby the client and
 *   significant others plan and are accountable for strategies which will maximize the client's potential for independence.

236 A total team approach that is client centered and sets goals
 *   in the best interest of the client. Has accountability built in.

237 Set goals for client, both residentially and vocationally; discuss and decide strengths and needs.

---

* Response includes all three official IPP principles and does not restrict IPP to the conference setting.

FROM
QUESTION 4: (cont'd)

239 A yearly meeting for client across all environments.

240 A system where training goals are established for the cient by an interdisciplinary team.

246 Individual Program Plan designed to ensure team approach in programming from goal setting to design to implementation. Ensures accountability of all team members. Does not allow for preparation to future environments.

247 Individual Program Planning – Team consensus to share information and develop goals, objectives, and strategies.

249 Client goal planning.

252 Individualized Program Planning – client centered planning of goals and objectives based on need areas agreed upon by client and team members.

253 Individual Program Plan is an opportunity for the client to meet with team members and significant others to help in identifying goals and strategies for the individual for one year and who will be responsible.

254 A team approach that oversees an individual's progresses and difficulties.

255 It is a team approach to planning and implementary
* individualized program for clients. Hopefully, it will provide some consistency and accountability to the team members involved.

256 Individualized meeting of all team members to review progress and to set objectives for future.

259 IPP is a client centered approach to individual programming. It involves a team with the client as the central member of that team.

260 A client centered, interdisciplinary team approach to the planning and implementation of individual programs.

261 IPP is a system used to provide individualized services to adults who are handicapped to maximize their potential for independence within the community.

265 Outlining a person's strengths and needs and building a program for that person to best utilize these. Outlined strengths and needs are decided by team members.

---

* Response includes all three official IPP principles and does not restrict IPP to the conference setting.

**FROM
QUESTION 4:** (cont'd)

268 A group of people who work with a client directly or
indirectly who help plan a strategy that will help improve a
client's quality of life.

269 Provide communication between all team members and strive
for the same goals and objectives in a consistent manner.

272 Team concept with client focus, assisting client in
formulating goals for future dev[elopment].

275 IPP is a plan to increase and maximize a person's potential
in all areas of his/her life. It is a year by year plan
which is developed by all persons involved with that
individual.

276 Program planning for each individual client.

277 Individual Program Plan - Team members discuss and plan long
term goals for trainee. People involved: trainee, parents/
guardian, front line staff, psychologist, coordinator.

278 A team meeting to plan out the coming year for the client.

280 The yearly review of client's strengths and needs in order
to progress toward specific goals to enable clients to be as
independent as possible for that individual.

281 The opportunity to assess the individual's past year and
discuss, with the individual and team members, the upcoming
goals, changes, etc.

282 A meeting held for a designated time interval where ... all
service persons and parents/guardian get together to discuss
with the client the goals and objectives for the following
designated time slot.

283 Philosophical approach to interdisciplinary team planning,
* client centered, with accountability built in to insure
goals and objectives are carried through.
285 It is an individualized program plan based on the person's
needs.

286 Client centered approach to programming dealing with
client's needs -- voc. residential, leisure -- a team
approach.

287 Individual program planning -- i.e., planning programs
around the identified needs of the individual.

---

* Response includes all three official IPP principles and does
not restrict IPP to the conference setting.

FROM
QUESTION 4: (cont'd)

288 Individual Program Planning is a treatment approach in which
a group of people who are directly involved in service of
the client plan a program to achieve client's goals. A
client is represented in his/her IPP. This is an
interdisciplinary approach to treatment planning.

289 An interdisciplinary, cooperative, client-centered team
planning process to determine the direction and structure of
client programs.

292 The Individual Program Plan is a program system based on
client's individual needs. Everyone, including the client,
meets once a year (or more often) to determine what these
needs are and programs are set up to meet the needs.

293 Individual Program Planning, deciding with the client which
programs and training will best benefit the individual.

295 Team members in conference setting; designing individual
program plans; goals and behaviour objectives based on
identified needs.

296 IPP is an informative program to evaluate the client's
progress in his/her programs; also to assess the client's
needs to find out whether the client is happy in his/her
area and changes made where needed.

297 Individual Program Planning - Based on info. from
supervisors, shop workers, instructors, guardians, group
home workers, psychologists, etc., and the client, a set of
goals and objectives and programs are designed for each
client.

298 The entire and complete function of why clients are here.
What they are doing here and the objectives behind the
training of them.

299 IPP is a program for the client to develop and carry out
personal goals.

301 A Program plan that is geared specifically towards each
client in dealing with all aspects of life.

302 IPP is an individualized program which focuses on the
individual (client) and makes the program suit the client's
needs.

303 An interdisciplinary team approach to planning for and
following through individualized programs with client
participation and using measurable and obtainable goals to
help maximize potential for client independence.

FROM
QUESTION 4:   (cont'd)

304   A system for the client and significant others as a team to
      determine a direction, goals, and objectives that best suit
      the client and to work as a team most effectively to assist
      the client in reaching these goals.

306   A meeting of involved staff to discuss and agree upon goals
      for a particular client. Held at set times and facilitated
      by a chairperson.

307   IPP is a system which ensures a team-oriented,
  *   interdisciplinary approach to program planning to meet the
      needs of the individual it is serving. It ensures
      accountability and a structured approach to planning.

308   An individual plan designed for each client.

.311   A system which is used to determine the client's progress
      and develop the goals and objectives to suit clients' needs
      and maximize their potential to the fullest.

---

* Response includes all three official IPP principles and does
  not restrict IPP to the conference setting.

QUESTION 6D: Reasons for unequal participation, when respondent answered "NO" to: "At your most recent conference, did you feel that all members shared equally in making suggestions and decisions, or not?".

200 In most cases they do, but at times Residential has all the tasks or parents don't participate enough. This, in part, could be due to the intimidation (i.e., terms).

204 Some staff don't have the skills necessary to plan, set goals, etc. in short time.

216 I felt family members did not participate as fully as possible.

220 At conferences I have attended in the last 3 years (10-12) often parents are virtually ignored. Some staff show little interest or concern.

227 Certain members did not actively participate. Most responsibility placed on Residential.

246 Differences in programming philosophies i.e., functional utility of goals, no consideration of future environments, philosophy differences in expectations of clients' performances or potential.

253 Not all are equally informed or interested and it limits participation.

255 Some team members had minimal contact with client and were not familiar with his overall performance, work habits, skills, strengths, needs, etc.

261 Some people remained less verbal than others.

265 Parents had a tendency to answer for the client.

276 Res. Group Home did all the talking.

287 Lack of familiarity to the IPP conference system -- e.g. external people.

288 Some people came to the conference without much preparation.

306 Uninformed of other team members responsibilities.

206 Information brought up was not discussed previously as it was delicate issue for the client.

247 Dynamics partly, personalities, positions.

289 Client's desires were too often interpreted for TM's.

QUESTION 6D: (cont'd)

239 Very little input from guardian; VRRI staff was left to do all planning.

240 Little input from family; they tended to agree/disagree when other TM's did.

101 The opportunity is there but I do not seem to take full advantage.

209 Some personalities will usually dominate.

275 I feel that conference information (pre-conference reports)
     should be shared between TM's prior to the conference.

277 Since this was my only conference I have attended to date my
     input may be biased.

280 Re: ii [comprehensibility of conference proceedings]:
     Family members don't seem to understand programming to
     achieve desired behaviours and that they can do similar
     things at home.

259 Annual Conferences are sufficient if the team communicates
     throughout the year.

293 Conferences seem to be well organized.

295 Conferences are very individualized; therefore questions
     (iv) and [ix] [dealing with conference frequency and
     whether or not new information is raised] are difficult to
     make a concrete decision on.

304 Not sufficient emphasis on what the client wants for a
     lifestyle and goals that relate to that desired lifestyle
     and what he is willing to do to reach that lifestyle. Too
     much emphasis on TM's values of what they think is best for
     the client and goals relating to these values.

253 Res. Review still often covers most concerns and IPP tends
     to be redundant.

302 Unable to attend all but the ones that require medical
     input. I identified one identified as having health
     concerns.

246 The I.P.P. concept is valid, however it does not appear to
     be functional or practical in relation to client overall
     program needs.

276 The clients do not understand the technical language.

220 Two hours is often too little time to review a year in the
     life of (name) and plan the next one. Many staff seem to
     feel it is something they HAVE to do versus want to do and
     this slows down productivity even more.

218 Regarding #6 c(ii) and (x) [dealing, with comprehensibility
     and jargon usage], I feel that at times the client is not
     fully aware of the statements made.

200 Accountability with all TM's needs to be enforced.

QUESTION 6E: (cont'd)

282   Conferences are necessary both for open communication for all TM's, and for consistency of programming methods and goals.

252   I think the conferences are well organized and chaired. I think it will be more organized when they implement the planning of objectives outside the conference.

272   I feel conferences have become very client centred and systems (follow-up, goals, objectives) are becoming much more streamlined.

307   I feel that generally TM's are acquainted with one another prior to the conference, but often have not communicated on a regular basis. Therefore TM's tend to "update" one another and often require redirection to planning.

240   I feel I would have been a more effectively functioning member of the team, had I been informed what was expected of me before the actual conference.

018   Once a year is nowhere near often enough to have a formal meeting of all TM's.

095   Conference chairperson unaware of client's personality and potential. Conference conducted by writing goals, tasks, strengths, needs on large poster paper and expecting client to sit through 2-1/2 hours of this is inhuman, to say the least.

144   Not all TM's know client well -- it seems that residential members know the client the best.

070   A useful opportunity to exchange views and make suggestions.

038   We've only had one conference to evaluate.

127   Though some format needs to be followed to make an I.P.P. conference productive, the formality seems to take away from open discussion and lead to a long, drawn out, often frustrating experience.

QUESTION 7E(iii): Why general referral form is not useful

220 The last one I filled out, I've yet to receive a response
     to, and have written two follow-up memos with no results
     again. VERY FRUSTRATING.

249 Generally, referrals are agreed upon at the conference,
     Most important with this (ILS) level of client is their
     input and decision to refer themselves or be referred. At
     this level, a team referral should not even be considered.

259 External people seemed less willing to become involved.

295 It is a very lengthy process to get in touch with all team
     members.

303 In most cases, all team members O.K the referral, so it is
     time consuming to get written O.K's. By phone is good
     enough. Cannot always get hold of all members of a team.

304 It is sometimes difficult to know which people should be
     informed and get their O.K. For example, an out-of-town
     parent who may have some but little contact with the client
     may or may not be contacted.

252 I've never used one.

282 I very seldom read them because I have usually had contact
     with the proposing shop manager or shop manager I am looking
     to find a placement with.

289 Haven't seen one in use yet.

247 Poor form for the second purpose [making conference
     changes]; o.k. for the first purpose [referring a client to
     different services within The V.R.R.I.].

QUESTION 7F: Comments on the After the Conference Section

277   To my knowledge, I do not receive ITP follow ups -- I write
      them.

259   Accountability and info. flow have improved considerably
      with the implementation of the new system.

302   I do not require a written follow up but, if health concerns
      were outlined, I would like to be informed of the results of
      the plan or resolutions of health concerns.

246   Work at co-op apartments rarely involved with IPP's. Co-op
      philosophy and program systems vary greatly from I.P.P.'s
      system in some ways.

218   In order to maintain consistency and accountability, the
      follow ups are necessary.

206   I do not directly receive the follow up, but oversee this.

272   To ensure programs do take place, acountability should be
      ensured by units' responsibility, and not necessarily
      individuals'.

065   Sometimes parts of the after the conference report do not
      agree with my understanding of what actually took place.
      They seem to be the recording secretary's impressions.

141   Follow-ups help me to understand what is still going on and
      how its progressing. The client sometimes doesn't remember.

051   Have a better understanding as [to] what is done for
      progress to client.

144   Please be more specific and use plain English. It's my
      understanding that staff at The V.R.R.I. use these forms
      (i.e., general referral form).

FROM QUESTION 8: General Purpose of Face-to-Face Meetings (frequencies are given for internal and external responses)

01 Information sharing/general discussion (internal responses = 7; external = 3).

02 Special concerns (int. = 11: ext. = 2)

10 "Concerns" (int. = 3)

15 Client concerns/issues (int = 5).

22 Medical concerns (int. = 1)

03 "It was for I.P.P." (ext. = 1)

04 Coordinate programming efforts (int. = 1; ext. = 1)

17 Evaluate programs (int = 1)

18 Review programs/tasks (int. = 3)

19 Update/review progress in programmatic areas (int = 3)

20 Set up/maintain programs with other TM's (int = 5)

21 Set up I.T.P.'s (int = 2)

29 Discuss existing programs (int. = 1)

05 Crises/behavioral difficulties/problems/problem solving (int = 16; ext. = 1)

09 Resolving TM conflicts (int. =1; ext. = 1)

06 "Accessing new resources" (ext. = 1)

07 "Usually for the six month conference" (int. = 1; ext = 1)

08 Home visits (ext. = 1)

11 Discussion of client progress (int. = 14)

25 Discussion of client strengths (int. = 1)

12 Discuss client needs/future programs (int. = 8)

13 Vocational needs (int = 1)

14 Updates (int. = 1)

26 Inform of changes (int. = 1)

FROM QUESTION 8: (cont'd)

24   Ensured consistency (int. = 4)

27   Discuss behavior (int. = 1)

28   Review meetings (int. = 1)

29   Accountability (int. = 3)

QUESTION 8D: Comments on the <u>Face to Face Meetings</u> Section

050   Have all been satisfactory.

053   We have had face-to-face meetings and felt that they were beneficial. There is so little change in (name)'s condition although she seems to be more relaxed and happy which is due to the staff and her landlady.

065   This is mostly with residential.

127   These meetings can be productive if held prior to an internal decision to terminate a client. I find this is seldom the case at VRRI.

018   Staff changes force one-to-one meetings to re-establish program goals, etc.

144   Would like to see Program Worker once per week and also to see more of residential coordinator (i.e., once per week).

275   I feel this is a big need at The V.R.R.I. -- there are not enough informal chit-chat sessions to keep up on what the team is doing.

277   These meetings are important; it lets everyone know what new situations are and past experiences which may help in training.

280   Face to Face [meetings are] helpful to brainstorming solutions to problems as well.

260   We only have special concerns meetings with team members when there is a crisis situation, i.e., once every six months.

295   Necessary, valuable in gaining insight of others' job perceptions of clients.

304   More important than Annual Conference in getting a clear picture of the client (strengths/needs, facilitating/restraining) as it tends to be slanted information making the client appear more skilled when presented in front of the client at the annual conference.

255   Should be more formalized -- not enough information is contained in the minutes. If problem occurs in one area it is sometimes felt that other area members are not interested in the problem.

286   Contact depends on the client -- due to large case load.

QUESTION 8D: (cont'd)

260 These meetings should be called to discuss positive issues,
    i.e., transfer, referral to employment, work experience
    placement, jobs.

298 Meetings were not structured "sit down" meetings but rather
    casual confrontations when the need arose.

220 These are extremely important, yet little effort is made by the
    other TM's to meet.

254 Lack clinical information and process. Without that approach,
    meetings are too often a waste of time.

200 It has helped to lay out the problem with resolution to it in
    mind in a formal manner. Documentation -- i.e., minutes -- are
    very important in these areas.

218 These meetings are very useful and should be done more often.

283 It was useful because we tried to establish some consistency in
    training programs throughout different settings (voc. vs.
    res.).

282 Essential for TM's to get together to be aware of client's
    overall living and voc. situation.

252 I find they are usually necessary.

272 Often relative ideas happen when informal discussion takes
    place without the threat of feeling unprofessional.

311. O.K.

240 In the eight months I've worked with the key client, day
    training staff have never initiated a meeting; I have initiated
    all of them.

235. They tend to be, if not very helpful, at least supportive.

236 Meetings with other front line staff occur on a weekly basis.

237 They served a need.

011 Really do appreciate the regular communication. Nice to have a
    person I can contact.

047 Heard; understood, action taken.

FROM QUESTION 9: General Purpose of Telephone Communication (with frequency of internal and external responses)

01   Information sharing (int. = 8; ext. = 1)

02   Updates (int. = 19; ext. = 3)

03   Client concerns (int. = 2; ext. = 1)

15   Concerns: general (int. = 3)

20   Medical concerns (int. = 3)

26   Special concerns (int. = 1)

04   Problems/behavioral difficulties/crises (int. =14; ext. = 3)

05   Ensuring accountability: form submission (int. = 2)

06   Requests (int. = 1; ext. = 4)

07   Progress: general (int. = 10; ext. =1)

08   General family contact (ext. = 1)

10   Work related (ext. = 1)

11   Discussion of programs/planning (int. = 5; ext = 1)

12   Coordinating/planning activities (int. = 1; ext. = 1)

13   Finding out how I can work on program in my area (ext. = 1)

18   Tasks, responsibilities (int. = 1)

14   Confirming things; general (int. = 1; ext. = 1)

23   Confirmation of meetings (int. = 5)

24   Home issues (int. = 1)25   Support (int. = 1)

27   Various (int. = 2)

30   Questions/inquiries (int. = 1; ext. = 1)

31   To disucss forwarding of information (int. = 1)

17   Consistency (int. = 5)

QUESTION 9D: Comments on the Telephone Communication Section

280 Telephones save a long walk for a short walk.

275 I feel this is a big need at The VRRI -- there are not
     enough informal chit-chat sessions to keep up on what the
     team is doing.

277 This area is important for immediate information, but it can
     be abused sometimes.

304 Often easier to do, to accomplish same end, than meeting
     face to face, if the communication is of most importance to
     two or three TM's.

253 Guardians/public guardians do not often initiate the contact
     but are often offended if not informed. Telephone messages
     are often not responded to.

255 Helps keep me informed of client program and progress.

260 Positive to some extent, though usually regarding a problem.

218 There should be more contact between members especially
     between res. and voc.

227 Telephone contact is necessary to ensure both parties are
     working towards common goals and in the client's best
     interest.

282 Most homes and group homes that we are dealing with now are
     communicating with Bottle Depot #1 and vice versa as needed.

272 Telephone contact is vital for any quick decision-making on
     approval from TM's.

223 Seems to be very much res. phoning voc. and very little of
     other TM's phoning, except in case of emergency.

236 Most contact is with voc. staff.

235 I would rather sit down face-to-face in an informal
     atmosphere rather than discuss details over the phone.

030 Was informative.

061 Only to clear up some minor problems which has always been
     satisfactory.

075 Usually I think it is important to have to do the phoning.

050 Phone calls could be too frequent in our case.

QUESTION 9D: (cont'd)

018   Very useful in maintaining ongoing communication of relevant information.

141   The names of all teammates are available to us to call at any time we have questions.

144   I don't like telephone conversation -- its too impersonal. I prefer to have face-to-face meetings -- they're more effective.

127   Again, the phone calls are great if there is a genuine interest on the part of the agency staff to improve the quality of service for clients. Phone calls regarding client terminations are devasting.

047   Appreciated the quick return of the call when a message was left.

FROM QUESTION 10:   Main Purposes of Memos (all frequencies are from internal TM's only)

03   Information sharing (14 responses)

04   Proof of contact; accountability (6)

11/22   Planning programs/scheduling (6)

05   Circulation/relay info (4)

06   Raising concerns (4)

01   Communication between all levels (3)

15   Updates (3)

02   Confirmation: general (2)

07/08   Transfers/program changes (2)

16   Set up meetings (3)

17   Changes in client profiles

09   Behavior (1)

14   Problems, crises, behavioral difficulties (1)

12   Issue people uncomfortable discussing by face-to-face or phone (1)

13   Messages (1)

10   Clarification of issues (1)

18   Informing of client absenteeism (1)

19   "Notificaiton of an action item" (1)

26   When a phone call or a meeting cannot be accomplished (1)

20   Notification of something out of the ordinary (1)

21   Reminders; general (1)

22   Reminders of deadlines (1)

24   Red tape; institute bureaucracy (1)

25   To advise of changes

QUESTION 10E: Comments on the Memo Section

275 As in **previous** [comments section on Telephone Communication] --
there should be more informal communications happening between
TM's. Memos can be good reminders, but sometimes are sent out
for little reason and are useless, since you've already been
told.

304 Easy not to clearly understand the info. in a memo. Not as
good as phone or face to face for clear understanding, and more
time-consuming as a rule. Memos best to put in writing what
agreed on the phone or in person.

260 Memos supply both parties with a record of the correspondence.

204 Should only be used for requests that responses are required
for in writing.

297 Effective because they can be referred back to at a later date
for future planning.

298 Would be nice to have more interaction with other TM's and
objectives laid out on a memo. Plus a memo. Plus a memo sent
down as to holidays taken by the clients and to inform us if
clients are away.

282 Memos are the most effective means of communication as being
able to contact another individual. They are accountable means
of communication.

272 I feel Memos are not as personal as one to one contact. As
part of advanced communication, interpretation may be lost or
actual meaning may be misinterpreted.

223 Needs to be written documentation and it helps keep some
communication open, especially if other types are not
happening.

QUESTION 11: Preference for Type of Communication:
"Other" Responses

306 Through supervisors

50 Combination of all

127 Social Events

144 Face to Face

204 Special Concerns Meeting (261)

220 One to One

236 Written Reports

269 Drop-in by Res.

272 passed on/third person (275)

298 Casual confrontations

303 Client updates

280 Quick talks in halls and shops

QUESTION 12 (11): Reasons for preference of formality/informality in communication.

Formal Communication

234 Informal meetings tend to lose track of the reason why everyone is meeting.

255 Accountability, consistency.

200 We document any contact - informal tends to provide staff with less accountability-the more formal, the more professional staff tend to view it.

260 To ensure consistency throughout The V.R.R.I.

212 Concise and to the point, no digressing, with concrete conclusions at the end of meeting.

282 Therefore, you are not wasting your time on unnecessary topics.

206 For accountability purposes.

077 A set time and date can be arranged (weather permitting) for meetings.

Informal Communication

223 Builds a more personal rapport between TM's, which makes communication more effective - less threatening to all concerned.

053 Due to the distance we live from Calgary, [and] our difficulty in driving in the city, we find it a problem to attend meetings. Yes, meetings are necessary and we appreciate the fact that there are others willing to attend and assist. My husband and I are in our seventies and do not feel that we have much to offer. Also, my husband has Parkinson's disease and is handicapped in that respect.

066 Persons involved communicate more frequently.

Formal and Informal; Mostly Formal

297 Because informal unclarified info. makes for error embarrassment, and frustration.

204 We're running a professional business.

296 To be sure that all were to know what was to happen and plans could be made much more easily.

228 To get more.

QUESTION 12 (11): (cont'd)

227 It makes for easier, straight forward conversation without the formality, yet still allows for the maintenance of professionalism.

285 We seem to get more accomplished during formal meetings, but its nice also just to get together and discuss things.

063 With formal communication, you receive some info. about your child's activites. Whereas there seems to be little informal communication.

Formal and Informal; mostly informal

276 Less time-consuming.

298 Usually time factor does not allow for a lengthy formal meeting.

246 Communications at present are adequate for me.

277 Informal for day to day meetings, formal for case conferences.

202 The type of info.-sharing should be in a relaxed open environment.

214 Provides for networking and sharing of concerns in a proactive fashion.

219 Save time.

229 Formal meetings are needed occasionally to review goals/strategies and do follow-ups, however informal communications allows for more contact and support to TM's.

293 Allows more creativity and relaxed attitude.

304 Too much formal would create contacts when they are not needed. Some formal would ensure some contact/communication did occur, even if a TM did not incorporate this well in their job.

306 Too much emphasis on hierarchy - waste of time and power-tripping.

253 Cannot rate as it depends on type of information being shared and how many people are involved.

249 Conserve time, only those who need to be involved are.

275 Because people are more relaxed in an informal setting and more seems to get accomplished - formal meetings, however, are sometimes necessary.

QUESTION 12 (11): (cont'd)

280 **Formalities** are _important_: changes, etc. I.P.P. etc.

265 Planning should be formal and all TM's should be involved.
Isssues not pertinent to planning - i.e., updates - should be
done on an informal basis.

268 Time restrictions wouldn't allow for formal communication.

216 In the formal setting, I find the client -[an] important TM -
is frequently too anxious to participate to their potential.

292 People are more relaxed and seem willing to communicate more
informally.

308 Makes things easier for the client.

236 When informal, can deal with things as they arise but some
formality ensures more accountability and accomplishment.

240 Members seem more at ease during informal meetings/telephone
calls and are better able to communicate.

311 Personal preference.

082 I find informal communication is more relaxed and I, for one,
get more from it.

127 If there is not a great deal of communication in between
formal meetings, a lot of problems can develop that could be
prevented by mutual support, commitment, and understanding.

141 Communication needs some regulations (i.e., format), but not
too much structure.

047 Time, balance.

Equal Amounts of Formal and Informal

220 Depending on the situation (i.e., sharing information or
special concerns).

261 The formal to ensure accountability, the informal to
facilitate complete info.-sharing

218 There needs to be structure but also comfortable.

259 The need for formal vs informal would depend on the issue.

230 You need to establish a good rapport with other I.P.P members
on a formal as well as an informal basis.

295 Creates a more relaxed environment.

QUESTION 12 (11): (cont'd)

269 Formal is for meetings and informal for telephone calls and memos.

211 Structured in terms of an outline, informal in terms of people feeling free to discuss issues.

252 Formal is necessary so as to ensure proper documentation; informal is nice, as it cuts back on paperwork.

289 Each serves a different purpose. Formal ensures accountability; informal promotes thinking, reasoning, exhange, brainstorming.

247 Both are important.

272 Some of the best ideas for programming may be experienced over a coffee. However, the best community P.R. would be recognized.

222 More is accomplished when people are more relaxed - i.e., get more input.

061 An I.P.P. conference once a year and occasional phone calls for small problems as they occur.

075 We do not have a University Education, so we can understand what's going on.

065 Because there are daily happenings that affect program and informally letting us know at the time would help us keep on top of the situation - rather than trying to after the fact.

106 More relaxed - puts client more at ease.

146 It would help us to understand the legal aspect of I.P.P. contracts, and to understand the person I am dealing with.

018 Depends on the purpose of the meeting.

011 Really like the regular reporting of info. Like to see info in print.

QUESTION 13 (12): "How often do you feel communication between team members should occur?": 'Other' responses.

1. Formally

    As necessary/As required (5 responses)
    Every 3 months/Quarterly (4 responses)
    When client concerns/Important issues arise (4 responses)
    Annually/Once a year (3 responses
    Semi-Annually/Twice a year (2 responses)
    Once/2 months (1 response)
    Per client 1-4 times/year (1 response)
    Very dependent on individual's needs (1 response)
    May vary. Between Employment Program and Res., once/two
        weeks; between Employment Program and Voc., once/month
        (1 response)

2. Informally

    As necessary/As required (12 responses)
    Every three months (2 responses)
    Whenever client concerns occur (1 response)
    Depends on kind of information (1 response)
    Very dependent on individual needs (1 response)
    Depends on the need and degree of involvement that the
        various TM's have with the client (1 response)
    Phone and memos, once/wk; communication book, everyday
        (1 response)
    Once every six months (1 response)
    When needed on either side, either in staff or schedule of
        client is being made (1 response)

3. Unspecified

    When plans and goals change, I, as a family member, would
        like to be advised. Also, if a problem arises, I'd like
        to know about it so that I know the truth as he tends to
        tell us all what he thinks we want to hear (1 response)

QUESTION 15 (14): Other areas in which the client is involved, and
of which respondent is aware

075   Client's progress in life.

127   Professional support.

253   Leisure (organized).

218   Work program.

214   Guardians (x2).

249   Social Services.

288   Client Services, Counselling, Music Therapist, etc.

304   Employment, volunteer jobs.

282   Social Education, employment program.

272   Specialized services (external) i.e., doctors, legal, etc.

223   Public Guardian.

222   Leisure Programs, Citizen's Advocates, Exterior Resource.

QUESTION 17 (16): Why TM's are satisfied or dissatisfied with the current state of communication.

DISSATISFIED WITH CURRENT COMMUNICATION (N = 47)

275 I feel there is a need for increased communication between annual conferences.

268 Too much time goes by and too many changes occur in the space of one year. Communication should be more often.

230 Some teams communicate well; however, other teams leave communication regarding concerns to major conference.

287 Due to the large size of the agency and high number of significant external people involved, information does not always reach the people that it should.

304 Tendency [is] not to communicate unless information is requested or [if] contact is initiated by myself.

256 Lack of current information regarding client difficulties, changes, etc. in different environments.

220 It's a one way street.

261 There should be more [communication between] residential and vocational.

229 Generally satisfied with communication with some TM's; others do not seem to understand what is being done residentially.

227 Emphasis seems to be on residential to initiate contact

286 Insufficient communication between TM's. Usually occurs around problems only.

260 Requires move regularity and structure.

306 Heavy workloads means there is little time available.

255 There is still little communication.

277 [Regarding] some information about trainee, front line are not made aware of decision.

204 But I feel as people adjust, it will get better.

298 Not too much interaction [3] (299) (261)

216 I feel that, as residential staff, I am frequently informed of problems at work (e.g., behavior, etc.), but myself sharing the same information with vocational staff is not received with interest or concern.

QUESTION 17(16): (cont'd)

DISSATISFIED WITH CURRENT COMMUNICATION (cont'd)

281   Not enough communication on a regular basis.

292   Not often enough. I don't feel we work as a team but more
      as a single unit.

283   There is not enough.

308   All the members rely on residential workers for information.

289   Too infrequent. Too much attempted at annual conferences.

223   Seems to be residential initiative always and it puts undue
      pressures and responsibilities [on them], rather than
      [having a] shared team approach.

307   From my experience in conferences, TM's could benefit from
      increased communication. It is a commonly expressed
      concern.

222   I find that we most often have to initiate.

239   To date, most contact that has been made between I.P.P. TM's
      has been initiated by residential staff. It seems as though
      other TM's feel it is solely our responsibility.

236   Could receive more written reports from vocational programs.

235   Sometimes I feel communication with [team] members outside
      of the direct V.R.R.I. residential or V.R.R.I. vocational is
      inadequate (i.e., Guardians).

240   Not enough contact initiated by Day Training staff.

095   Conference report was a maze of "status" goals, "status of
      tasks", "agency responsible". No wonder reports are seldom
      re-read.

112   No communication whatever.

030   Would like to hear more often how he [my son] is doing.

038   No communication exists.

063   We would appreciate an occasional phone call from anyone
      involved. Especially on urgent matters.

065   Is there really communication?

105   There has only been one conference and what was suggested be
      done wasn't.

QUESTION 17(16): (cont'd)

DISSATISFIED WITH CURRENT COMMUNICATION (cont'd)

127 Though communication with residential staff is generally good, I have greater difficulty receiving accurate, timely information from vocational services.

146 All members are in this program for different reasons, and all people have different priorities, so this makes it hard to find out why they are in the program and to work from that angle, if it means different groups, OK. But it should all focus around helping the client. There are very few people who would be in this program if you took away the money including staff members, true, so we have to face that (the month helps).

066 After the 1984 conference all team members submitted a six month follow-up report. This was not done in 1985. It remains to be seen if it will be done in 1986.

SATISFIED WITH CURRENT COMMUNICATION (N = 49)

278 Seems adequate.

280 Friendly, useful, supportive and helpful if needed.

285 We have very good communication; all sides make an effort and we are truly working as a team.

265 Some TM's are more communicative than others; therefore, I hate to pidgeonhole them all. Generally, on the whole, I am satisfied.

269 Communication happens as it is needed.

259 I think TM's adjust the frequency of communication to meet individual situations.

253 The nature of our specific clientele demands it.

219 If I feel I need to know something, I ask.

246 Minimal involvement with a lot of TM's. Team members involved are well informed.

276 We have very good communication between vocational, residential group homes, and families.

282 Because team members contact each other when it is necessary. Not enough work time to meet with everyone all the time.

QUESTION 17(16): (cont'd)

SATISFIED WITH CURRENT COMMUNICATION (N = 49)

272 I feel adequate communication does occur but more vocational and residential unity should take place.

237 We have residential reviews every six months.

141 I know pretty well how the programs are run and expect to get a call up if there is any drastic changes (good or bad).

011 Regular meeting.

047 My contact has been only with one TM over the past year; however, that has been a satisfying contact in "crisis" situations.

007 They more or less stay out of business of mine.

077 Permission is requested for major changes or plans for well-being of client.

082 I feel I am kept quite well informed on all current affairs.

106 Progress with client seems to be going forward and so I assume the team is working in her best interest.

NON-CODEABLE RESPONSES:

(SATISFIED and DISSATISFIED or NEITHER AT ALL)

295 Very individualized: some TM's are great on communication, some are not so great.

302 Medical information on many of the clients is lacking but it may not be the TM's faults.

242 Varies with different I.P.P.'s.

075 I think there should be more concern and care taken with clients' accounts and the way they are handled -- there should be more control over staff members handling their clients' accounts. Either that or there should be written account balance sent to their parents or guardians so that they can keep tabs also.

QUESTION 18(17): "If you were able to bring about any changes to improve communication between TM's, what would you do?"

112 Work with/encourage clients more, so they also would be interested.

141 Maybe monthly or bi-monthly discussion groups to talk over any changes or problems.

144 That other TM's (i.e., vocational) make more effort to share information with the rest of us. Where are the rest of you?

047 See that the "family" part of the team is notified when other TM's are changed over. Also would like a six month (or so) "progress" report (phone or written; prefer phone) on job situation -- both from the employer's point of view and the clients.

011 Do something about staff changes.

254 Establish a consistent approach for communication.
Establish acountability.
Outline responsibilities in all areas of communication.

200 Ensure written info. (mostly summaries) are passed on to team members as well as bi-weekly contact to update res. and voc.

228 Ensure that there is more contact of TM's.

218 Somehow (??) get res. and voc. to realize they are working for the same clients.

219 Changes should be noted and the appropriate TM's notified.

227 Arrange for more phone calls.

216 Voc. staff [should] not refer to clients that are from my group home, and yet are in their shop, as "your client". Counselling for family members to enable them to communicate and participate in team more fully.

281 Make it mandatory to have some sort of communication, whether formal or informal, on a regular basis.

211 Encourage TM's to call frequently or write memos to each other in regards to client's progress.

292 Set up a key client system. If you were responsible to act as an advocate, you would be more up to date on the happenings in the client's life.

QUESTION 18 (17): (cont'd)

247 Role clarification of different positions, including
    authority levels. Team building: possibly include voc. TM's
    with house [group home] TM's. The IPP team has a
    representative from each dept. Decisions are made within
    the res. team. Perhaps the two teams -- voc. and res. --
    can be brought closer together outside IPP conference.

289 Rotating chairmanship of conferences, including
    representatives from other agencies. Use of brainstorming
    sessions where good definitions are not required. More
    background info. circulated to team members [?] conference.

252 Probably more telephone communication -- I find it
    efficient, useful, and timesaving.

308 Equality.

275 Stress mostly telephone, written, or face to face contact --
    especially between res. and voc. -- informing TM's of any
    changes, additions, or deletions in a client's program.

277 Always include front line staff, as they are the one's
    directly involved with trainee.

280 Res./Voc. is sometimes distant; only contact is when there
    is a problem which is severe.

285 Put more hours in a day!

265 Each TM [should] submit a monthly review (overall) to a
    person responsible to disseminate that info. to all TM's.

268 Implement brief monthly updates (written) that have to be
    circulated amongst TM's (progress, task training specific).

259 Set up a brief, concise update report format that could be
    completed at established intervals (e.g., once every 2
    months).

286 Difficult to improve with large caseload sizes as
    communication is time-consuming -- regular communication
    would ensure information flow.

253 Request that guardians be more initiative in seeking info.
    when things are going well.

256 Simplify the process - make it as easy as possible to
    encourage consistency.

249 Is fine now.

299 Make time available to have meetings to discuss what is
    needed.

QUESTION 18 (17): (cont'd)

298 First of all, find out who the other TM's are and what their input is.

297 I would appreciate knowing the main goals and objectives for all the clients I deal with so I can design their programs accordingly.

246 Discuss philosophy differences and expectations. Appears, and always has appeared to be communication problems with other units of VRRI. Animosity is underyling.

204 I'd fire the people with attitude problems.

255 Incorporated in the IPP [system] should be formalized contract indicating dates and times of TM contact. This is difficult in terms of face to face meetings as res. should not be working in the daytime as their shifts start in late afternoon. There is no budget for extra hours. Communication might be enhanced by memos and phone calls and quarterly meetings every 3 months.

220 Either cross day program hours with res. or make it mandatory for voc. to visit res. as often as res. visits voc.

261 Increase the number of IPP's [i.e., conferences] to, at the very least, twice yearly.

288 Talk to TM's on the phone before a conference.

214 Have everyone understand and believe in I.P.P. Have people change attitudes regarding doing "with" instead of "for".

272 Feel more confident in going to individuals with ideas, commands, beefs, whatever the form of communication, and feel at ease in doing so on an informal basis.

221 Nil.

240 There should be more scheduled contact between TM's (even phone calls).

235 I would try to involve members (again, outside of res. and voc.) more. As it is, res. and voc. do almost all the talking and the planning.

236 Have more informal contact through written reports in various areas.

222 At IPP [conferences] -- indicate communication section, frequency, and people sign.

QUESTION 18 (17): (cont'd)

307 Propose a communication format for TM's to follow and review
it at the annual conference.

223 More accountability and documentation in VRRI voc. settings
to enable more sharing of responsibilities.

209 Increase formal written skills, "apprentice" TM's to I.P.P.
process with experienced staff.

070 More formal and informal contacts.

056 Keep the lines open between residential and work programs so
that they complement each other.

007 Nothing

038 Phone calls at home at least once per month on voc.
progress. Meetings more frequently. A communication book,
[should be] passed from work to home as significant events
happen.

063 Parental concerns and advice should be given better
consideration and not thought of, by some staff, as
unwarranted interference.

065 Encourage use of a daily communication book, perhaps with a
coded system to reduce writing time, [passed] between voc.
and res. -- to be given priority when something may have
happened to affect, disrupt, or change the client's daily
activity.

105 [I should] feel like I'm part of a team, which I don't feel
now. Regular communication with TM's.

127 Coordinate more informal communication between key I.P.P.
members and hold meetings as soon as a problem begins to
surface, so that a preventative, pro-active strategy can be
implemented.

018 Increase frequency of annual meeting; continue monthly
reports from voc. and res. on client functioning.

066 I would urge regular meetings of TM's between conferences.
At the same time, I am aware that information I may want
regarding the client is available, [and] I am free to
inquire or to contact any TM.

095 Re-organize the conference to be chaired by someone who
knows the clients. Re-organize the conference report to
make it more humane. What in the world are I.P.P. work
sheets (poster-size) and conference reports sent home with
the client for? Client cannot read. The V.R.R.I.'s
greatest concern for three years at I.P.P. conferences has
been my young person's self esteem. Conducting the meeting
in print [and/or] handing out work sheets does nothing but
reinforce his low self-esteem.

QUESTION 19 (18): Any additional topics related to I.P.P. and
communication.

280 Communication to the general public regarding the mentally
handicapped and their situations is non-existent! The
mentally handicapped are too alienated from the public.

259 I think accountability and deadlines are not being met in
all areas. This is unfair to those who are following the
system.

304 Re: confidentiality section [III] -- to clarify: One
should not promise confidentiality if it is not in the
client's interest. Bargaining on confidentiality, where you
give the person a time period to relay the info. themselves
before you relay it, decide how the info. will be relayed,
or will ask the TM's to call the individual to get the
information and not say what, etc. can be helpful. Info.
needs to be passed to those who require it and not to those
who cannot use it or should not have the info. In future
when clients may be doing subcontract work in the community
and an employer may be considered a team member, they should
not know or pass over the desk everything about the client.

253 Meetings should occasionally be held in client's home during
residential hours.

255 The forms used for the conference are not adequate. The use
of percentages in calculating behavioural objectives. TM
accountability.

277 IPP orientation should be compulsory within the first two
days of employment to ensure proper lines of communication.

246 Feel animosity in that res. appears not to be involved in
IPP changes. Memos have stated that program workers have
been consulted prior to changes, yet when speaking with
peers this is not the case. From experience of 4 1/2 years,
voc. and res. attend I.P.P.'s [i.e., conferences] prepared
via I.P.P. system and return to their units to continue on
with their individual programs. Question whether or not may
comply with the I.P.P. system but don't fully buy into.

298 Would be nice to know exactly what time and objectives are
set out in regards to the recreational aspect which we deal
with.

276 IPP conference are too long; immaterial things that could be
done re memos, telephone, do not have to be discussed at the
conference.

QUESTION 19 (18): (cont'd)

2) **tells me** there was a lack of follow through on goals (**lack** of accountability, previously)

3) tells me pre-conference reports [are] rarely read.

The client isn't asking for parole. What's this "impartiality" about. Document refers to numbered recommendations and then did not number the said recommendations. This questionnaire asked me to return it by Aug. 13, 1986 in the accompanying letter and then says before July 31, 1986 above.

My young person has not met many of the objectives set at I.P.P. conferences. Often not able to get into the special group, or "class filled", or "showed no interest", or "unable to meet criteria". Does this mean he's a failure or that The VRRI staff has failed to assess his potential for failure or success at a particular task? Tasks (in [The] VRRI and Group Home) are not kept in focus consistently. Then I notice a great flurry of talk just weeks before the six month review to make me think the task has been in mind all along. Input from TM's is not always honest. My young person, by residential reports, could cook a meal, clean the kitchen, use Canada's Food Rules to plan nutritious, balanced meals and budget the money needed for such a task. I think it is quite inhumane to want these mentally handicapped people to come up to "normal" standards. My young person's self esteem would be much improved by some honest, wise assessment and some structured programs to help him feel good about himself. If unit supervisors and others had some joy in their work they'd likely smile a bit and take the load off some of the withdrawn, low self-concept clients.

There is no need for a mental age of five to sit through a two and a half hour conference. It is unthinking and unkind to think they can be made to focus on something for that length of time. Hell, if they could concentrate on the printed words on the IPP conference wall for 15 minutes, they wouldn't be in The VRRI.

070 The client and his family should be kept up to date about the client's progress and performance.

136 It is felt that I require an orientation to the I.P.P. system before I can answer this questionnaire.

030 A phone call once in a while would be helpful.

050 Generally covers all things and areas of accountability, particularly with regards to handling of funds.

QUESTION 19 (18): (cont'd)

065   We are **aware** by checking files that some reports of
      incidents are filed, but there were some reports of
      incidents filed which we had not heard of before, nor had we
      been informed of [it] at the time of happening. We feel if
      something happens that means a report being filed, [then]
      parents or guardians and all TM's should also receive a copy
      or at least a phone call, so that they are made aware.
      Such incidents can affect the program plan's proceeding and
      the client's response.

      What happens in day programs can affect the client's
      reaction in the home or res., and vice versa: what happens
      in res. can affect their function in day program (all
      [TM's] need to be aware).

223   Health and medical -- nurse/Dr. (name) are not fully aware
      and somehow need to be further aware of changes, etc.

???   There seems to be some mistake about all this, as I have
      neither participated in any of the I.P.P.'s, nor have I any
      clients at the V.R.R.I. (Name) is my brother and I'm his
      legal guardian only".

002   I am not involved with I.P.P. as I am a guardian for
      emergency only. (Name)'s sister in Vancouver handles
      everything else.

063   We receive very little communication from the present staff
      at The V.R.R.I. group home, including Key Workers. Also, no
      effort is made by the staff to have our child keep in touch
      with the family. Previous staff were much more agreeable to
      us.

127   I feel you have largely ignored the area of
      consumer/guardian satisfaction, which would be the focus for
      your program (therefore the reason for an I.P.P. process).

148   [At top of questionnaire, front page]. Attention - not
      qualified to answer these questions.

007   I don't know what I.P.P. is.

077   Some of the sections [of the questionnaire] have
      contradictory questions (i.e., Section VII: A, B, C, D, E, F
      [statements on confidentiality and information sharing]).

QUESTION 19 (18) cont'd

299   IPP's may be a good idea, but we are not really given any time to interact with other staff. For instance, there is no chance for pool staff to go to conferences. We did not even have time for more than a 1/2 hr. orientation.

200   Sufficient time is required to ensure all systems are working together, i.e., new res. forms. There [are] obviously some things I am still unaware of.

227   I would prefer to use the blue Res. Review forms rather than the form provided through the IPP system.

216   Why do the day training staff seem to feel that res. staff work from 9 A.M. to 11 P.M. [They] call us in when we're not working to deal with problems they are encountering at work and frequently expect us to deal with those problems at home, and yet there is no reciprocity. The idea of being an "equal" TM then becomes distorted.

292   I'm sorry I did this in such a rush. Perhaps more time could be alloted next time.

206   TM roles need to be clarified now and then.

098   My daughter has only been involved with V.R.R.I. for one month so I am not familiar with any of the procedures.

089   We have been involved with The V.R.R.I. for almost 20 years and very few questions seem to apply to our situation at this time.

091   As I phoned you and we discussed the relationship of this paper to us -- at the present time, it is void.

144   This questionnaire is extremely hard to fill out and to understand (i.e., terminology). This is the last questionnaire I will fill out like this.

011   Like to know more about our daughter's financial situation.

033   Some of the questions do not relate to me. The conference I was in was very educational to me. I had learned that the school (V.R.R.I.) does do a tremendous job with the students. The social worker that looks after my brother does an excellent job. She does care about he welfare of the person she has in her care.

084   My son has not been at The V.R.R.I. since February, 1986. Therefore I never filled out this questionnaire.

095   This TM loses confidence in I.P.P. conferences when:

   1)   sent a document dated Dec. 30/85 which tells me new chairperson will be "impartial"

APPENDIX C

THE QUESTIONNAIRE FORM

The following is a complete copy of the internal questionnaire form used in the survey. Questions from the external form which differ dramatically from these items have been included immediately following the internal form, and noted appropriately.

I.   **BASIC INFORMATION**

Internal:

1. Please check the area in which you work:

   a) ___ Front Line Staff   ___ Manager   ___ Director
      ___ Co-ordinator   ___ Support Staff   ___ Research Staff
      ___ Other

   b) ___ Day Training   ___ Residential

   How long have you been in this position at V.R.R.I.?

   _____ years/months

2. How many clients do you currently have on your caseload?

   _____

3. a)   Have you received an orientation to I.P.P.?

      ___ YES   ___ NO

   b)   Was this adequate or not?

      ___ YES   ___ NO

External:

1. Please identify whether you are a: (Please check all that apply)

   ___ Parent   ___ Client (or representative)
   ___ Family Member   ___ Citizen's Advocate
   ___ Guardian   ___ Professional (at external agency)
                        ___ Consultant

2. How many clients are you involved with on a regular basis?[136]

_____

3. a) Have you received an orientation to I.P.P.?

___ YES   ___ NO

b) Was this adequate or not?

___ YES   ___ NO

II. TEAM MEMBER PERCEPTIONS OF I.P.P. (Internal and External)

4. Please outline, briefly, your understanding of what I.P.P. is:

_____

_____

_____

III. ASSESSMENT OF COMMUNICATION

IMPORTANT NOTE: Questions # 5 to # 10 involve feelings you may have about the different kinds of communication which take place during the whole I.P.P. process. Statements are given for each of the different kinds of communication, with the words "YES", "yes", "no", "NO", written next to them. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of the statements in the following manner:

YES - if you strongly agree with a statement, circle the big YES

yes - if you somewhat agree with a statement, circle the small yes

no - if you somewhat disagree with a statement, circle the small no

NO - if you strongly disagree with a statement, circle the big NO

*Please read each question or statement carefully before circling your response.

5. General Concerns of Communication (Internal and External)

The following statements apply to all I.P.P. communication, both inside and outside of conferences.

a) Changes in team members sometimes   YES yes no NO
   leaves me confused as to who my teammates
   are.

b) I don't <u>really</u> feel that I am part   YES yes no NO
    of my I.P.P. team.

c) I feel that my comments and suggestions   YES yes no NO
    are valued as much as those from other
    team members.

d) The responsibilities of each team member   YES yes no NO
    are clearly understood by everyone on my
    team.

6. <u>Annual Conferences</u> ("conferences") (Internal and External)

    a) Have you ever attended an annual conference?

        ___ NO -   please go to section 8 on <u>Face To Face Meetings</u>

        ___ YES -   please complete the following section

    b) When was your most recent conference?

        _____ (month/year)

    c) Now please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the
        following statements.

          i) The conferences are useful for me   YES yes no NO

         ii) Some things go on at conferences   YES yes no NO
              that not everyone there understands

        iii) The conferences try to do too much   YES yes no NO
              in too short of a time

         iv) Conferences are being held often   YES yes no NO
              enough

          v) Conferences are well organized   YES yes no NO

         vi) Everything that happens in   YEs yes no NO
              conferences is related either to
              the client or I.P.P.

        vii) The conferences do not cover all   YES yes no NO
              the points that I think are
              important

       viii) The conferences are too formal   YES yes no NO
              (that is, too structured and
              regulated)

         ix) Many things are brought up at the   YES yes no NO
              conferences which I was not
              aware of beforehand

          x) The language during conferences   YES yes no NO
              is too technical

d) At your most recent conference, did you feel that <u>all</u> members shared equally in making suggestions and decisions, or not?

___ YES

___ NO - Why not? _____

_____

e) Comments on the Annual Conference Section:

_____

_____

_____

7. <u>After The Conferences</u> (Internal and External)

A) <u>conference summaries</u> ("summaries")

Have you received a summary from your most recent annual conference?

___ NO]
___ DON'T RECALL] go to Section B on <u>one month follow-ups</u>.

___ YES please respond to the following statements

  i) The conference summary is not useful to me   YES yes no NO

  ii) Summaries are important if I.P.P. is to be successful   YES yes no NO

  iii) The summary is too structured and <u>regulated</u> (i.e., formal)   YES yes no NO

  iv) The summary includes all the important information from the conference   YES yes no NO

B) <u>one month I.P.P. follow-ups</u> ("follow-ups")

Have you received a (one month) follow-up since your most recent annual conference?

___ NO]
___ DON'T RECALL] please go to Section C on <u>I.T.P.'s</u>

___ YES please respond to the following statements

  i) "Follow-ups" are not important for the success of I.P.P.   YES yes no NO

ii) "Follow-ups" are too structured and   YES yes no NO
     regulated

iii) "Follow-ups" are not useful to me   YES yes no NO

C)   <u>individual training plans</u> (I.T.P. follow-ups)

Have you received an I.T.P. since your most recent
conference?

___ NO   ]
___ DON'T RECALL]   please go to Section D on <u>six month</u>
                     <u>reviews</u>

___ YES   please respond to the following statements

i) I.T.P.'s are too structured and   YES yes no NO
   regulated

   ii) I.T.P.'s are useful to me   YES yes no NO

   iii) I.T.P.'s are necessary for the   YES yes no NO
        I.P.P. system to be successful

D)   <u>six month reviews</u> ("I.P.P. six month follow-up")

     i)   Have you received a six month review since your last
          conference?

          ___ NO   ]
          ___ DON'T RECALL] go to Section E on <u>general referral</u>

          ___ YES   <u>please</u> respond to the following statements

     a)   The reviews are useful to me   YES yes no NO

     b)   Six month reviews are too   YES yes no NO
          structured and regulated

     c)   Reviews are important for the   YES yes no NO
          I.P.P. system success

     ii) Do you think that the time between conferences and
          receipt of the six month review form is:

          ___ too short   ___ too long   ___ about right

E)   <u>the general referral form</u>

     i)   Are you aware of the general referral form?

          ___ YES   ___ NO (go to Question 11)

     ii) Please state your understanding of what a general
          referral form is used for: _____

iii)   Do you find the general referral form useful?

___ YES

___ NO   Why not?   _____

_____

_____

F)   comments on the <u>After the Conference</u> section:

_____

_____

_____

8.   <u>Face To Face Meetings</u> (<u>Other</u> than Annual Conferences)
     (Note to Residence Staff: this would exclude your Residential
     Reviews.) (Internal and External)

A.   Do you recall having any face to face meetings within the past year,
     with one or more of your teammates, to discuss your clients and their
     I.P.P.'s?

___ NO -   please go to Question 9 on <u>Telephone Communication</u>

___ YES -   please respond to the statements below

   i) The meeting(s) was/were <u>not</u> useful to me   YES yes no NO

  ii) I feel face to face meetings happen often   YES yes no NO
      enough

 iii) The meeting(s) was/were too structured and   YES yes no NO
      regulated

  iv) It is easy enough to set up a meeting with   YES yes no NO
      the necessary team members when the need
      arises

B.   About how often would you say that you have had meetings with
     teammates over the past year (exclude conferences and Residential
     Reviews)?

___ more than once a week   ___ once a month

___ once a week   ___ less than once a month

___ twice a month

C.   And what was the general purpose of the meeting(s)?

_____

D.   Comments on the <u>Face to Face Meetings</u> Section:

_____

_____

_____

9.   <u>Telephone Communication</u> (Internal and External)

A.   Do you recall receiving any phone calls from teammates (within the
     past year) to discuss your clients and their I.P.P.?

     ___ NO -   go to Question 10 on <u>Memos</u>

     ___ YES -   please respond to the stateme ts below

       i) Phone calls are useful for me   YES yes no NO

      ii) Phone calls dealing with clients I.P.P.'s   YES yes no NO
          do not happen often enough

     iii) I feel that telephone contact is necessary   YES yes no NO
          for the I.P.P. systems success

B.   Over the past year, on the average, about how often would you say that
     you were in telephone contact with one or more of your teammates?

     ___ more than once a week   ___ once a month

     ___ once a week   ___ less than once a month

     ___ twice a month

C.   And what was the general purpose of this/these phone call(s)?

     _____

D.   Comments on the <u>Telephone Communication</u> Section: .

     _____

     _____

     _____

10. <u>Memos</u> (Internal TMs only)

A. Do you recall receiving any memos within the past year regarding your clients and his/her/their I.P.P.s?

    ___ NO -   go to Question 11 on Type and <u>Frequency of Communication</u>

    ___ YES -   please respond to the statements below

  i) Memos are not very useful for me   YES yes no NO

  ii) Memos usually cover all the important points at issue   YES yes no NO

B. As a means of communication, memos seem:

    ___ too structured and regulated (i.e., formal)

    ___ not formal enough

    ___ about right so far as communication goes

C. Memos should be used:

    ___ more often

    ___ less often

    ___ as often as they are being used now

D. In your experience, what are memos <u>mostly</u> used for?

    _____

E. Comments on the Memo Section:

    _____

    _____

    _____

IV. **TYPES AND FREQUENCY OF COMMUNICATION** (Internal and External)

11. Please rank (from 1 - 4, where 1 means most preferred) the following means of communication:

    ___ meetings   ___ telephone

    ___ memos   ___ other (please specify) _____

12. And would you prefer that communication was on a __formal__ (structured, regulated) or on an __informal__ (unstructured, unregulated) basis?

___ formal   ___ some of each, mostly informal

___ informal   ___ about equal amount of formal
                                       and informal

___ some of each;
     mostly formal

Why: _____

_____

13. And how often do you feel communication between team members should occur?

__Formally__:

___ more than once/week   ___ once/month

___ once/week   ___ less often than once/month

___ once every two weeks   ___ other _____

__Informally__:

___ more than once/week   ___ once/month

___ once/week   ___ less often than once/month

___ once every two weeks   ___ other _____

V. OUTLOOK OF I.P.P. COMMUNICATION (Internal and External)

14. For the most part, do you find that the communication in I.P.P. (from all sources, in and out of conferences) deals with problems and crises, __or__ would you say that most of the communication deals with progress and accomplishments.

___ communication usually about problems/crises

___ communication usually about progress/accomplishments

___ neither problems/crises nor progress/accomplishments gets
     stressed more

___ neither problems or progress is stressed __at all__ (please
     explain) _____

_____

VI. INTERDEPARTMENTAL AWARENESS (Internal and External)

15. Thinking of the information you receive from <u>all</u> sources, how would you describe your level of awareness (or non-awareness) of your clients' status in the following areas/environments. (Circle the letters below the description which comes <u>closest</u> to how you feel; circle N/A <u>only</u> if you have no clients involved in that area.):

		Very Aware	Aware	Unaware	Very Unaware	Not Applic.
a.	Vocational/ VRRI	VA	A	U	VU	N/A
b.	Vocational/ non-VRRI	VA	A	U	VU	N/A
c.	Residential/ VRRI	VA	A	U	VU	N/A
d.	Residential/ non-VRRI	VA	A	U	VU	N/A
e.	Familial	VA	A	U	VU	N/A
f.	Other (please specify)	VA	A	U	VU	N/A

VII. CONFIDENTIALITY AND INFORMATION SHARING (Internal and External)

16. Below are some statements of opinion on the importance of confidentiality of client information within six different circumstances. For each one, indicate whether you agree or disagree.

a) Information which could help a client, but which is "confidential", should not be made known to <u>any</u> team members.

YES   yes   no   NO

b) Information which could help the client, but which is "confidential", should be made known to <u>selected</u> team members <u>only</u>.

YES   yes   no   NO

c) Information which could help the client and which is <u>not</u> "confidential", should be made known to <u>all</u> team members.

YES   yes   no   NO

d) Information which could help the client, and which is <u>not</u> "confidential", should be made known to <u>selected</u> team members <u>only</u>.

YES   yes   no   NO

e) <u>All</u> information which could help the client, whether it is "confidential" or not, should be made known to <u>all</u> team members.

YES   yes   no   NO

f) <u>All</u> information which could help the client, whether or not is is "confidential" should be made known to <u>selected</u> team members <u>only</u>.

YES   yes   no   NO

VIII. FINAL COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS (Internal and External)

17. a) Are you satisfied with the current state of communication between team members or not?

___ satisfied   ___ dissatisfied

b) Why? _____

_____

18. If you were able to bring about any changes to improve communication between team members, what would you do?

_____

_____

_____

19. If there are any topics or areas of concern, related to I.P.P. and communication, which you feel have not been addressed by this questionnaire (or were not addressed sufficiently) please use this space to bring them to our attention.

_____

_____

_____

Thank you very much for your time and effort in completing this questionnaire. Please return completed questionnaires to V.R.R.I. c/o Ted Hermary, Research (S.T.E.P.), before July 31, 1986.

Cover Letter for External Participants

Dear Team Member:

Following this short note is a questionnaire on
"Communication and IPP". You, as a respondent, have been
selected by way of a careful and exact procedure which <u>cannot be
repeated</u>. Because of this, you are unable to be replaced as a
respondent. It is then, <u>your</u> responses which are so important
for the success of this project and for it to be a useful
resource for the VRRI.

Every attempt has been made to keep the length and
difficulty of the questionnaire as low as possible, without
missing any important information you may have to offer. For
this reason, most of the questions need only a circle around (or
check mark beside) the most suitable response.

Since, for the most part, the questionnaire is interested in
your views on different aspects of communication, there are no
"right" or "wrong" answers. Please feel free to offer your
honest evaluations.

To assist you in voicing your opinion, comment sections
appear in different places in the questionnaire, as well as at
the very end. I also hope the bold headings will help by making
clear the way in which the questionnaire is organized.

The three-digit number which appears on the questionnaire is
a code used for response-control purposes <u>only</u>. It will not be
used to identify your completed questionnaire once it has been
received by the VRRI. Of course, all the results will be kept
<u>confidential</u>.

If you meet with any difficulties while completing the
questionnaire, please do not hesitate to contact me at the VRRI
(284-1121, local 353).

Thank you in advance for you interest, time and effort in
completing this questionnaire. It is very must appreciated.
Please notice that completed questionnaires must be returned on
or before <u>AUGUST 13, 1986</u>.

Very truly yours,

Ted Hermary
Research Assistant (STEP)

TH:ev

Enclosure

P.S. For your convenience a stamped, self-addressed envelope has
been included in your questionnaire package.

APPENDIX E

FEEDBACK FROM (FRONT-LINE) STAFF CONCERNING PROBLEM AREAS
(listed according to recommendations)

1. Confusion Due to TM Changes

    -   Develop and maintain a comprehensive index (organized according to client) as to who current team members are, in order to assist proposed familiarization procedure.

    -   Form letters could be sent out to external team members, informing them of changes in team membership.

    -   Future presentations to components regarding "reorganization" process will assist.

    -   Some staff - Social Education, for example - are typically involved on a short term basis.

    -   The "house" system, employed at some of the residences, does not identify a particular TM, lowering the practicality of the proposed recommendation.

2. Clarification of TM Responsibilities

    -   Need clarity concerning the part played by external TM's (especially guardians).

    -   Confusion is more over specific tasks, as opposed to general roles.

    -   Reorganization will address this problem.

    -   Should be a part of the annual conference proceedings.

    -   Should be phrased or approached so as to indicate what part a TM plays in the client's life (i.e., holistically).

3. Inclusion of External TM's

    -   Could be conflicting conferencing systems (presuming respondent has experienced other ones). If so, differences should be clarified and explained.

    -   Must deal with the possibility that, in some cases, external TM's exclude themselves (not wanting to be part of the team).

    -   Could begin by using a non-professional framework for discussing clients, moving (comfortably) to a professional one.

    -   Could have a staff development workshop on team dynamics. [Researcher's note: could encourage external TM's co-participation in this workshop at a mutually convenient time].

3. <u>Inclusion of External TM's</u> (cont'd)

- -In determining whether inclusion is crucial, should take into account the level of a team member's responsibility/ activity/involvement.

- As with confusion over team roster, sometimes due to short involvement on a team (e.g., Social Education).

- Should be part of the annual conference proceedings.

- Geographical isolation plays a big part (e.g., group home or out of town parents, versus those who work on site).

- Team members often cannot visualize how their specific duties contribute to goals or how they relate to the specific duties of co-TM's.

- Assign 'day trips' to different environments (possibly for a shared work program) in order to increase individual empathy and team consciousness.

- Send a copy of the program to parents for their input.

- More orientations to external TM's.

- Proprietors often feel isolated from the team; program workers act as mediators in order to screen out irrelevant information or requests for information.

- Could permit (encourage?) advocacy for non-professionals who feel uncomfortable speaking at conferences.

- Schedule conferences at external locations.

4. <u>Conference Comprehensibility</u>

- Clarify purpose and agenda (i.e., planning orientation).

- Emotions and rigid perconceptions get in the way; problems in understanding may be due more emotional than intellectual differences.

- Team members (especially, though not exclusively, internal ones) may be unclear as to the rationale behind programming -- e.g., taking a long-term perspective. Careful explanation is essential.

- Clients may be the ones who do not understand 'everything that is going on' in the conferences (further research could look into this).

- Respondents (professionals and non-professionals alike) may have been reluctant to admit that they don't understand the technical language.

4. <u>Conference Comprehensibility</u> (cont'd)

- **TM's often cannot** tell how strengths, objectives, and long **term goals are** related. Could require that goals/objectives be **directly and** explicitly based on strengths (instead of **merely paying lip** service to the strengths as a matter of formality, **while** basing goals on something completely different) and that the relationship between them be clearly stated on IPP forms.

- Sensitive issues are 'talked around' rather than addressed outwardly. Those who are already aware of the subject understand; 'outsiders' do not.

- Intensity of conferences may have something to do with their incomprehensibility.

- If TM's (especially new ones) could assert themselves by not feeling obliged to sign up for every task, this would increase accurate recall of responsibilities and manageability of duties.

- Confusion may not be due to technical language, per se, but whole 'system' (including acronyms and numerical scores which instead could be qualitatively and concretely interpreted for parents and other non-professionals.

5. <u>Conference Comprehensiveness</u>

- Agenda of the conference (i.e., task oriented) does not allow for expressing certain concerns that external non-professionals may have. At least clarify agenda. Could the rigidity of the conference agenda be lessened to include other types of concerns?

- Day-to-day difficulties are more relevant for external TM's than the abstract 'goals in the future'.

- 'Priorities list' to arrange for meetings about unfinished business is a good idea, but it already occurs.

- 'Lack of comprehensiveness' could refer to 'confidential' issues which are intentionally censored from conference discussion. Establishing a more comfortable environment, however, might encourage discussion of some of these.

6. <u>Communication Frequency</u>

- Depends on individual clients and TM's.

- Need to encourage contact between conferences; contact schedules are reasonable, but need to be impartial in assigning communication responsibilities: recognize that accountability is double-sided (e.g., internal TM's are accountable to external TM's and vice versa).

6. <u>Communication Frequency</u> (cont'd)

- Contact schedules should be directed toward informal communication.

- Informal regulation, happening at present, is sufficient.

- Keyworker system will increase personal investment, and therefore increase accountability.

- Formal update should (at least) include or reflect IPP goals and behavioural concerns. In any case, need to formalize content of scheduled communication to some extent.

- In communicating, tasks and roles should have priority over socio-emotional problems.

- Make known that the official hours of contact between TM's are flexible, and therefore are compatible with both residential and day training work schedules.

7. <u>Communication Outlook</u>

- Communication book can provide positive reinforcement.

- In the event that a workshop is held, some sort of follow-up procedure would (still) be necessary.

- Easiest to remedy in written communication.

- Need monitoring and feedback from supervisors concerning communication. Need agency-wide recognition that positive communication is important.

- Communication workshop could be incorporated into orientation.

<u>Miscellaneous</u>

- There should be more to the official definition of confidentiality, specifying: what types of material are confidential, levels of confidentiality, and different levels of access to these materials.

- Questionnaire should be refined, simplified, and incorporated into a follow-up monitoring procedure, to check up on IPP communciation.