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Abstract

In recent years considerable interest and concern has been expressed with regard to the nature and quality of decision-making at federal, provincial and local levels in both public and private sectors. This concern, stimulated by the unintended consequences of hastily and poorly developed decisions and by the accelerating rate of social change, has prompted the allocation of substantial resources in many organizations and departments to develop more rational approaches, designs and models for decision-making.

In the social welfare field at federal, provincial and local levels in both public and private sectors there is also an increasing demand for better models and approaches for decision-making, accountability and performance analysis and general administration.

This thesis will suggest the development and operationalization of a Planning, Programming Budgeting System (PPBS) as a means of meeting some of the above demands and will focus upon the development of a comprehensive decision-making model which will facilitate:

1. the rational and on-going identification of community need
2. the establishment of periodic community priorities
3. the formulation of specific planning/budgeting objectives
4. the allocation of resources to alternative service or program strategies to achieve defined objectives
5. the on-going evaluation of results for the next planning-programming-budgeting cycle.

While the setting in which this thesis was developed in the United Way of Greater Vancouver, the model developed is applicable to the general
social service field at various levels in both the public and private sectors.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I  The Need for PPBS

In recent years, considerable interest and concern has been expressed with regard to the nature and quality of decision-making at federal, provincial and local levels in both public and private sectors. This concern, stimulated by the unintended consequences of hastily and poorly developed decisions and by the accelerating rate of social change has prompted the allocation of substantial resources in many organizations and departments to develop more rational approaches, designs and models for decision-making. Examining the need for better decision-making models and processes in the public sector, the Economic Council of Canada in their Eighth Annual Review noted that:

"Government activities have been growing rapidly in scale and scope. All Canadians are becoming increasingly aware of the impact of government decisions - federal, provincial and municipal - on their daily lives. Along with this awareness has come a spreading recognition that government decisions now have greater consequences for good or ill than was true in earlier days when governments played much more limited roles. These developments are not unique to Canada; they are taking place on a world-wide basis ... A rising need for better decision-making is, in part, a consequence of success. Affluence has had a prismatic effect on the aspirations of our society, producing a wide spectrum of wants. To govern is to choose, and to choose among multiplying, shifting and conflicting goals is to govern under difficult conditions. Affluence is, of course, the result of change. The heightened pace of change - itself a source of unease - has coincided with growing awareness in recent years of the complexities of modern society and together these appear to be producing a wide array of discontents. This perhaps more than any other single factor has produced a focus for public concern about developing greater innovation in both government and private decision-making processes."

(Economic Council of Canada Eighth Annual Review - Design for Decision-Making, Queen's Printer, Ottawa (Sept. 1971))

The Council report goes on to state that:
"The nature of government is such that ad-hoc responses to crises, and incremental changes in policy will always be facts of life. It is not possible to plan ahead for every contingency, nor is it desirable, in the interests of political consensus to avoid the trial and error process of moving ahead by small changes. Yet in our increasingly complex interdependent society, short range and ad hoc responses to the problems of growth and change seem increasingly inappropriate in many instances.

The conviction that there must be better ways of making decisions has led to the exploration of a variety of innovative approaches. None of these is a cure-all but they do provide additional perspectives by looking at society's problems in more systematic and comprehensive ways."

In the social welfare field at federal, provincial and local levels in both public and private sectors there is also an increasing demand for better models and approaches for decision-making, accountability and performance analysis.

"At no time in social welfare history has there been so much pressure upon social agencies to produce hard facts: pressures from their supporting public, from budget authorities, at local, provincial and national levels. Not facts about the money they spend, the number of people who pass through their doors, the various activities in which they engage ... these are known. Instead the demand is for facts which will show the extent to which social agencies are dealing with pressing social problems about which our society now is more concerned than at any previous time. Facts about the nature and causation of these problems, about the degree of progress, or lack of it, being made toward the elimination of them among the families and individuals receiving the community's social and health services."

(Greater St. Paul United Fund & Council Family Unit Register, St. Paul, Minnesota (1969))

Over the past decade there have been many expressions of disenchantment with the management and administration of the social service system. In recent years these expressions have increased in frequency and intensity. Some of the most frequently noted criticisms of the administration of the present social service system are as follows:

- Decisions regarding the allocation of resources are rarely linked to meaningful statistical data, systems of priorities or statements of policy.
- Service and program strategies to achieve specific objectives or to deal with defined social problems are rarely identified.
- Service and program objectives are seldom stated and those that are, are either poorly formulated or unrelated to broader goals, priorities and policies.
- Little evaluation is carried out to determine the relative effectiveness of alternative strategies used in dealing with social problems.
- Creative responses to changing problems and needs are stifled by the present system of resource allocation and the failure to search for alternative approaches.
- Lack of concerted decision-making and coordinated service delivery in the public and private health and welfare sectors results in duplication of effort, inadequate program development, failure to meet changing needs, waste of scarce resources and the failure to identify the overall pattern of social need and resource allocation at any given point in time in the community.

The problems of the present social service system are summarized by Alan Cohen:

"Budgets are agency oriented rather than service or program oriented. Efficiency is all too often related to the use of resources rather than to organizational goals. Data are rarely available to enable policy decisions to be made on a cost-benefit basis, weighing all the possible alternatives to achieving the stated goals. Little is being done in the field of value analysis, the practice of attaching financial values to benefits, as determined by actual agency output. Little research has been done on final performance evaluation which is the stage where control can become meaningful planning because it is the process that determines how effectively the type of program just completed has been contributing to the agencies' stated objectives."

(Cohen, 1968)
The expanding role of the social service system, the increasing complexity of 20th century urban social problems, the growing turbulence of the contemporary environment (Trist, 1968) and the continuing criticism of present administrative procedures necessitates a new look at the methods of formulating policy, defining objectives, and allocating resources to meet community needs of the present and the future: a system that will be flexible enough to facilitate modification and change in response to the ongoing evaluation and assessment of present and future contingencies and developments.

Wolf Wolfensberger (1973) in reviewing problems in the social service fields, notes that:

"In the past, human service agencies and personnel have been remarkably unconcerned with the issue of accountability. By tradition, and partly by necessity, human services have been based more upon ideology than empiricism, and therefore, dogmatic assertions were often made and readily accepted. Operating a service agency was often equated with rendering a service; and both were equated with rendering quality services. Concern with the cost of a service in relation to its benefit was rarely expressed. One reason for this is probably the fact that many human managers considered it inappropriate to put dollar price tags on human service benefits. It is only recently that industrial management concepts have begun to filter into human service systems, and that the public has become aroused to the issue of accountability in a wide range of human services. A second reason is that there have been relatively few tools available, either to assess the quality of human service or for establishing cost-benefit ratios. Again, it is only recently that such tools have been developed to any significant degree.

In addition to moving toward greater fiscal accountability, we are now coming into an era of demand for programmatic accountability, of new accountability requirements on federal, provincial or state, and local levels and of demands of consumers and citizens which necessitate new and different types of agency auditing concerns. In addition to the periodic financial audit requirement of most service agencies, agencies will see educational, rehabilitational, social service and other auditors in their midst. Already in some financial assistance programs
administered by the United States Office of Education, under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a yearly audit is required for an educational accounting and a rigorous and intensive cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analysis of the funded program. This audit and analysis must be conducted by outside experts whose job it is to determine the extent and degree to which the program has reached its specifically defined behavioral outcomes for the students.

Observing these trends toward greater accountability and the use of more sophisticated techniques and procedures, Wolfensberger cautions that:

"With increasing sentiment that human services should account in a better way for their stewardship, certain dangers inherent in this trend must be recognized. One of these is precipitate use of inadequate or inappropriate instruments and techniques merely because these may exist while better or more appropriate ones may not. Rendering an accounting with such tools may not be merely futile, but also costly as well as misleading. Furthermore, certain methods of accounting may permit deception by those with vested interests, and/or induce them to engage in practices which may be less productive than those in which they engage ordinarily. A good example has been the practice in the field of vocational rehabilitation to insist on case closure as a measure of counsellor productivity. As a result, counsellors simply close cases prematurely and the client pays the price.

A major problem with some systems which have attempted to evaluate human services objectively is the fact that these systems tended to seize upon those program elements which are easily quantifiable. Unfortunately, easily quantifiable program elements may also be relatively trivial and are often only modestly related to program quality ... we have too often made the quantifiable important instead of the important quantifiable.

Despite the dangers just mentioned, the time for the common program laxity of the past is drawing to an end. Because of the increasing demand for quality of services and for human cost-accounting, means must be developed and/or adopted for bringing adaptive change into agencies and - indeed - for building strategies for such change right into agency structure and operation."

(Wolfensberger, 1973, pp. 2-3)

Arthur Spindler (1969) observing that social and rehabilitation programs operate in a highly challenging rapidly changing world, notes that, nowhere is the challenge greater to social service agencies than in the public's
growing awareness of and impatience with the results of programs to help handicapped and disabled persons and to end poverty, deprivation, and other social ills. Nowhere is change more rapid than in the methods being developed to manage human affairs.

"Technological development in the management sciences can go a long way toward helping social and rehabilitation agencies meet the challenges before them. The Planning, Programming and Budgeting System (PPBS) now used by the Federal Government offers such an opportunity. The system gives order and relationship to the key functions of planning, programming, budgeting and evaluation by focusing them upon the primary goals and objectives that agencies seek, weighing alternatives and presenting the facts objectively and validly for better decision-making. These functions have long been in operation, but a distinguishing characteristic of PPBS is their integration into a unitary or systematic mechanism."

(Spindler, 1969)

Spindler suggests that social and rehabilitation agencies especially need a PPB system, for the administration of public programs in these fields is complex and the allocation of resources to them does not provide equally for all. Agencies operate many diverse programs and offer a variety of services in many fields. Their operations are governed by numerous plans, laws, regulations, guidelines, manuals and directives, and their staff members represent many professions. The people they serve often differ widely in background and in the kinds of services they are seeking. And the public spurred by community consciousness is pressing social agencies to fulfil physical and social needs. Given such complex conditions, there is an urgent need to assess the direction in which social and rehabilitative agencies are moving. In an environment of limited funds and manpower, this assessment becomes a necessity.
II Area of Focus of this Thesis

The basic assumption of this thesis is that the methods and techniques of management science, systems analysis, functional budgeting, computer technology, evaluation research and cost-benefit analysis can be applied to the social service field as effectively as they have been to other fields. Nowhere is change more rapid than in the methods and techniques being developed to manage human affairs. Increasingly the strategies and techniques of a variety of disciplines and professions are being adopted in order to develop the skills and techniques which will introduce systematic problem-solving approaches and modern management techniques to the social service field. The methods of scientific management, cost/benefit, value and decision analysis, computer science, functional accounting and budgeting, systems analysis and simulation techniques are being experimented with, adapted and modified for application in the field of health, welfare, recreation and education, in order to deal with the complex problems of assessing needs, planning programs, determining priorities, allocating resources, and evaluating outcomes in a systematic fashion. While these developments have taken place largely in the United States, there has been some initial exploration in this regard by the Treasury Board of the Federal Government and the Economic Council of Canada.*

The fact that decisions regarding the allocation of resources in the social service field have not generally been based on logical problem-solving approaches, or on the systematic evaluation of alternative program strategies, explains a great deal of the criticism currently levelled at the

* see Bibliography for work of the Treasury Board and the Economic Council
management of the welfare system. At the present time there is little appreciation of the total pattern of need at the local community level. There is only a general idea of the services being provided for the dollars allocated to agencies and there has been failure to set specific objectives and to relate expenditures to an on-going analysis of need. Little thought of the relative cost-benefits of alternative service and program strategies has been accorded.

This thesis will suggest the development and operationalization of a Planning, Programming Budgeting System (PPBS) as a means of effectively integrating the above concepts and developing a comprehensive decision-making model which will facilitate:

1) the rational and on-going identification of community need
2) the establishment of periodic community priorities
3) the formulation of specific planning/budgeting objectives
4) the allocation of resources to alternative service or program strategies to achieve defined objectives
5) the on-going evaluation of results for the next planning-programming-budgeting cycle

Figure 1 sets out the general PPBS model that will be used as a guide in developing and operationalizing a PPBS approach for the social welfare field. The general model forms a framework for systematically dealing with the complex problems of:

1) identifying and assessing needs
2) determining priorities
3) setting objectives
4) planning services and programs and
5) evaluating outcomes
It is important to note at this point that this proposal is presented from the perspective of a central planning or funding body. The general principles and processes, however, are applicable to any organization, agency, or group who come together to deal with a common task (or set of tasks) since the "name of the game" in the final analysis is problem-solving and decision-making.

1) The Model begins (or ends) with a data storage system which should provide the information necessary for the identification and measurement of social problems, needs and trends in the community.

2) From a variety of sources of information which will be discussed, it should be possible to identify a range of social problems and issues to be dealt with over the planning-budgeting period. This process should involve representatives from the government, social agencies and the community.

3) After identifying a range of geographically specific problems or needs to be dealt with, priorities should then be set as to the relative importance and urgency of each for the distribution of resources during the period.

4) When relative priorities have been satisfactorily established, specific objectives should be set for each of the problems identified. These objectives must clearly define the expected outcomes for the period and should be stated in quantifiable terms. For example - to reduce juvenile delinquency by 20% in a certain area of the community.

5) Having formulated specific objectives, the various service or program strategies appropriate to the successful achievement of each objective should be selected for funding.
Figure 1
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For example - programs or service strategies that might be seen as appropriate to reduce juvenile delinquency could include:

I) Detached youth work programs
II) Family and individual counselling programs
III) After school programs, e.g. group work, social adjustment and social development programs.

It is expected that as the cycle goes around several times, the fund allocating body will gain a greater appreciation of the types of service strategies that are appropriate to achieve various types of objectives. These service strategies may take the form of innovative programs or more traditional services or they may be a combination of the two.

6) After the various program strategies are agreed upon, the agencies offering them should be allocated funds to deliver specific programs or services in specific areas of the community to achieve specific objectives. It follows that the objectives set by the individual agencies should be congruent with those established for the broader planning, programming, budgeting system. The agencies should be responsible for developing and delivering these funded programs, providing statistics and financial data, and participating in the evaluation of outcomes.

7) Statistics and the evaluation of outcomes should be incorporated into the data bank to create a self-monitoring system. These data should then be available for any group or organization in the community for detailed research and analysis.

The next planning, programming, budgeting period begins with the benefit of experience gained from previous cycles and therefore refinements, adjustments and modifications in approach and procedure, may take place with each new cycle.
It will be noted that there is continuous feed-back, analysis and evaluation at all stages in the process. Statistical data, community and agency opinion and matters of policy are reflected in determining priorities and defining objectives. The selection of program and service strategies are influenced by on-going evaluative research, experience and data developed in other communities. The important feature about the general PPBS model is the fact that decisions made at any stage in the process can be related to those of previous stages. The proposed model seeks to effectively integrate various management activities and place them in proper perspective. It projects a rational, yet flexible system that provides for maximum participation at all levels and the provision of a clear frame of reference for decision-making and policy formulation.

The above model will be used as a general guide for developing and operationalizing a suitable PPB system for the social welfare field. While the general model is deceptively simple and intuitively logical at first sight, the development of a fully operationalized PPB system for any field of endeavour is a highly complex undertaking. It is the intent of this thesis to come to grips with this task.

III The Setting of the Study

The setting in which this thesis will attempt to develop and operationalize a suitable PPB system for the social welfare field will be United Community Services of the Greater Vancouver Area (UCS). The following paragraphs describe the basic nature, objectives and structure of UCS.

* The following is taken from the UCS Directors' Kit
A) Statement of Objectives of UCS

United Community Services is a volunteer directed Society responsible to its membership and the community for carrying out its constitutional objectives.

The Society is governed by an elected Board of Directors which represents the concerns and interests of various elements in the Greater Vancouver community. This balance on the Board is essential to unite support for the Society's goals in terms of fund raising, budgeting, planning and research.

Early in 1970, in an effort to clarify and make current its goals, the Board adopted a redefined statement of the Society's aims. This statement reads:

The objectives of United Community Services of the Greater Vancouver Area are to ensure the development of social services in a manner that enables them to respond effectively and with justice to the needs of people; and to provide for access to the opportunities afforded by society to those persons unable to obtain it for themselves.

To achieve these objectives UCS is pledged to:

United Fund Raising

- pursue a policy directed toward unification of all valid fund raising endeavours on behalf of health, welfare, rehabilitation and recreation services. UCS will continue to seek to consolidate those appeals in contiguous geographical areas into one United Way campaign.

- increase the number of people who financially support the United Way and to achieve fair share levels of individual and corporate giving to the United Way, thereby narrowing the gap between needs and financial resources, and strengthening its mandate for community action.

Stewardship

- ensure that monies collected are disbursed in support of services which are consistent with the continually emerging needs of people whose access to opportunities is limited for financial or other
reasons. In support of this goal UCS adopts the concepts of functional budgeting (financing by services) and the application of a continually updated system of priorities in the allocation of monies entrusted to it.

- encourage innovative and demonstrative programs designed to explore more effective means of meeting social needs.

- ensure that fees are charged to those able to pay for services rendered, making available greater assistance to those unable to do so.

- encourage the meaningful use of volunteers to assist in the direct delivery of services.

- exercise a strong voice in urging governments to assume their appropriate financial responsibility for those services which are fundamental and universally required in the community.

Planning and Advocacy

- maintain a social planning and research program which constantly reviews and evaluates community needs and services.

- serve as a responsible 'community advocate' for the development of social policies and services.

- facilitate active citizen involvement in the continuous consideration of social issues as they emerge in our community, in the firm belief that a concerned and involved citizenry is essential to the development of a community united toward the betterment of its people.

B) The Board of Directors

The Board of Directors meets at least 6 times a year. Occasional extra meetings are called for special purposes. It is the function of the Board to receive reports from the various sections of the organization and to deal with them in a manner consistent with the goals of the Society.

The Executive Committee of the Board serves as a steering committee coordinating the activities of the organization and facilitating consideration of matters by the Board of Directors.

The Executive Committee is comprised of the Officers of the Society
and the chairmen of the Membership, Management Advisory, Agency
Operations, Social Planning, Social Policy and Research and Fund
Raising Committees, the chairman of the Conference of Financially
Participating Agencies, and chairmen of the three Divisions.
The following chart indicates the general structure of the organi-
zation. Each segment of the Society is volunteer based; each is
provided with staff services to carry out its program.

C) The United Way Campaign

The United Way Campaign is an annual fund raising partnership under-
taken by United Community Services of the Greater Vancouver Area,
the Canadian Red Cross Society, and the United Good Neighbours.
Some 20,000 volunteers contribute their efforts annually to this
major task.
The one United Way Campaign replaces a multitude of individual cam-
paigns. This means that with less campaign expense there is more
money to help people. It also results in one "knock on the door"
instead of 70.
Fund Raising responsibilities are undertaken by two committees: the
Fund Raising Committee and the Campaign Management Committee.
The Fund Raising Committee provides year-to-year continuity through:

1. establishing basic fund raising policy
2. undertaking projects to improve fund raising, and
3. selecting the General Campaign Chairman.

The Campaign Management Committee is responsible for organizing and
carrying out the United Way Campaign under the chairmanship of the
General Campaign Chairman.
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The General Campaign Chairman is appointed by the Board of United Community Services upon the recommendation of the Fund Raising Committee and the General Campaign Co-Chairman is appointed by the Board of United Good Neighbours.

Each year the United Way Campaign Goal is established by a Goal Setting Committee. The Goal is determined after a consideration of agency needs, an economic forecast, and campaign potential.

D) **Agency Operations Committee**

The main responsibility of the Agency Operations Committee (AOC) is to consider all budgets and to recommend to the Board of Directors annual allocations to member agencies, as well as to carry out planning and evaluation which is directly related to the determination of allocations. A summary breakdown of each agency's budget for 1972, by major sources of income is presented in Appendix I.

Although the consideration of annual agency budgets is the core of this Committee's relationship with agencies, its overall task includes consultation with individual agencies on financial, administrative, service and statistical matters, general and continuing liaison with all agencies and the carrying out of special studies of agencies or small groups of agencies.

AOC consists of some 30 appointees by the Board of Directors, Social Policy and Research, Social Planning, the Divisions, the Conference of Financially Participating Agencies, and the Conference of Local Area Councils.
Budget Reviews

There are 11 Budget Review Committees within AOC, composed of AOC members and a general pool of knowledgeable volunteers. The review committees meet throughout the year for orientation, planning, and review of agencies and services encompassed by their committee. In addition, they maintain continuing liaison with the agencies and services coming within their scope. They are particularly active during the months of April and May, when agency budgets and services are reviewed for suggested allocations for the ensuing year.

For many years, UCS has been attempting to distribute the money it raises in a way which will:

1. have the greatest beneficial impact in the Greater Vancouver area
2. demonstrate the need for and effectiveness of new services and programs not yet supported by the government
3. complement and support government sponsored programs.

Traditionally, UCS distributed the money it raised to its member financially participating agencies. These funds were used to support either the total agency operation or selected aspects or programs of the agency's work. This method of distribution was criticized from time to time by the public, the agencies and by UCS itself on the grounds that allocation decisions were not related to planning considerations, that data concerning service costs or output was lacking, and that there was little analysis of the effectiveness of alternative approaches. In addition, the agencies themselves had no way of clearly identifying specific program or service budgets by income or expenditure, and agency statistics varied from organization and did not permit comparison or analysis.

Priorities

Over the past few years UCS has made efforts to support those specific aspects of agency programs and services which appeared to be most appropriate for voluntary support. The first step in this direction was the publication of the Priorities Report in 1965. The report examined the quantity and quality of each service offered in the Health and Welfare field in Vancouver, and made specific recommendations as to future patterns of government and voluntary financing for each. Attempts to implement the recommendations of the Priorities Report began to shift the focus
of UCS from an agency orientation to a service orientation as steps were taken to examine in detail the services and programs of each agency rather than the total agency in isolation of the services it offered.

Functional Accounting

As a result of the decision to deal with priorities on a service basis, it became necessary to recommend that agencies maintain their accounts and submit their budgets not merely on an overall basis, but also on a service-by-service basis, i.e., a functional basis. At the time the original Priorities Report was issued another report on functional accounting and budgeting was distributed. It soon became apparent that the difficulty of service cost accounting in large and complex agencies made a manual bookkeeping system virtually impossible. The decision was made to develop a computer program for agency functional accounting, and with the help of funds from the Vancouver Foundation, such a program was produced. Progress in the adoption of functional accounting and budgeting by agencies was slow for several years until the Provincial Government became interested in and finally adopted the UCS program. Later the Provincial Government provided funds for converting a number of agencies to the system.

The Priorities Report and Functional Accounting together facilitate rational decision-making in the distribution of UCS voluntary dollars and provide some specific guidelines for selecting the services that should legitimately be funded by UCS. They also permit the selection of specific services for which additional support is indicated. In 1970 it was agreed to update the priorities on an annual basis within AOC. The first annual report, called "Service Priority Guidelines for 1972 Budgeting", was adopted by the Board in January 1971.

Planned Program Budgeting Systems Project

Late in 1971, UCS, building upon the foundation of its leadership in the fields of functional accounting and budgeting and the application of priorities, initiated a demonstration project in Planned Program Budgeting Systems (PPBS). On November 5th, 1971, the Minister of National Health and Welfare announced the approval of a demonstration project grant to finance the project over a four year period.

This project is an attempt to fully integrate planning, budgeting, service delivery, the establishment of priorities, and the evaluation of outcomes into a rational yet flexible system. It is divided into four phases, each of approximately one year, and will seek to develop and experiment with:
1. the extension and refinement of functional accounting
2. the development of meaningful statistical and case reporting information
3. the identification of community opinion regarding its problems and needs ("community" includes agencies, experts, clients and citizens)
4. the formulation of objectives for services and programs in quantitative terms which will lead to
5. the ability to evaluate the benefit and successes of various services and programs
6. the development of methods of cost benefit analysis
7. the integration of all the above components into a system which will be capable of adoption by individual agencies, groups of agencies, UCS, governments or any other funding systems so as to produce the most beneficial employment of funds to respond to community needs.

In approving the initial grant to finance Phase 1 of the project, the Department outlined its general expectations of the project. It was felt that the project had the potential to:

"a) demonstrate the ability of a non-governmental service system to actually develop and implement a PPBS model
b) demonstrate the way in which such a model could be utilized by municipal and provincial authorities in the management of their service programs
c) demonstrate the degree to which governmental and non-governmental administrations could use a common model and so increase the rationalization of the total service delivery system.
d) stimulate non-governmental organizations in other parts of Canada to actively explore and test the concepts of PPBS
e) provide a model that would have potential application elsewhere in Canada."

These were taken as the broad term of reference of the project.

The project is administered by two co-directors, A.R. Fitzpatrick and R.W. Patillo, each of whom is responsible for specific components of the project as presented on the following page.
Demonstration and Development Fund

The Table Officers Committee of AOC, with certain other interested members of AOC, administers the UCS Demonstration and Development Fund. This Fund was created to provide a means of stimulating the development of new and innovative programs by any agency, organization or group in the Greater Vancouver area. It is not limited to UCS members. In 1969, $15,000 was made available for this purpose, in 1970 - $20,000, in 1971 - $22,000, in 1972 - $53,000, and in 1973 - $40,000.

E) Social Planning Committee

The Social Planning Committee provides overall direction and co-ordination to community social planning carried out under UCS auspices. More specifically, the Committee undertakes such studies and activities which will facilitate the planning, coordination and evaluation of health and social services in the Greater Vancouver Area.
Activities in which the committee and planning staff have been particularly active recently include: updating of priority guidelines for the allocation of United Way dollars; decentralization and integration of services; a study of family and individual counselling funded by the Vancouver Foundation; organization of local information centres in Division areas; specific activities in efforts to meet local community needs (youth services in Richmond, day care services on the North Shore, etc.).

The Social Planning Committee is appointed by the Board of Directors, and committee members include members of the Board and representatives from the Agency Operations and Social Policy and Research Committees, the Conference of Financially Participating Agencies, Conference of Local Area Councils, and each of the Divisions. Although planning activities are carried out at the central level, the UCS Division governing committees in Burnaby, Richmond and on the North Shore provide a focal point for action related to local community needs, identifying priorities, and coordination of agencies.

F) Social Policy and Research Committee

The Social Policy and Research Committee (SPAR) of UCS initiates broad studies of major social issues and concerns, and identifies trends and needs related to the health, welfare and recreational fields. When the research is completed, policy implications are considered by a task force of knowledgeable volunteers. Results are then publicized via the media and a special effort is made to communicate with groups responsible for policy change, such as government,
school boards, and agencies.

Recent activities of SPAR include studies which reflect current concerns for housing, day care and family planning.

G) Divisions of UCS

United Community Services maintains Divisions in Burnaby, Richmond and on the North Shore.

These Divisions provide UCS community planning and coordination services in their respective areas. Most important, they encourage citizen participation in the leadership and planning necessary to meet local problems and to relate these to overall UCS operations and objectives.

H) Conference of Local Area Councils

In recent year UCS has actively encouraged the formation of Local Area Councils as organizations which can best deal with social problems at a local community level. A number of Councils are now active in Vancouver, Burnaby and on the North Shore.

The Councils are composed mainly of local citizens and are completely autonomous. Planning consultation from UCS staff is available to them upon request and in the city of Vancouver the Councils receive community development staff through services of the Neighbourhood Services Association.

Under UCS auspices, a Conference of Local Area Councils facilitates effective local area planning and coordination and fosters cooperation among the autonomous local area councils and between the councils and UCS. The Conference functions primarily for area councils in the City of Vancouver. In adjacent municipalities, area
councils work closely with the governing committees and staff of UCS Divisions.

I) Conference of Financially Participating Agencies

The Conference, which is comprised of an Officer of the Board of Directors and the Executive Director of each financially participating agency, meets at least once each year. In addition, however, participating agencies choose to belong to one of four special groups on the basis of common interest. These groups meet more frequently. Each group elects a chairman who is a volunteer and an Honorary Secretary who is an executive director.

On-going business is conducted by a Chairman's Committee which normally meets monthly except in July and August. The Committee consists of a Chairman who is elected by the full Conference, and the Chairmen and Honorary Secretaries of the four groups.

The Chairman of the Conference is an ex-officio member of the UCS Board of Directors and of the Board Executive.

The purposes of the Conference and its groups are:

1. to promote satisfactory understanding and sympathetic relationships between the financially participating members and the Society and among these members.

2. to consider and make recommendations to the Board of Directors of the Society upon matters of common interest and concern.

3. to develop effective communications among the financially participating agencies and between them and the Society.
The Conference considers both policy matters referred to it by the Board of UCS and questions of general concern raised by any group or any member agency.
Unfortunately PPBS has come to mean many different things to many different people and a great deal of emotionalism has developed around the very mention of the term. Some welcome its emergence and others fear it for many reasons. Some see it as the premature application of unproven techniques and methods to the social service field and others identify it as some devious plot to control and manipulate the unaware. Some feel that it holds the solution to all problems present and future and others see it as an improvement over previous methods and approaches to dealing with social problems and concerns. It is thus very difficult to gain a balanced perspective since those who advocate the PPBS approach tend to be as emotional about its potential as do those who oppose it.

As PPBS approaches attempt to organize the diverse but interacting activities of planning, programming, and budgeting so that they work toward the common purpose of optimizing management effectiveness in achieving organizational and/or system wide goals and objectives. The PPBS approach gives order and relationship to the key functions of planning, programming, budgeting and evaluation by focusing on primary goals and objectives, weighing alternatives and presenting the facts objectively for better decision-making. While these functions have long been in operation, the distinguishing characteristic of the PPBS approach is the effective integration of these activities into a rational problem-solving system or model. PPBS has been identified as relating primarily to budgeting. In reality it is a unifying concept which effectively integrates planning and budgeting in the
interests of achieving specific objectives. It places each activity of management in proper perspective and relates community need to program objectives and to final outcomes. In addition the approach introduces and demands a rational, systematic way of thinking which relates one management activity specifically to the other. In this sense PPBS is a management tool.

David Page (1967) analyzing the PPB system of the U.S. government and the analytical techniques that underlie its operations, notes that it was designed to improve the evaluation of federal expenditures and suggests that "it is likely to become one of the most significant innovations in planning and budgeting at all levels of government". Page observes that:

"In recent years government officials and the general public alike have caused, and in turn, have been influenced by many changes in attitude. Strong and long held views have undergone drastic modification and new techniques are being applied to assist in a more rational approach to decision-making in allocating scarce resources. New approaches to budget formulation and the allocation process require that input-output relationships be carefully evaluated and seek to maximize the benefits to public programs by equating marginal benefits and marginal costs. Alternatively the newer approaches attempt to achieve a given objective at minimum cost. Benefit-cost analysis has thus proven helpful in evaluating and choosing between alternatives. Such analyses are useful in selecting projects, in allocating funds within program categories and in allocating funds between broad program categories."

(Page, 1967, p. 256)

Traditionally, budgets have been organized by executive departments and their sub-divisions. Within this format, expenditures emphasized personnel, supplies and equipment. In addition, expenditures for these resources were usually projected only one year ahead. Such an approach is clearly "input" oriented. That is, it focuses on the resources that must be brought together to carry out the agency's programs and activities. For several reasons, this approach is no longer adequate for a systematic analysis of expenditures across the total system.
First, the name or even the apparent goal of a department or agency, is usually not sufficient to describe what it does. Second, numbers or types of personnel reveal little of the functions they perform. Third, a one year budget throws little light on the significance of expenditure decisions, the effects of which may be spread over the next decade or beyond. Fourth, the relationships among programs with similar purposes, complementary or substitutive are not shown. Fifth, and perhaps most important, it does not tell one whether proper amounts are being expended on programs.

"A budget should be a financial expression of a program-plan. Setting goals, defining objectives, and developing planned programs for achieving those objectives, are important integral parts of preparing and justifying a budget submission. Until now, program review for decision-making has been concentrated within too short a time period; objectives of agency programs and activities have not been specified with enough clarity; accomplishments have usually not been adequately presented or analyzed, and in most cases, the future costs of present decisions have not been systematically programmed or analyzed. In short, planning and systems analysis have had too little effect on budget decisions."

(Page, 1967, p. 257)

The PPBS approach should go a long way in remedying some of these shortcomings. It is designed to provide decision makers at various levels with information and analysis that will assist them in analyzing objectives and in deciding on the use of resources among competing claims to meet these objectives.

I What is PPBS?

PPBS is the brain-child of the Rand Corporation and was first developed and used in the government sector in 1965 by the U.S. Department of Defense under Secretary McNamara. It was the success of the Rand-McNamara approach to military defense systems that led to the adoption of PPBS throughout
the U.S. federal government and later in various state and local governments throughout the country. This also stimulated considerable interest in Canada, especially from the Federal Treasury Board, the Economic Council of Canada and several provincial governments.

While there has been much confusion about what PPBS actually is, the most responsible proponents and defenders of PPBS have tended to be very clear about what PPBS is not. They have repeatedly stressed that it:

"- is not dependent upon tight mathematical models or computerized calculations.
- is not a system of replacing human judgement.
- does not deal directly with such sector-proportion questions as the relative emphasis placed upon health versus education, transportation versus communications, or military versus civilian expenditures."

Despite this, many otherwise well-informed people still think that PPBS is one or all of the above. This may be explained in part by the fact that those most closely associated with PPBS have difficulty in explaining what it actually is. Bertram Gross (1969) feels that there are many good reasons for this difficulty:

"One is that the PPB spirit is more important than the letter. Some officers practice PPB without knowing it; others go through all the formal motions without coming anywhere near it. Moreover there is really no one system. Rather there is a large variety of PPB type services; and organizations will differ greatly in the specific mix provided during any one period. Above all, PPB is in an early state of growth - and more changes are probably taking place in it than anyone could possibly track down.

The spirit of PPB is a marriage between program planning and budgeting. Without such union, planners can easily lose touch with the contraints imposed by scarce resources, while budgeteers can easily be divorced from the contents of plans and programs."

(Gross, Bertram M., March/April 1969, pp. 115 - 116)

Briefly described, the PPBS approach attempts to replace the piecemeal methods of program planning, budgeting and evaluation at successive organizational levels with a unified and integrated system of decision-making.
The U.S. Bureau of the Budget summarizes PPBS as follows:

"The principle objective of PPB is to improve the basis for major program decisions, both in the operating agencies and in the Executive Office of the President. To do this, it is necessary to have clear statements of what the decisions are and why they have been made. Program objectives are to be identified and alternative methods of meeting those objectives are to be subjected to systematic comparison. Data are to be well organized on the basis of major programs and are to reflect future as well as current implications of decisions. As in the case of budgeting generally, PPB applies not only to current programs but to proposals for new legislation."


Paul Permar identifies PPBS within the context of effective planning:

"PPBS is a framework for planning - a way of organizing information and analysis in a systematic fashion so that the consequences of particular choices can be seen as clearly as possible. It attempts to do three things: 1) to display information about the functioning of actual programs so that it is possible to see easily what portion of resources is being allocated to particular objectives, what is being accomplished by the programs and how much they cost; 2) to analyze the costs of alternative methods of achieving particular objectives so that it is possible to rank the alternatives in terms of their relative costs; 3) to evaluate the benefits of achieving objectives as comprehensively and quantitatively as possible in order to facilitate the setting of priorities among objectives.

Under the PPBS approach the six major elements of a program budget are: 1) An attempt to describe the programs in narrative statements involving a statement of objectives and a breakdown into sub-programs and targets; 2) A breakdown of budgetary allocations by functional programs which involves crossing organizational lines when necessary; 3) An attempt to identify and quantify the results of the programs; 4) A relation of output to input in terms of cost-benefit analysis; 5) A relation of programs to total resources in terms of a discussion of alternative methods and priorities and 6) long range planning, generally from three to five years ahead."

(Permar, Paul A.)

Samuel Greenhouse (1966) suggests that an understanding of what PPBS is, rests upon recognizing the primacy and interplay of its ingredients. The concept of "accountability" is posited as the philosophic base of the PPBS structure. A true understanding of PPBS cannot derive from reliance upon the traditional definitions of terms. Each has a particular meaning and
The fresh design which emerges from this rearrangement, rather than the individual ideas themselves, is what is new about PPBS. PPBS is a multi-purpose system and if implemented and instrumented soundly, it should have a variety of uses, not the least of which is the improvement of individual agency operations.

The PPBS approach assumes that the central purpose of agencies is the delivery of goods and services to the public, rather than merely a happenstance or an indirect byproduct of other, more characteristic purposes.

An understanding of PPBS therefore, depends upon recognizing that internal agency efforts and interchanges are considered subordinate to the central purpose. Unless this is recognized, the ideas which underlie the terms "objective", "program", "output" and "input" cannot be clearly discerned nor can the interplay of these terms be comprehended.

In 1971, the United Way of America, with the assistance of the consulting firm Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and Co. identified PPBS as:

"An analytical tool designed to assist management in performing its function with optimal results. The function of management can be defined as the orderly use of means to achieve ends. The concept of "orderly use of means" implies planned allocation of resources - resources of every kind; manpower, money, material, building space etc. Thus, in very simple language PPBS is a system which helps management in putting its resources to the best possible uses for achieving its organization's ends or goals."

(United Way of America, Alexandria, Virginia (1972) p. 5)

A number of basic concepts of PPBS require definition, explanation and analysis in order to fully describe the overall approach. The first is the concept of "System" since this construct provides the linking pin between the others.
Sample of a Hierarchical Goal Structure

- G-1: Optimal personal development of the individual and his or her optimal adjustment at home and in society.
- G-1-A: Preserve and strengthen families; provide for a substitute family environment where one is absent; provide intervention in crisis situations; protect individuals from exploitation and self-abuse; and provide certain supportive services to individuals and families.
- G-1-A-1: Assist families and individual members of a family unit whose social functioning has been impaired for one or more reasons, and who experience stress because of existence of some problem or condition.
- G-1-A-1-a: Enable families and individuals within a family unit to come to grips with and to resolve whatever emotional problem or temporary stress experienced by them.
1. A System can be defined as:

"a complex unity formed of many, often diverse parts subject to a common plan or serving a common purpose ... an aggregation or assemblage of objects joined in regular interaction or interdependence ... a set of units combined by nature or art to form an integral, organic or organized whole; an orderly working totality."*

Thus, the concept "system" encompasses two major elements. First, that it is made up of diverse parts and second, that these different parts are organized in such a way that they are interdependent and that they interact to serve a common purpose. In PPBS, therefore the diverse but interdependent and interacting activities of planning, programming and budgeting are so organized that they work toward the common purpose of optimizing management effectiveness in achieving organizational goals.

2. Planning - The key concept in PPBS is planning. It is the most fundamental activity in program budgeting and it is the budgeting based on planned programs which sets it apart from all other types of budgeting.

The dynamic concept of planning may be defined as:

"a systematic, deliberative process of determining and laying out a course of action (including the devising of procedures) to achieve a stated goal based on a rational examination of all available pertinent data for implementation in some future time frame."*

Broadly described, the concept of "planning" encompasses the following inter-related and interdependent activities.

a) Goals - Planning is not done in a vacuum - it is always related to something, some goal, objective or area of concern. Precision in defining organizational goals and objectives is one of the most important factors in planning because it facilitates the measurement of outputs.

* Websters Third New International Dictionary (unabridged)
Organizational goals are usually described in a "goal structure" which may be in the form of goals-sub-goals or goals-objective structure. Whatever may be the name given to a goal structure, the essential principle is the same: namely that a broad general goal statement is followed by one or more specific, preferably quantitatively expressed statements.

Large, complex organizations use a hierarchical goal structure containing several levels of goals as shown in exhibit 1. The importance of the factors of clarity and specificity in a goal structure or a goal statement cannot be over emphasized since it is closely tied to programming, budgeting and especially to later evaluation. The statement of goals and sub-goals (or objectives) can, therefore, have critical positive or negative consequences on the entire PPBS system.

b) Selection of a Course of Action - Determining and laying out a course of action to achieve some goal or objective implies that a rational choice is made from among available alternatives. In theory, for every possible course of action, there are one or more alternative courses to achieve the same goal. In the real world, however, this may not be practical or feasible. A number of constraints from a variety of sources operate to narrow down the choices for feasible, implementable alternatives.

Constraints are conditions existing within and without the organization which limit the capacity of achieving certain ends even though well deserved and highly desired. It is therefore advisable to identify as many of the constraints as possible and to document them for use as guidelines in developing organizational goals and alternative methods of achieving them.
c) **Evaluation** - The process of choosing means among alternatives to achieve ends also implies evaluation of current programs being utilized to achieve the same or similar goals. The evaluation process may be defined as:

"the process of arriving at objective, optimal evidence with regard to the degree to which a given course of action has achieved its pre-defined (or hypothesized) objectives".

In short "evaluation" means finding out whether a given program has or has not achieved what it was supposed to, and how well or how badly.

**d) Program Analysis** - The selection of appropriate means to achieve defined goals or objectives is known as program analysis and is a critical component of the PPBS approach. The idea of "program" is very different from the traditional governmental usage. Prior to PPBS, all agencies used the term to characterize functions and professional disciplines. Hence, "procurement", "data management", "engineering" and many other activities were called programs.

Individual activities, functions, and professional disciplines are the very antithesis of programs in the PPBS sense. The concept of PPBS is to facilitate the drawing together of agency efforts to meet particular objectives. The validity of each program may then be assessed in terms of its overall approach, dimension and costs, and may be compared with other competing programs, potential or existing.

The program analysis process can be described in the following steps: First, it is essential to establish some general program selection criteria. Application of the criteria has the effect of narrowing down the possible alternative programs and expedites elimination of certain alternatives without need for detailed examination.
Second, feasible alternative programs meeting the predetermined criteria are analyzed in depth in terms of a) various resources needed for the program including dollar resources, b) the kinds of benefits the program is expected to achieve e.g. analysis of advantages and disadvantages of the program and c) the relationships between the total program costs and the total program benefits.

Third, the selection of the most appropriate program - not necessarily the one which is the most suitable and implementable under the circumstances. Once the decisions have been made as to which measures are to be used, and which course of action is to be selected to achieve stated ends, the related step is that of laying out a course of action or designing a "program". The concept of planning is comprehensive enough to encompass within it some element of programming activity at least in outline form.

e) Data Base - "Information to planning and to PPBS is like cement and concrete to a building structure. Quality information - both hard and soft variety - is essential at every single stage in the planning process. Without it, the decision making process lacks cohesion - decisions become at best guesstimates. The process of planning not only must use available information from outside but must develop its own information in the needed format. Specific types of information are needed at various planning stages. For example - a systematic delineation of needs and establishment of priorities precede the establishment of organizational goals. Designing new programs or modifying existing ones requires a wide variety of demographic and economic data, including information on the efficacy of existing programs. It can be safely stated that the quality and extent of information and information analysis will have direct impact on the degree to which a given planning effort succeeds or fails."
f) **Time Frame** - A meaningful planning effort is always set in some specific time frame. The following is a good example of a time-bounded planning goal; "to create 5000 new jobs in selected trades and occupations by December 31, 1974". (Reddin (1970) stresses this in his book *Effective Management by Objectives*.) When the time period to achieve a stated goal is not specified, one is hard put to measure the results. There is no magic number to use as a guideline for the duration of a planned program. The most common in usage is three to five years. Planning for a specified time frame promotes long range planning. The advantage is that it permits evaluation of the current year's effects of a management decision and also the long-term impact on the allocation of resources in the future.

It should be stressed that the planning process per se does not make the decisions and thus does not guarantee rational choices. It does however provide decision assisting information in a format which shows the relative advantages and disadvantages of alternative courses of action. The decisions themselves in the final analysis are value judgments arrived at through the political and administrative processes of the organization.

3. **Programming**

Under the PPBS approach, programming is a distinct component activity that can be defined as a group of interdependent and inter-related activities operating or working towards a common objective. Essentially, programming involves:

1. identification of specific program components, tasks and activities
2. scheduling of the various tasks to fit into the time frames specified in the goal-objective structure; and
3. assignment of resources such as personnel, materials, facilities etc., for the performance of the identified tasks.

Programming occurs during the program analysis process described earlier. Once a program has been selected on the basis of analysis, however, some refinements may take place in the "programming of the program".

Organizations having several programs use a program structure as shown below, which is a hierarchical arrangement of programs that demonstrates the relationship of program activities to the organization's goals and objectives.

Sample Program Structure

```
P-1

P-1-A

P-1-A-1

P-1-A-1a
```

P-1 Adequate Income & Economic Opportunity
P-1-A Employment Services
P-1-A-1 Manpower Development and Training
P-1-A-1a Job Finding

4. **Budgeting**

The last concept in PPBS is that of budgeting. Webster defines the term "budget" as:
'"a statement of the financial position of a sovereign body (as of a nation) for a definite period of time based on a detailed estimate of planned or expected expenditures during the period and proposals for financing them ..."

Under the PPB approach, the annual budget must be prepared and presented on a program basis. This is why it is commonly called a program budget and the process of preparing it - program budgeting. The program budget is much more than a listing of expenditures by program. In a program budget, the proposed dollar figures for expenditures are related to the goals, objectives and programs of the organization.

In grouping costs by programs, the budget indicates where the emphasis is being placed and to achieve what. In the case of organizations utilizing long-range planning, the dollar figures are incorporated in two documents - the multi-year financial plan and the program budget itself. The former presents financial data for existing and alternative programs projected over several years, frequently five years. The program budget, pertains only to the forthcoming fiscal year.

The stage is now set for the actual commencement and the day-to-day operation of the program. The budget itself is now looked upon as a working tool and a management control device. Maintaining control over operations involves periodic comparison of the actual progress with the program budget.

This leads to what is technically recognized as the final step in the PPBS approach - that of evaluation.

5. Evaluation of results to determine the program's effectiveness in achieving the anticipated program objectives is built into the PPBS cycle. The evaluation task is performed by comparing program results against the evaluation criteria established in the planning phase. Thus, it may be
more appropriate to consider the evaluation function as part of the "planning continuum". PPBS operates in a dynamic environment. It is designed as a continually active process. In the PPBS cycle, the line between the beginning and the end is hard to pinpoint.

Werner Hirsch (1966) examining early experiences in developing and applying PPBS to various departments in the U.S.A. suggests that it has three major aspects; structural, analytical and administrative. Structural Aspects

PPBS relies upon a structured program, the chief feature of which is that it is output oriented. It permits the activities of several agencies of departments to be assembled in terms of specific output packages i.e. programs and sub-programs of various convenient levels of aggregation. For example, if one of the national goals is the economic and social development of human resources then allocation decisions must be made to achieve this goal, (i.e. between a vocational retraining program to develop new skills in the work force and a college education program to improve the level of scholarly, scientific and artistic contributions in the country). These two sub-programs must therefore compete with each other for resources and federal funds. Each sub-program is in turn made up of alternative sub-subprograms which compete with each other for resources as inputs for achieving the objectives of the program of which it is a part. Therefore, teaching the operation of a turret lathe or physical therapy can be viewed as alternative forms of vocational training and are more competitive with each other than they are with studies of political science, economics and philosophy. The structural layout of this set of programs can be presented diagrammatically as shown in Figure 6.
Ultimately the program budget identifies elements down to the input level of basic building blocks of required resources: manpower, materials, equipment, building, land etc. These elements may be combined and recombined into various packages that produce desired outputs. Wherever possible, programs and sub-programs should be clearly delineated, should have minimum overlaps with other programs and should consist of components that are in closer competition with each other than with those outside the program. Breaking down and combining data into useful building blocks allows a decision maker to reconstruct the program budget at his particular level of responsibility according to articulated objectives or goals.

The program budget format requires that outputs be quantifiable so that projected expenditure data can be meaningfully related to expected performance.
"The final structural aspect of the program budget is its extended time horizon. The traditional organization of budgetary data rarely offers a profile of the future expenditures linked to or implied by current investment decisions. To make rational choices, the decision-maker must know something about the future expenditure implications of decisions he makes today, and this may require that the budget be projected several years into the future. By understanding the full costs of first year financing, "foot in the door" financing which has often proven costly can be prevented."
(Hirsch, 1966 p. 261)

Analytical Aspects

Analysis and evaluation is an integral part of the PPBS process and includes the study of objectives and of alternative ways of achieving them, of future environments and of contingencies and how to respond to them. Since planning and budgeting need to be done over a number of years into the future, explicit recognition must be given to the uncertainties of the future. To do so, budget analysts can draw on the economic theory of choice over time and benefit cost analysis.

"Benefit-cost analysis is concerned with resource allocation efficiency and attempt to relate total resource costs to benefits produced by a particular program. It permits the use of explicit criteria and systematic comparison of several alternative courses of action that might achieve a certain objective for some future time period. Benefit-cost analysis requires information in addition to that likely to be presented in the program budget. Ideally it should take into account all costs by whomever they accrue. The benefits are the value of the added output or the added satisfaction resulting from the choice of one course of action rather than another. The costs of a program are the resources sacrificed if that action is taken; i.e. their value in their best alternative uses."
(Hirsch, 1966 p. 261)

The program budget provides no information on benefits, however, and in addition, not all of the items that are included in the program budget are costs, and all of the costs of a program are not included in the program budget. The program budget presents a list of proposed expenditures, but not economic costs.
"If benefits and costs were exhaustive, certain and commensurable, efficient resource allocation would result from a policy calculated to yield the greatest present value of net benefits. If financial constraints were to force us to choose from desirable programs, we would adopt those with the highest positive net present value until we came to the point where the entire budget was spent. In fact, benefits and cost are not exhaustive, certain and commensurable. In virtually no case can we obtain a complete estimate of the present value of net benefits. With care however, we can usually identify major social benefit and social cost components, and obtain partial estimates of some of them, and can furnish the decision-maker with partial qualitative information on others. Therefore, in practice, instead of seeking to maximize net present values, we are satisfied with identifying preferred solutions, i.e. we sub-optimize."

(Hirsch, 1966 p. 262)

Budget analysis also involves the careful, explicit treatment of uncertainties and their implications for planning and budgeting. These arise largely because of the extended time horizon required for rational decisions. Some of the tools for handling these uncertainties are sensitivity and contingency analysis.

**Administrative-Organizational Aspects**

In addition to devising a program budget and using available analytical tools to help reach decisions, there must also be the means to administer and possibly revise the budgetary decisions that have been reached.

Hirsch feels that it would be preferable to shift relevant administrative functions into the jurisdiction of officials who make final program decisions but such a reorganization is not likely to be accomplished soon. Program budgeting is therefore likely to face considerable opposition within bureaucratic organizations where officials are used to the familiar administrative budget. Some officials will resist program budgeting to protect established seats of power. Others will feel that existing budgetary arrangements benefit them, and fear uncertainties of the new. Thus, makeshift arrangements are likely to be developed, and these should include effective information systems, decision making processes and the means to
insure compliance with program decisions, once they have been made.

Hirsch suggests that these adjustments are likely to result in some concentration of authority, and yet they should be such that budget modifications and revisions can be made if conditions should change over time. This will require a system which controls or at least monitors reprogramming. To accomplish such a scheme, dollar thresholds should be designated; and methods of reprogramming, evaluation, approval and enforcement should be designed. It is likely that such steps will be facilitated by linking the PPBS process with the prevailing annual budget cycle.

Considering the special nature of social and rehabilitative agencies, Arthur Spindler (1962) identifies several important principles and characteristics of PPB that must be considered when application is contemplated in this setting.

1. PPBS is a goal-oriented system. Its first and overriding requirement is for better definitions of public goals and objectives. This requirement applies to the alternate aims of social and rehabilitation services directed toward adults, children and their families. PPBS can stimulate a re-examination of goals and objectives and can help clarify existing points of uncertainty about relationships with other agencies and programs.

2. PPBS calls for a clear expression of the relationship of social and rehabilitation programs and services to program goals and objectives. Within social and rehabilitation services for instance, day care can be offered as part of rehabilitation, prevention or collateral services. The agency's purpose and method of operating a day care program can be determined and evaluated according to the agency's objectives. Seeing the
relation of the day care program to objectives in this way is significant throughout the process of planning, programming and budgeting.

3. **PPBS requires comprehensive, reliable and valid information about the universe of unmet needs for different kinds of social services.** Before an agency can recognize needs and find ways to meet them, it must develop a detailed knowledge of the social, economic, psychological and health characteristics of different groups of people in the population, particularly the disadvantaged and the underprivileged, as well as the nature, cause and prognosis of these peoples' problems. To make this information available, public, private and voluntary agencies must try to integrate and standardize their information and statistical reporting systems. A high degree of cooperation between local, provincial and federal agencies is required as is a commitment of resources and capabilities to develop mutually compatible information systems.

4. **PPBS points up the important relation of program costs to program performance.** A major requirement of the PPBS approach is to obtain and apply an accurate definition of program costs to show clearly the extent of the commitment of resources to specific goals. The element of cost is vital in the management of public and private agencies, not only to justify requests for increased staff and other resources, but also to explain the social and economic value of program, to project the dollar value of services and activities and to relate cost and value to program goals in planning.

5. **PPBS relies on the identification of units of measurement that define types of services and programs and makes possible the comparison of performance and program effects among different agencies or departments at different times.** Once an agency or system of agencies has agreed upon
the measurement units it will use, it can assess and analyze the contribution of its services and programs in meeting specific goals and objectives. One unit of measurement of the success of a work incentive program, for example, might be "the number of trainees enrolled", another might be "the number of social assistance cases closed as a result of successful placement". A fourth measure that assesses the most direct program effects is "the aggregate of the trainee's weekly earning compared with the average training cost, the actual and potential social assistance payments, and the tax revenue resulting from employment". To these should be added a fifth - the program's value in improving the self-image of the trainee - but ways to measure such results have yet to be developed.

The foregoing has attempted to outline the basic nature, principles and characteristics of PPBS. The following section will examine the evolution of PPBS as it has emerged in the United States.

II The Evolution of PPBS

In his classic and often quoted article, "The Road to PPB: the Stages of Budget Reform", Allen Schick (1966) traces budgeting reform in the U.S.A. through three distinct stages, the last of which is associated with Planning-Programming-Budgeting Systems. Schick suggests that the PPBS approach proposes:

"A radical change in the central function of budgeting, but it is anchored to a century of tradition and evolution. The budget system of the future will be a product of past and emerging developments; that is, it will embrace both the budgeting functions introduced during earlier stages of reform as well as the planning function which is highlighted by PPB. PPB is the first budget system designed to accommodate the multiple functions of budgeting."

(Schick, December 1966, pp. 243 - 244)
Reviewing the functions of budgeting, Schick notes that budgeting has always been conceived as a process for systematically relating the expenditure of funds to the accomplishment of planned objectives. In this sense there is a bit of PPB in every budget system.

"Even in the initial stirrings of budget reform more than 50 years ago, there were cogent statements on the need for a budget system to plan the objectives and activities of government and to furnish reliable data on what was to be accomplished with public funds."

(Schick, December 1966, p. 244)

Planning, however is not the only function that must be served by a budget system. The management of ongoing activities and the control of spending are two functions which in the past have been given priority over the planning function.

Robert Antony (1965) identifies three distinct administrative processes: strategic planning, management control and operational control.

"Strategic Planning is the process of deciding on objectives of the organization, on changes in these objectives, on the resources used to attain these objectives, and on the policies that are to govern the acquisition, use and disposition of these resources.

Management Control is the process by which managers assure that resources are obtained and used effectively and efficiently in the accomplishment of the organization's objectives.

Operational Control is the process of assuring that specific tasks are carried out effectively and efficiently."

(Anthony, R.N. (1965) pp. 16 - 18)

Schick points out that every budget system, even rudimentary ones, encompass planning, management and control processes. Operationally these processes are often indivisible. In the context of budgeting, "Planning involves the determination of objectives, the evaluation of alternative courses of action, and the authorization of select programs".

Planning is closely linked to budget preparation under PPB, and one of the major aims of the approach is to convert the annual routine of preparing
a budget into a conscious appraisal and formulation of future goals and policies.

Management involves the programming of approved goals into specific projects and activities, the design of organizational units to carry out approved programs and the procurement of necessary resources. The management process is spread over the entire budget cycle, and ideally, provides the link between goals made and activities undertaken.

Control refers to the process of binding operating officials to the policies and plans set out by their superiors. Control is predominant during the execution and audit stages, although the form of budget estimates and appropriations is often determined by control considerations. The assorted controls and reporting procedures that are associated with budget execution - position controls, restrictions on transfers, requisition procedures, and travel regulations, to mention the more prominent ones - have the purpose of securing compliance with policies made by central authorities.

Very rarely, are planning, management and control given equal attention in the operation of budget systems and frequently they have tended to be competing processes in budgeting with no distinct division of functions among the various participants. In addition, the absence of reliable internal control systems has loaded central authorities with control functions at the expense of the planning function. Moreover, these processes often require different skills and generate different ways of handling the budgeting objective and as the orientation of budgeting has moved from control to management, there has been a shift from accountants to administrators. Initial experience with PPB systems, points out
Schick, suggests that the next transition will be from administrators to economists, as budgeting takes on more of the planning function.

An important factor to consider, is the differential informational requirements of planning, control and management processes. Informational needs differ in terms of time spans, methods of aggregations, linkages with organizational and operating units and input-output foci. An apparent solution is to design a system that serves the multiple needs of budgeting. Historically, however, there has been a strong tendency to homogenize informational structures and to rely on a single classification scheme to serve all budgetary purposes. For the most part, informational systems have been structured to meet the purposes of control. As a result, the type of multiple purpose budget system envisioned by PPB has been avoided.

Schick suggests that an examination of budget systems should reveal whether greater emphasis is placed at the central levels on planning, management, or control.

"A planning orientation focuses on the broadest range of issues: what are the long range goals and policies and how are these related to particular expenditure choices? What criteria should be used in appraising the requests of the agencies? Which programs should be initiated or terminated, and which expanded or curtailed?

A management orientation deals with less fundamental issues: what is the best way to organize for the accomplishment of a prescribed task? Which of several staffing alternatives achieves the best results? Of the various grants and projects proposed, which should be approved?

A control orientation deals with a relatively narrow range of concerns: how can agencies be held to the expenditure ceilings established by the legislature and chief executive? What reporting procedures should be used to enforce propriety in expenditures? What limits should be placed on agency spending for personnel and equipment?"

(Schick, December 1966, p. 245)
While every budget system contains planning, management, and control features, a control orientation means that the planning and management functions are subordinate to control, not totally absent. In the matter of orientations one is dealing with emphases, not with pure dichotomies. The critical issue is the balance among these vital functions at the central level.

Given the three critical functions of budgeting one might visualize an integrated budgeting and administrative process as shown below. This overall process is essentially a PPB system.
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Schick notes that various attempts at budget reform have altered the planning-management-control balance, sometimes inadvertently, usually deliberately. Three successive stages of budgetary reform can be identified. In the first stage, dating roughly from 1920 to 1935, the dominant emphasis was on developing an adequate system of expenditure control. Although planning and management considerations were not altogether absent, they were pushed to the side by what was regarded as the first priority, a reliable system of expenditure accounts.

The second stage came to the fore during the New Deal and reached its zenith more than a decade later in the movement of performance budgeting. The management orientation was predominant during this period, and established itself in the reform of the appropriation structure, development of management improvements and work measurement programs and the focusing of budget preparation on the work and activities of the agencies.

The third stage, the full emergence of which must await the institutionalization of PPB can be traced to earlier efforts to link planning and budgeting as well as to the analytic criteria of welfare economics, but its recent development is a product of modern informational and decisional technologies such as those pioneered by the Department of Defense.

PPBS according to Schick "is predicated on the primacy of the planning function yet it strives for a multi purpose budget system that gives adequate and necessary attention to the control and management areas. Even in embryonic stage PPB envisions the development of crosswalk grids for the conversion of data from a planning to a management and control framework, and back again. PPB treats the three basic functions - planning, management, and control as compatible and complementary elements of a budget
system though not as coequal aspects of central budgeting. In ideal form, PPB would centralize the planning function and delegate "primary" managerial and control responsibilities to the supervisory and operating levels respectively." (Schick, 1966, p. 246)

III Specifics of the PPBS Approach - How it is intended to work*

There are three central documents of the PPB system as applied by the U.S. Bureau of the Budget. The Program and Financial Plan (PFP), the Program Memoranda (PM) and Special Analytical Studies.

The PFP of each agency should be a quantitative statement, largely in tabular form of the agency's programs, organized according to the various functions it performs. Data should be shown for the current year and for as far into the future as it is useful to project. Most agencies should project five years ahead but some will do so only for two or three years and some will go well beyond five years.

The PFP should express objectives and planned accomplishments wherever possible in quantitative physical (or output) terms. The physical description of program elements might include for example, the number of acres of recreational facilities to be built in metropolitan areas, the number of youths to be trained, the number of housing units to be constructed, and the number of children to receive pre-school training. For some programs, it may not be possible to obtain or develop quantitative physical measures; but for them, objectives and performance should be described in as specific terms as possible.

Associated with the physical output data should be financial data to

*This section is drawn primarily from Page, D. (1967) op cit, pp. 256-259
show the cost of carrying out the activity. Cost data is to be expressed in system's terms. All costs that are associated with a program element should be assigned to that element and these component costs can generally be derived from existing appropriation and accounting categories.

The PFP should serve many functions. It should reveal future implications of current budget decisions and group programs in a way that facilitates comparison among these with similar purposes. Because it is designed to pull together all the costs associated with decisions to carry on a given program at a given level, it will provide important data for decision-making. The PFP should not be seen as fixed. As circumstances change, so should the PFP.

The second central document, essential to the PPB system, is the Program Memorandum. It is designed to:

1. describe the programs recommended by the agency for the time period being considered, show how these programs meet the needs of the target population, show the total costs of recommended programs and show the specific ways in which they differ from current programs and those of the past several years.

2. describe program objectives, insofar as possible in quantitative physical terms.

3. describe program objectives and expected accomplishments and costs for several years into the future.

4. compare the effectiveness and the cost of alternative objectives, of alternative programs that achieve the same as comparable objectives, and of different levels of quantity within any given program category; this comparison should show past experience, the alternatives that are
believed to be worthy of consideration, earlier differing recommendations, earlier cost and performance estimates, and the reasons for changing these estimates.

5. make explicit the assumptions and criteria that support recommended programs and

6. identify and analyse the main uncertainties in the assumptions and in the program effectiveness or costs and show the sensitivity of recommendations to these uncertainties.

This is a lot to ask for and it may be unrealistic to ask for such complete and often speculative data in practice.

The Program Memoranda are not intended to be simple essays. They are to be analytic, quantitative documents that describe needs, define objectives in precise terms, analyse cost and effectiveness, and state explicit priorities. Assumptions and uncertainties are to be identified as are the criteria for choices.

Emphasis in PPBS is on the findings of program analyses and evaluation to buttress decisions. These findings are presented in Special Analytical Studies which vary not only with respect to subject matter and scope but also in the analytical methods used. They may deal with a single program component, such as housing services to recipients of old age assistance, or they may encompass a broad range of programs that are themselves components of a common social objective such as rehabilitating the poor. The Special Analytical Studies may require simple analysis of short duration or the use of a complex array of research tools, but they have one element in common: they respond to the need for information in making decisions among alternative ways of achieving program objectives.
These three - the Program and Financial Plan, Program Memorandums and the Special Analytical Studies - represent the major inputs to the PPBS approach to budgeting.

The overall system is designed to enable each agency to make available to top management more specific data relevant to broad decisions by:

1. stating clearly and precisely the objectives of agency programs
2. analysing alternative objectives systematically and presenting agency heads with alternative programs to meet those objectives
3. presenting on a multiyear basis, the prospective costs and accomplishments of programs
4. producing total rather than partial cost estimates of programs
5. evaluating the benefits and costs of programs and
6. reviewing objectives and conducting program analyses on a continuing year-round basis instead of on a crowded schedule to meet budget deadlines.

"The potential implications of the PPBS are exceeded only by its demands. First and most fundamental is the need to bring together in a coherent way the planning activities of government (and agencies) within the budget process. Planning separated from budgeting tends to be unrealistic and ineffective; budgeting separated from planning tends to be shortsighted and not well enough informed. It is vitally important that these complementary activities be linked. But for this to be possible, there must exist a serious planning effort. Each agency must develop integrated planning-programming-budgeting organizations charged with the task of stating objectives, analysing alternative programs to meet these objectives and translating these into budget requirements.

Second, there is the need to develop adequate analytical staffs to help formulate objectives and analyse programs. Almost every area of federal government activity presents difficult and challenging problems requiring analysis. Experience has demonstrated that good analysis can make important contributions to public policy issues and help evaluate alternative solutions to national problems. We must develop a group of employees equipped with analytical techniques and capable of creatively adapting these techniques to public programs."
Third, we must begin to develop basic quantitative program models. A model should describe the central relationships between variables within the program area. A program model in education might show the relationship among basic human ability, years and type of education, and their effect on earning capacity. Models, of course, are simplified versions of the real phenomena being described but they are badly needed if one is to gain a clearer understanding of the effect of existing programs and of the kinds of new programs that can have the greatest effect. Adequate analysis of difficult subjects cannot be done immediately - in many cases it will take several years of continuing endeavour to produce a satisfactory analytic product.

Fourth, and perhaps most critical is the fact that good analysis requires good data and we need better data than we have now to evaluate the effectiveness of our programs."

(Schick, A., December 1966, p. 258)

The primary aim of PPBS is to provide a formal and systematic means for evaluating and measuring effectiveness against costs of alternative programs. To do this, one must specify objectives and attempt to measure performance against these objectives. In so doing, the hope is to move away from decision-making on a subjective basis and toward decision-making on benefit-cost and marginal utility analysis. It is suggested that this approach will be a significant improvement over the intuitive processes of the past.

IV Problems of Implementation

PPBS is by no means without controversy. There are enthusiastic advocates and there are those who express grave doubts about its utility and point out many problems. The proponents of PPBS cite the following specific benefits.

- Provides a framework for accountability
- Provides opportunity for long-range planning
- Assists in acquiring government funds
- Provides opportunities to program staff to give their inputs in the decision-making process
- Compels organizational self-study and analysis
- Promotes rational decisions

The more cautious and less enthusiastic point out various problems such as: difficulties in defining programs adequately: finding adequate measures of output and problems in associating costs with outputs. Of all the problems, however, the one most difficult to tackle remains that of defining units of output or products in human care services. Finally, there are the dangers of inter-agency comparisons based on cost-benefit analysis when comparability of programs is in question.

It should therefore be stressed the PPBS is no panacea. It is by no means a perfected instrument but as experience builds, its values can be more thoroughly assessed and further refinement and innovation will become possible.

Allan Schick (1966), reviewing the movement of budgeting systems toward a PPBS approach asks:

"In an operational sense, what difference does it make whether the central budget process is oriented toward planning rather than management? Does the change merely mean a new way of making decisions, or does it mean different decisions as well? .... The case for PPB rests on the assumption that the form in which information is classified and used will govern the actions and decisions of budgeters; and conversely, that alternatives in form will produce desired changes in behaviour. Take-away the assumption that behaviour follows form, and the movement for PPB is reduced to a trivial manipulation of techniques - form for forms sake without any significant bearing on the conduct of budgetary affairs.

Yet this assumed connection between roles and information is a relatively uncharted facet of the PPB literature. The behavioral side of the equation has been neglected. PPB implies that each participant will behave as a sort of Budgetary Man ... who whatever his situation or role in the budget process, is assumed to be guided by an unwavering commitment to the rule of efficiency; in every instance he chooses that alternative that optimizes the allocation of public resources."

(Schick, A., December 1966, p. 256)
PPBS, as Schick notes, probably takes an overly mechanistic view of the impact of form on behaviour and underestimates the strategic and volitional aspects of budget making. Given the political nature of budgeting, the participants are more likely than not to seek out and use data which suit their preferences than to alter their behaviour automatically in response to formal changes. This is a major problem to be encountered by any system which wishes to introduce a PPBS approach to the allocation of resources. Schick noted that "... PPB aspires to create a different environment for choice. Traditionally, budgeting has defined its objectives by identifying the existing base and proposed departures from it. "This is where we are; where do we go from here?" PPB on the other hand defines its mission in terms of budgetary objectives and purposes. "Where do we want to go?" "What do we do to get there?" The environment of choice under traditional circumstances is incremental; in PPB it is teletic. Presumably these different processes will lead to different budgetary outcomes.

A budgeting system and process, which accepts the base and examines only the increments will produce decisions to transfer the present into the future with a few small variations ... A budget making process which begins with objectives, however, will require the base to compete on an equal footing with new proposals. The decisions will be more radical than those made under incremental conditions. This does not mean that each year's budget will lack continuity with the past. There are sunk costs that have to be reckoned and the benefits of radical changes will have to outweigh the costs of terminating prior commitment." (Schick, December 1966, p. 257).

Summing up, Schick feels that to a far greater extent than heretofore, budget decisions will be influenced by explicit statement of objectives and
by a formal weighing of the costs and benefits of alternatives.

Robert Millward (1968) on the other hand, points out a number of subtle and often not so subtle, shortcomings which deserve close attention in introducing a PPB approach to a budgeting process. It is suggested that

"PPBS is not simply a proposal for the improvement of public administration or planning that is easily defined, readily installed and promptly effective in operation. On the contrary, from initial concept to final implementation, the project raises difficult and important problems which must be anticipated at the outset. The system poses unique demands on the existing functionaries and the results are potentially far different from those produced at present."

(Millward, R.E., (March 1968) p. 90)

For purposes of analysis, Millward views PPBS as another attempt at "rationality" closely related to the ideal of comprehensive planning.

"A rational decision is defined as one that: 1) establishes goals and objectives after observation; 2) designs alternative means to accomplish these goals; 3) predicts all consequences of each alternative; and 4) selects the preferable alternative in terms of the most valued ends.

The necessity of a greater rationality is underscored by the increasing complexity of government programs and the unprecedented demands upon government decision-makers. The problems are greater than ever before, and the traditional methods of allocating scarce or limited resources are often no longer adequate for the complex tasks now facing our government leaders. More rational decisions are sought because they are either more efficient, more economical, more objective, more effective or more in the public interest."

(Millward, (March 1968) p. 90)

The problems of implementing a PPBS approach to budgeting may be divided into two main categories - conceptual and operational with further distinctions being made as to short and long range problems.

1. Conceptual Problems

The conceptual problems are those encountered in designing the program budget and relating it to decision-making requirements. Included here are
the fundamental questions of aims and functions of government, the kinds of problems that demand government action and the processing of data that are needed in decision-making.

First, the determination of objectives is a basic step in PPBS and poses a unique set of problems at the outset. To begin with, societal goals are rather elusive; since ends are rarely agreed upon among individuals, agencies or in government as a whole and possess dynamic properties, objectives are seldom articulated even with the expenditures of vast sums of money. Moreover, societal or general goals are often substantially different from individual agency goals. In short, concrete meaningful goals do not always exist, sometimes cannot be articulated and seldom are agreed upon even within the confines of a specific agency.

Relating means to ends is also a prerequisite of rationality and the PPBS approach. Even if we had specific goals that were agreed upon, the knowledge of effective means to achieve them is overwhelmingly inadequate. Herbert Simon examining the conceptual problems of relating means to ends points out the following:

1. the ends to be attained by the choice of a particular alternative are often incompletely or incorrectly stated through failure to consider the alternative ends, thus obscuring the comparative element in decision-making.

2. a complete separation of the factual elements from the value elements is impossible;

3. the role of the time element in decision-making is obscured thus blurring the differences between short-run and long-run effects.
   (Simon, H.A. (1957) Chapter IV)

In addition, the connections between organizational activities and ultimate objectives are not always clear, and usually cannot be so, given the complex nature of the constraints operating upon any organization.
Sometimes the means are unknown, and sometimes there are internal conflicts and contradictions among the means selected.

Also, an agency may have a consensus on goals, yet have no control over the means to achieve them. Millward concludes that "decision-making in general and PPBS in particular are restricted in their application of the true rational model because means and ends cannot always be effectively compared ... One can only wonder how ends will be selected, means evaluated, consequences anticipated and so forth, given the existing limitations placed on all would be decision makers." (Millward, (March 1968), p. 90)

2. Operational Problems

In addition to the inherent problems of PPBS - namely that the system requires performance never before or seldom attained in practice, another set of problems is operational in nature, centring around managerial implementation and acceptance in the period after adoption.

A) Millward notes that

"it is no small chore to relate objectives to specific programs, assuming that we know the objectives. The structural elements around which a program budget operates must be built. Ideally, program elements should be designed to be relatively independent but interdependencies will no doubt be exposed that will require continual modification. Once activities are identified as an appropriate cluster of a single program or program element, it will likely be found that such activities are currently scattered through several agencies, bureaus and divisions, not to mention levels of government. To try to rearrange these into a "meaningful" framework will certainly encounter strong institutional resistance."

(Millward, (March 1968) p. 91)

B) Another severe problem is relating the specific programs to resource requirements and the resource inputs to budget dollars. The task is first to compare alternative programs with respect to both costs to be
incurred and gains to be achieved, and then to translate the program requirements into budget dollars projected several years ahead. The basic methodological technique is cost/benefit analysis. Aside from some success in military planning and possibly in water resource planning, however, this technique is still in its infancy in terms of quantifying all but the most obvious direct benefits. The indirect and intangible benefits which are often the most crucial in social service programs are extremely difficult to quantify and, therefore component cost elements based on cost/benefit techniques may be highly distorted and of little use in making evaluative decisions at least initially. To the extent that these techniques can be improved in the future, this shortcoming may eventually be alleviated. Cost/benefit and cost effectiveness will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter.

C) The conversion of manpower, facilities and other resource requirements into budget dollars, projected several years ahead, sounds much easier than it is likely to be in practice. Prediction plays an important part in ascertaining needs and demands for future years. Prediction, however, is based on either 1) an understanding of the dynamics of an event or 2) knowledge of past events. The second method is the one most often used in planning and public administration, since the first is still largely unworkable. The procedure of collecting and interpreting data for predictive purpose is not an exact science however, and there are opportunities for error existing at each stage in the process. Our ability to actually know the past is limited and its relevance to the future is often only a rough approximation of general trends. The realization that there is really no sound method of prediction is essential to those who expect PPBS to dramatically improve the quality of decision-making.
D) If PPBS is to be more than an exercise in arithmetic, it must gain acceptance by the operating agencies, governing bodies and probably numerous interest groups as well.

"It is not enough to invoke the sacred words of 'economy', 'efficiency', 'better decisions' or 'total welfare'. PPBS is heralded as a revolutionary method of making fundamental decisions affecting the objects and magnitude of governmental financial support which means that it will be construed as a threat (either real or imagined) to existing, familiar, and manipulative institutional arrangements, and will therefore incur opposition from the bureaucracy itself, as well as from outside.

A key fact is that any bureaucratic institution is going to oppose change, partly because of a desire to hang on to those things that are known. Aside from the stated goals and objectives, there is an overriding desire to maintain and enhance the power and prestige of existing institutions. These cannot be overemphasized, for they play a crucial role in any reorganizational effort. This is not to say that major administrative innovations have not taken place, but that they encounter very strong resistance, at least initially."

(Millward, (March 1968) p. 91)

It is natural for agencies and individuals to fear any kind of shift that might involve decisions less advantageous to their interests.

McKean and Anshen (1964, 65) suggest three possible outcomes of a PPBS approach: 1) identification and possible removal of overlapping and redundant activities; 2) exposure of ineffective or inefficient employment of resources; and 3) clearer illumination of the long-range cost implications of proposals with relatively painless initial expenses and consequent better screening of such proposals with an accompanying higher rejection rate. Thus one might predict that the promise to provide better information that is better organized for better decision-making will not always be universally received. The goals of central funding bodies are not necessarily consistent with those of its individual components nor with individual administrators. The structure of decision-making arising from a PPBS
approach will most likely not resemble the existing bureaucracy. Since
the resulting realignment and reorganization of agency functions and
programs will likely produce a subsequent shakeup of hierarchical re-
lationships, it is easy to see why it will not be endorsed whole-
heartedly initially.

E) In examining potential difficulties with regard to implementa-
tion, it is important to understand how the traditional budgetary
process works. Wildavsky (1964) has described the federal budget process
as "incremental, proceeding from a historical base, guided by notions of
fair shares, in which decisions are fragmented, made in sequence by
specialized bodies, and coordinated through repeated attacks on problems
and through multiple feed-back mechanisms. In short, it is the anti-
thesis of long range, comprehensive, goal-oriented planning and budgeting.
Rather than focusing on policy implications the traditional approach is
more interested in hiding them. Log rolling and bargaining are integral
aspects of most expenditure decisions. The conflict or argument is over
incremental changes in last year's request and there is also almost no
consideration of the relative merits of entire programs. Although major
changes are possible, our institutional framework tends to favor incre-
mental steps. In fact, the mitigation of conflict is a widely shared
value among participants in the political process, and compromise has
become an indisputable part of the North American political system. A
PPBS approach would force more overt considerations of policy and specific
programs by elected officials (and boards of directors) requiring "yes"
or "no" commitments. Few politicians are willing to accept the possibil-
ity of being voted out of office by endorsing an unpopular long-range
expenditure.
"The resistance of the public bureaucracy and elected officials may be reinforced by opposition from "clients" served by and benefiting from existing budgetary arrangements. These clients may be special interest groups of many varieties which would stand to lose if the switch over to the programmed budget were accomplished. It is also possible, however, that some special interest groups would support PPBS, since it would open up the budgetary process to more scrutiny, increase the discretion of the executive and the agency heads to make decisions, and restrict the opportunity of other groups to make their detailed expenditure decisions without general approval."

(Millward, (March 1968) pp. 92 - 93)

F) In addition to generating acceptance, which may be accomplished over a period of time, an even more immediate need is to develop the analytical staffs to help formulate objectives and analyse programs. Extensive education efforts and strengthening of staff capabilities will be required in the executive departments.

Summing up, Millward states:

"One must conclude that PPBS has many shortcomings although its attempts at normative decision-making may be desirable. There is no disagreement about the need for new decision-making tools, only a caution that the PPBS framework alone will not solve the immense problems facing us. It is hoped that working with PPBS will result in a greater awareness of ends, means, consequences, needs and resources, all of which will facilitate decision-making within agencies. Its attempt at quantification of costs and benefits may lead to more sophisticated comparative efforts, particularly the use of mathematical models. Perhaps the basic advantage of PPBS is in the forced examination of ongoing activities in problem terms, in direct contrast to the present approach of incrementation, where we do not evaluate what has already been approved and is operational. Such an examination is bound to reveal problems heretofore unrecognized."

(Millward, (March 1968) p. 93)

In his memorandum on the introduction of PPBS into the Department of State, Thomas Schelling made some important observations on the managerial prerequisites for PPB's success.

"PPBS, backed up by a competent analytical staff, can hardly fail to be helpful to a decision-maker who insists on making his own decisions and on understanding how he makes them; it can be a seductive comfort and in the end an embarrassment, to a lazy executive who wants his decisions to come out of a process in which
hiw own intellect does not participate. PPBS can be a splendid tool to help top management make decisions: but there has to be a top management that wants to make decisions."

(Schelling, Thomas, March/April 1969)

This observation restates one of the oldest verities of business and public administration; namely, that "good staff services alone do not a good decision-maker make". Often the activities of a competent analytical staff can by itself lead to paralysis by analysis. Excessive attention to the development of formal calculational capabilities can divert scarce resources from the equally important tasks of building action capabilities.

Moreover, even though it be a small group with a small budget, any ambitious new PPB staff inevitably locks horns with the defenders of the programs they question, with old guard budget staffs, or with rivals for positions of strategic influence. The extent to which such conflicts are constructive or destructive depends largely on the wisdom of top management.

Michael Teitz (1968) notes that PPBS promises to be a visible means for carrying rational calculation into many realms of public effort and expenditure. Its ideas and techniques are seductive both for their power and generality and for their demonstrated applicability in attacking incredibly complex problems. Despite this, successful adoption of PPBS will depend heavily upon the analytic capabilities of local governments for generating and evaluating programs.

Teitz points out that new methods often fail to make the difficult transition between levels of government, often with good reason. Many methods are technically inappropriate at widely differing levels; others are unacceptable because of variations in political style. It might be argued, however, that a good part of the failures stem from the fact that
diffusion and transition are frequently accompanied by coarsening of understanding, formalization, and routinization of procedures, along with dependence upon weaker technical staff. The result is often adoption of form but not substance and outputs are poor. Thus, as PPBS is diffused into local governments, these influences will likely threaten its adoption.

The successful implementation of PPBS and its component parts - program structure, program elements, analytical comparison of alternatives in terms of cost and effectiveness - presupposes both a sophisticated understanding of the technical nature of particular systems and methods for their manipulation and analysis. Teits suggests that "although cost or benefit analysis of projects has been carried out in federal and state agencies for a considerable time, most agencies especially in local government, do not have analytical and systems design capabilities ... nor have they been under the same kind of pressure to create new alternatives. They have had less money and less operating freedom, faced less rapid change and been less able to evaluate results of new programs."

Thus, even if good analysts are found to put PPB into local agencies, information gaps will remain. Without a good deal of basic work on the technology and economics of public services, PPB could turn into an empty ritual. Unless significant advances occur in basic urban housekeeping functions, including social services, PPB will be hardly worth the effort." (Teitz M.B., (September 1968), p. 304)

The unifying theme of PPBS is its style of attack upon problems. The core of the approach lies in the attempt to describe any problem in relation to a total structure of objectives, costs and benefits. The analyst typically looks at his system not as an end in itself but as a means toward the achievement of certain objectives of some broader entity within which he is working. In order to do so he must be able to specify
those objectives operationally and relate the outputs of alternative systems to the achievement of objectives.

"The requirement of operationality is crucial. It is not enough to say for example, that a particular set of activities promotes education. We must define what we mean by educational achievement, specify how it is observed and measured, show how the outputs of the activities are related to it, and demonstrate that those activities will in fact have the effects attributed to them."

(Teitz M.B., (September 1968), p. 304)

The process of definition and specification of objectives is difficult and painful. In the provision of public services, the specification of objectives is rarely adequate and typically display two kinds of weaknesses. First, objectives may be specified, but in terms so broad and vague that it is impossible to tell how well the system is doing toward their achievement.

Such objectives as health, safety, education and fuller citizenship are important goals, but require operational definitions for measuring the effectiveness of alternative systems for their achievement.

A second weakness has been to establish objectives in input rather than output terms. Public services are particularly prone to this because of the difficulty in specification and measurement of their output. Objectives tend to be set up as standards for the provision of certain classes of inputs, and the quality of the system's performance then comes to be measured in input terms. They measure what is being put in, not what is coming out. Measures of this type are particularly attractive in situations where the system outputs are diffuse and the objectives imprecise. Because these things are hard to pin down, the attraction of easily measurable inputs becomes overwhelming for the hard pressed administrator who must run his agency and secure a budget for his operations.
The use of input measures as objectives leads to distortion of goals away from the social ends for which the agency was established, toward internal organizational and administrative ends. Empire building within organizations is a familiar example of such a distortion.

3. Determining Costs and Effectiveness

The relative quantities of different outputs produced and their distribution among competing recipient groups depends in large part upon the form of allocation procedure adopted. For commercial enterprises and some public and quasi-public products i.e. telephone services, the price system allocates output among consumers on the basis of their own preferences and the distribution of income. For some public products, there is no differential allocation, and for other some eligibility criteria are adhered to.

In the social service field, where a price mechanism to allocate output does not exist, some other procedure must be adopted. Traditionally, this process has been a mixture of political, administrative and professional judgement. During recent years, however, there have been attempts to increase the amount and quality of information upon which such decisions may be based. Foremost among those have been efforts to quantify both the costs and the benefits stemming from alternative governmental actions. Through the use of cost-benefit analysis (or benefit-cost analysis) attempts have been made to quantify both sides in dollar terms and every effort has been made to include not only direct immediate costs and benefits, but also indirect or spillover costs and benefits accruing to others not directly related to the service or program in question.
Through the use of cost-benefit analysis, it is possible to quantify objectives toward which actions are directed, and to devise measures of the cost and benefits of alternative actions or systems with respect to those objectives. If such measures are available, it should be possible to form a good idea of the relative costs of achieving a marginal gain in one direction as opposed to another. In contrast to cost-benefit, cost-effectiveness analysis allows the use of multiple measures on the benefit side. It does not solve the problem of incorporating all of them into a single benefit measure in dollar terms but rather allows the decision-maker to see clearly the cost of achieving specified gains in each of a variety of measures related to any objective. For activities such as social services in which quantification is difficult and dollar evaluation of direct and indirect benefits subject to arbitrary assumptions, this procedure can offer a useful approach toward improvement of information for decisions.

(A) Cost Analysis

Costing is relatively straightforward and for any configuration of outputs one should be able to develop the total cost of producing them under the assumed system structure and production relationships. The process is not without difficulty however. Perhaps the most difficult in the case of urban services is the specification of outputs and the understanding of technical relationships.

Defining outputs for any service or program constitutes a major problem both of general understanding and of specific measurement. This problem manifests itself in the confusion between activities and objectives. It is usually relatively easy to find some measure of
activity going on but the real trick is to find a measure appropriate to the objectives for which the agency or organization was created.

The second difficulty relates to understanding technical relationships. In order to produce costs, (both total and by output category) of alternative output configurations, one must be knowledgeable about the important technical relationships that determine what can be produced by any given set of inputs. A costing model should also allow for variations in input proportions in order to take advantage of substitution of inputs whose prices and productivity differ. This would imply a costing model that is capable of producing a minimum cost input solution for any output set. This is not a simple task, for even if one knows how outputs are to be defined, delivery of public social services usually involves complex organizational structures and the effect of organizational alternatives on output is rarely known. Studying an existing organization may not reveal cost/output relationships sufficiently to determine whether it is producing efficiently.

While techniques for allocation of resources such as linear programming and simulation have been widely adopted in private industry, they have hardly penetrated the social service sector. The failure to use them has been due, in part, to their initial cost and the necessity for skilled personnel, and in part from a failure to recognize their potential value.

Cost analysis is particularly relevant if an organization's output structure encompasses programs directed toward specific ends. However, there are always some components in any agency that are difficult to allocate to outputs with precise objectives. Typical of these is the
is the overall management function. Major difficulties arise in agencies where large expenditures are unallocable. The cause of this may lie either in the nature of the work performed or the attitude of the agency to its own activity. Any agency that looks at itself primarily through inputs and internal arrangements rather than outputs will be difficult to analyse.

(B) Effectiveness Analysis

Effectiveness analysis deals with the relationship between the structure of output and the achievement of broader objectives. Since the main concern centres on the use of resources in the production of public services, it seems reasonable to measure those resources by their price. The other side of the coin, outputs and benefits, is more difficult to quantify in dollar terms. One reason for this is the absence of a market and price system to allocate what is produced, and thus no obvious valuation procedure based on people's subjective demands presents itself. Often public goods are produced by government or voluntary bodies simply because any such price allocation is inconceivable or because the idea of valuation is meaningless.

Systems analysts have attacked this question through attempting to measure effectiveness - that is relating the output characteristics of any activity or system to the achievement of broader objectives. This approach is not without difficulties and abuses however. For example, one might use the dropout rate, as a measure of the effectiveness of various manpower retraining programs. But a low dropout rate might simply reflect or induce a tight screening process for admission in one
program as compared to another. Candidates in the worst straits could be cut off from help by its use as a measure of effectiveness. If one applies a broader criterion for effectiveness - the total number of participants benefitting, the most effective program as measured by the increase in individual skills may also be the most costly in that it reduces the numbers involved to a point where the total impact of the program on the problem it is attacking becomes trivial. If one can find no one single program evaluation measure, then the next best thing may be to find the incremental relationship of each to cost. Clearly, the selection of effectiveness measures calls for skill, judgement and a full understanding of both the alternatives being analysed and the problem which they are designed to deal with.

Teitz observes that:

"Measures of effectiveness in the production of government services are rare. Typically, they are replaced by two kinds of devices, performance measures and standards. Performance measures relate to the problem of administrative control of operations where the output is poorly defined. Usually they are specified on some sort of activity basis so as to give an estimate of work performed. Thus the effectiveness of a welfare worker may be assessed by the number of case files he can process or a policeman by the number of traffic tickets he can issue. Naturally, controversy exists over this sort of performance measure and its doubtful relationship to the ultimate output toward which the work is directed. The performance measure tends to be a control device designed to detect variations in work levels and allow management to respond accordingly. It may in fact have little relation to final output or conceivably result in effects opposite to what was intended."

(Teitz M.B., (September 1968), p. 309)

The problem of performance standards is much broader and one can distinguish between technical performance standards and generalized system standards. Technical performance standards exist throughout industry and give a vital measure of uniformity and interchangeability, together with
confidence of performance. In government they perform a similar function.

Detailed housing standards may insure uniformity in wiring and plumbing, but they also imply the protection of certain occupational groups from innovation. Generalized system standards are somewhat similar but they tend to be specified for the entire system or some major part of it, and are commonly couched in input terminology. System standards are very common whereas output and effectiveness measures are difficult to find.

Teitz notes that:

"... if the standards are established by knowledgeable people, they will reflect the technology of the system and aid in establishing some minimum levels of service. But their formulation in terms of input quantities rather than desirable output levels may lead to misallocation of resources in situations that are not average. More important they may divert the attention of the agency from what it is supposed to be doing toward a concern for meeting input requirements and from there lead naturally to the evaluation of performance in input terms. The danger in this attitude lies in cutting off an agency from its mission, a sort of loss of contact with reality. Concern with internal organizational aims becomes overriding to the eventual detriment of the agency itself and the community at large. To the extent that the existence of effectiveness measures offsets this tendency alone, they may be well worthwhile."

(Feitz M.B., (September 1968), pp. 309 - 310)

The need for good measures of effectiveness in the provision of social services is unanimously agreed by all in the field, but the form of these measures cannot be entirely analogous to those used elsewhere. Social services are provided principally for the population at large or selected groups therein, and therefore any pattern of production and distribution implies not only cost efficiency and effectiveness in response to declared objectives but also the question of equity in the distribution of both costs and outputs.
4. Measurement and Information Development

The question of measurement of inputs and outputs is critical to the PPBS approach. PPBS and the systems approach searches constantly for operational definitions and the ability to measure becomes an important constraint on operationality in the analysis of problems, the specification of objectives and the evaluation of programs. Very often the way in which one decides to measure variables significantly influences one's view of the variables themselves. Furthermore, the ability to measure some variables more easily than others may lead to a bias in favour of those which one can measure and objectives most closely associated with them.

The measurement problem on the cost side is somewhat eased by the use of dollars as the uniform unit of measure. The principal problem is to ensure the accuracy of the measurement of any specific cost and by the inclusion of all relevant costs under any specific heading. There is considerable experience in this area in the cost accounting field that is readily transferrable to the social service field with minor modifications. The major area of difficulty is in allocating unallocatable costs that cannot be pegged to any one service or program and in developing appropriate units to develop unit costs.

The measurement of effectiveness presents problems of a different order. Without any specific units of measure and without any a priori reasons for selecting some measures of effectiveness over others, the choice of measures is bound to be a process of interaction between what one would like to be able to measure and what one can measure with a
reasonable degree of accuracy. The only real test of a measure of effectiveness is its ability to reflect the achievement of the agency's objectives. One danger however, is the temptation to select measures of effectiveness because one has the ability to measure them even though one may not know their relationship to system wide objectives. Without such a relationship any measure of effectiveness must be regarded as subject to criticism.

To date two types of measurement have emerged in the area of effectiveness measurement; absolute and ratio measures. Absolute measures are necessary in order to retain a perspective on the magnitude of operations and output implied by any particular system. Ratio measures are useful in analysing distributive consequences of particular systems and as measures of efficiency in the use of inputs. Examples of the two kinds of measure might be total number of young people 5 to 15 years of age served in a particular community by a recreation project, and the number of young people 5 to 15 years per 1000 aged 5 to 15, served in the community. The first is an absolute measure while the second is a ratio related to the total number in the population that fall in the specified age range. Considerable evidence suggests that both kinds of measure should be used simultaneously in order to avoid bias and distortion.

One of the crucial tasks in PPB is the development of measures of effectiveness needed for program evaluation. Seidman (May 1970) suggests that such measures can be set out in a hierarchical order with the low end containing concrete measures of the administrative effectiveness of specific projects and programs, primarily of use for short term administrative control. Examples of these are the number of clients enrolled
(absolute measure) or the proportion of a target group reached by a program (ratio measure). At the high end are measures of the actual benefits of the program, generally in terms of changes in the overall status of a community or a nation with respect to certain important attributes. Such measures have a high level of "intrinsic significance". Examples of these are decreases in the infant mortality rate and in the crime rate.

A characteristic of each of the higher level measures is that they have normative values; that is, if the particular measure changes in the "right" direction while other things remain equal, then there can be agreement that the condition of society has improved. Thus, figures on mortality rates or crime rates qualify, but statistics on numbers of doctors and policemen do not. The reason for this relates to the distinction between inputs and outputs. Doctors and policemen must be considered as inputs into a process intended to improve the outputs of health status and crime prevention. They have significance only as they affect these and other outputs or objectives.

To illustrate these hierarchal concepts, Seidman considers a specific set of evaluation measures that relate to family planning programs.

"Level 1 - Project Administration Measures

These are to be measured on individual family planning projects and aggregated to national totals. They include such factors as total numbers of women and of new women seen per year; percent of unwed and high risk mothers enrolled, cost per patient year; and the like.

Level 2 - Sampling Survey Questions

These are asked of persons in the target area of a family planning project or in a more general area such as a city. They are intended
to determine what impact a family planning project is having in a community in terms of knowledge, attitudes and practice. The surveys seek changes in the percentage knowing of family planning and of the specific family planning project, approving the concept of family planning, practicing family planning, and similar questions.

Level 3 - Basic Output Measures

It is assumed here that the basic objective of a family planning program is preventing of unwanted and untimely births. Therefore, basic output measures include total number of births averted; changes in fertility rates; costs per birth averted; and the like. Some of these measures such as fertility rates, can be obtained directly and routinely; others may have to be partially inferred - such as births averted.

Level 4 - Measure of Benefits

This is the highest level of significance and corresponds to the level of social indicators. Measures of benefit could include such things as changes in infant mortality rates, selected infant morbidity rates, abortion rates or deaths attributed to abortions, illegitimacy rates, number of families avoiding poverty (because of smaller family size), increased family income due to ability of the mother to work, and the like."

(Seidman, (May 1970) p. 176)

Ascribing the higher level measures of benefit to any program is a difficult inference to make and this is one reason why at the lower level, more clearly causally related measures are used to assist in evaluating specific programs. The lower level measures are also frequently used as a step in the estimation of benefits. For example, expected decreases in poverty because of smaller family size can be inferred by using a factor of say $500 additional income needed per child to stay out of poverty and multiplying this by the estimated decreases in family size.

The use of various statistical techniques such as multiple regression, step-wise regression and discriminant analysis can be used to analyse more complex inferential chains and determine the extent to which each of several independent variables affect a selected benefit measure. For
example, "a multiple regression analysis of infant mortality, done on individual maternity records could indicate the extent to which age, number of children and pregnancy interval relate to infant mortality rates. From our knowledge of changes caused in these independent variables by family planning one can estimate the effect of a specific family planning program on infant mortality".

The above example demonstrates the need to develop and experiment with mathematical models in many program areas. This will be more difficult in some program areas than in others. One difficulty is in appreciating the complex causal linkages between the variables of human behavior. Another difficulty is in not having even basic data with which to make a beginning. Some program areas, such as those in the physical health field have considerable data that is maintained on a systematic basis. Other program areas, such as those in the social welfare field, have precious little data, and severely handicap more sophisticated analysis and manipulation of variables. In many cases the critical variables, both dependent and independent are not known let alone measured.

If the development and implementation of PPBS in the social welfare field is to emerge beyond the theoretical and conceptual stages a major investment will have to be made in the area of basic data collection.

A hierarchy of measures similar to those described above should be developed for each program. While there will not always be the same types or number of levels, such a hierarchy should prove useful by providing a range of measures for evaluating different aspects of a program's operation.
"For programs consisting of projects with similar objectives, evaluation measures for the program can also be used to evaluate the effectiveness of individual projects. For example, the evaluation measures for family planning can and should be used at the project level. Their use will be helpful in several ways: (1) it will help individual project directors compare themselves with other projects and analyze where their strengths and weaknesses lie; (2) it will assist federal and state program managers to determine where significant difficulties exist in projects; (3) it will help program managers to determine what techniques are and are not effective and to demonstrate and promote proven effective methods among other project directors; and (4) it will provide much more concrete evidence to program managers in reaching and justifying decisions that certain project grants should be suspended or terminated."

(Seidman, (May 1970) p. 177)

Elizabeth Drew, analyzing the experience of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in the United States in attempting to implement PPBS notes that,

"the generally inadequate information upon which to base a programming planning study is one of the factors that has led to revised estimates of what PPB can accomplish, at least in the short run. Program planners now have a heightened appreciation of the unmeasurable, and of the limitations on their ability to establish honest measures of commensurability between programs. In addition, it was found that precious little information existed as to how many and whom existing programs were reaching and whether they were doing what they were supposed to do. If the purpose of an adult basic education program is to teach people how to read and write, the Office of Education might reasonably be expected to know how many people thereby actually learned how to read and write, but does not."

(Drew E.B., 1967, pp. 9 - 24)

In similar fashion, those working on an income maintenance study found that the welfare administration could not tell them very much about the public assistance caseload - who was on welfare, where they came from, why they were on it, and what they needed in order to get off. Concluding, Drew suggests that,

"More attention will have to be turned to gathering data which will lead to more telling evaluations. The process of analyzing and comparing selected programs revealed that the information
available about their effectiveness was shockingly inadequate. Only very rough judgements about their relative effectiveness could be reached. Information on costs per participant was often unavailable and had to be estimated. Data on the characteristics of participants (even in some cases, their age and sex) were inadequate. Information on what happened to the participants during and after the program - gains in educational attainment, employment experience, earnings history and so forth - was extremely limited. Estimates had to be pieced together from a variety of sources. Information about control groups - for example, equivalent members of the work force who did and di not receive vocational education - was virtually non-existent."

(Drew E.B., 1967, p. 185)

5. Personnel and Analytical Capabilities

Harry Hatry (1971) suggests that a major reason for the dearth of analysis effort has been the lack of qualified personnel to do the work in state and local governments. This holds equally in Canada. In addition, at least part of the reason why the analytical approach has not made faster headway is that it is unfamiliar to many government officials and they do not see the value of pursuing it or of obtaining qualified people to perform analytical functions. Thus far, most of the personnel involved in PPBS approaches have been persons transferred from within individual governments or existing organizations. Only in a relatively few cases has any significant use been made of outside personnel such as those from universities or private consulting firms. In most cases "local and state governments have used a get-it-alone approach. Although this ensures that staff are familiar with the internal government, other specialized analytical approaches essential for PPBS have not been sufficiently available. Qualified analytical staffs, even small ones, generally have not been obtained." (Hatry, 1971, p. 185)

On the other side of the coin; highly qualified professional analysts have displayed difficulties of their own which act to prevent good technical work from becoming useful and relevant. These include (a) the
tendency to "optimize" - to search for the one best answer rather than satisfice when the policy maker needs estimates of many alternatives and trade-offs; (b) the failure to consider implementation feasibility when analysing a broad spectrum of alternatives including possible legal, financial, organizational and political factors; and (c) the inability to summarize findings in ways that are concise and understandable for decision-makers.

David Novick (August 1971) analysing some of the difficulties of implementing PPBS in the United States notes that many organizations have encountered problems developing the required program analysis capabilities. The search for goals, objectives and meaningful programs has lead some organizations to recognize that analytical capabilities are important to management. To establish objectives requires analysis of what the organization wants to accomplish and developing programs means looking at activities now carried on, creating possible alternatives and then deciding upon a future course of action in program and program element terms. All this requires systematic analysis and the trained staff to carry it out. Novick suggests that one reason for the failure to develop analytical capabilities is the lack of demand for good analysis on the part of managers and directors.

"Analysis related to the decision managers must make is not sought for a simple reason: they have no occasion to want such assistance unless there is a crisis which threatens their control ... Most chief executives do not want a strong independent group of directors and the majority of chief executives look for a rubber stamp board. That is they do not want to be appraised or be held accountable. In addition, managers strive to maximize their own autonomy, to do their own thing, to ignore past mistakes and have little tolerance for uncertainty. They have no obvious reason to want to change the existing system which is the one that
brought them success. Thus in the absence of a crisis or threat to his leadership, the manager has little or no incentive for self examination."

(Novick, D. (August 1971) pp. 4 - 5)

Summing up her experiences in the Department of Health Education and Welfare Drew reaches the conclusion that:

"How well PPB has worked, agency by agency has depended more than anything on how seriously the man at the top has taken it, how hard he worked to attract good people to do the job, and how much he lent his authority to the adoption of a system of hard analysis."

(Drew, E.B., op. cit.)

On the whole, there has been a great deal of interest expressed in the PPBS approach and its concepts and a great variety of effort has been expended. While progress toward the substantive policy analysis and formulation aspects of PPBS has been disappointing and while there have been and still are many unresolved conceptual and operational weaknesses, the issue today is not whether it has been a success or a failure. The question is whether the analytical values of PPBS can be sufficiently implemented to be a long run trend toward considerably greater use of the substantive parts of PPBS. This relates primarily to beginning attempts to develop information for decision making, to identify problems, to develop objectives and formulate programs, and to evaluate the results of these programs. In many cases such activities are carried out in isolation of one another. The real challenge is to integrate these activities into an integrated system of planning, programming and budgeting.
CHAPTER III

A Proposed Approach to Operationalizing a PPB System

I Introduction

While a great deal has been written concerning the conceptual and theoretical principles of PPBS, little has been put forward which deals with an approach to operationalizing such a system.

This section and the following one will propose a method of operationalizing and implementing a PPBS approach in the social welfare field. The particular setting of this application will be the United Community Services of the Greater Vancouver Area as described in Chapter I. In appreciating what will be put forward in this and the following chapter, one should refer to pages 17, 18, 19, and 20 of Chapter I to become familiar with the present system of allocating funds at UCS.

It will be noted that UCS attempts to allocate funds to agencies on the basis of funding specific services which are deemed to have priority for its support. To do so, agencies must submit service budgets which indicate the items of income and expense associated with each service, the expected number of service units to be delivered and unit cost figures. A sample budget form is found in Appendix III.

To assist agencies to identify, budget and account for their services, and budget review and priorities committees to carry out their tasks, specific definitions and units of service have been developed for each service.
While the service approach to developing priorities and allocating funds has proven useful to UCS and its member agencies in gaining a greater appreciation of the various functions it was funding and performing, the system is not without some dysfunctions. Experience has also shown that it is not totally compatible with the demands of a PPB approach. The following operational problems have been identified with the present service approach to allocating funds to agencies.

- Some agencies have reported that the present method of accounting and budgeting by fixed categories of service is restrictive and unrealistic in terms of what they are actually doing.
- The comparison of services based on fixed service definitions across agencies is sometimes difficult and can result in misleading conclusions. This problem has been encountered by budget review committees and was reported by Wallin (1972) in his study of Family and Individual Counseling.
- Individual agency employees have found it difficult to record their time correctly among the services they deliver while administrators have found it difficult to allocate items of income and expense to specific services. It has been suggested that it would be more appropriate to group services under major programs.
- Since agencies are required to describe their activities in terms of the service categories developed by UCS there has been considerable "shoe horning" of activities to fit the definitions. This has created problems for comparison and analysis and also inhibited the use of service budgets by agency administrators.
- The time period between priority and funding decisions and actual service delivery has been considered to be too long to have the immediate impact that is required.

II Assumptions

In approaching the problem of operationalizing a PPB system that would be capable of implementation at UCS while at the same time attempting to overcome some of the problems with the present method of budgeting and allocating funds, the following assumptions have been made.

- UCS wishes to maximize on a priority basis the effective allocation of its limited resources to areas of greatest need in the community without duplicating the activities of other service systems.
- UCS seeks to be accountable to the public and to perform a responsible stewardship role in allocating voluntary dollars.
- UCS wishes to encourage innovation in meeting community problems and to foster effective service delivery.

It is also assumed that:

- the Financially Participating Agencies of UCS wish to remain autonomous and control their own destinies.
- the Financially Participating Agencies of UCS have a high degree of skill, expertise and experience in identifying problems, needs and concerns in the community and are able to develop viable programs to respond appropriately to them.
- While the Financially Participating Agencies of UCS agree with the general principles and roles required in 1, 2, and 3, their primary concern is continuity and stability in a complex and changing environment.
From the foregoing it is apparent that any practical development of a system of fund allocation must provide for maximum autonomy, participation and innovation on the part of participating agencies on the one hand and maximum information for decision-making and influence by UCS regarding service delivery on the other.

III Constraints of the Proposal

A number of constraints have been accepted in putting forward this proposal. These include the following:

1. Preserve the basic chart of accounts of the UCS functional accounting system.
2. Suggest a proposal that will be acceptable to UCS, its financially participating agencies and other funding bodies such as the City of Vancouver and the Province of British Columbia.
3. Preserve agency autonomy, participation and stability.
4. Develop a proposal that provides for flexibility, innovation and rapid response to community needs.
5. Design a system of fund allocation that falls within the general context of a general PPBS model such as that presented on pages 8, 9, and 10 of Chapter I.
6. The United Way campaign must take place in the fall of each year.

IV Proposed System - Program Budgeting

The basic reason for suggesting an alternative budgeting and fund allocation system is that several difficulties have been identified with the present method. These difficulties have been discussed in some detail
earlier. Two of the more serious problems are that:

1. The time period between the generation of priorities and funding decisions and their actual implementation is too long and does not permit rapid and flexible responses to new community problems and needs as they emerge.

2. The present system of functional accounting and budgeting which is based upon fixed categories of services is felt to be restricting by the agencies and therefore they sometimes do not provide UCS with data for valid comparison and analysis across agencies providing the same services.

In addition the present allocation process is an involved and detailed one as shown in Figure 8.

A critical examination of the present system of fund allocation of UCS has resulted in three general patterns of alternatives. The first alternative set called for no controls or expectations whatsoever to be imposed by UCS upon its member agencies with respect to their service delivery or the manner in which they choose to spend their funds. The second alternative suggested complete control by UCS over the management, administration and service delivery activities of agencies receiving voluntary dollars. The third alternative attempts to derive the benefits and minimize the drawbacks of the first two alternatives and suggests a system of budgeting which provides for maximum autonomy, participation and innovation on the part of the agencies on the one hand and maximum information for decision-making and influence by UCS regarding the overall pattern of service delivery on the other. The first two alternatives clearly violate the assumptions and constraints set out earlier while the
Interfunctional Chart
Present UCS Budget Allocation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Agency Decision</th>
<th>Technical Decision</th>
<th>U.C.S. Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec.73</td>
<td>1974 Approved Budget Agencies decide on program for 1975 and prepare Budgets</td>
<td>Allocate 1974 dollars to agencies for Services</td>
<td>Estimate 1974 Campaign Take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb.74</td>
<td>1975 Budget Prepared</td>
<td>Translate Expected $ Take to services (Tentative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar.74</td>
<td>1975 Budgets Received</td>
<td>Translate agency budgets to service priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr/May 74</td>
<td>Agencies Present 1975 Budgets to Review Committees</td>
<td>Prepare guidelines for review Committees-Ra-Agencies</td>
<td>Budget Reviews &amp; Tentative allocations for total agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug.74</td>
<td>Preliminary Notification of 1975 Allocation</td>
<td>Preliminary Notification of 1975 Budget allocation</td>
<td>1974 Campaign Goal Set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.74</td>
<td>Final Notification of 1975 Service Budgets</td>
<td>Goal Reached</td>
<td>Campaign Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.74</td>
<td>Adjustments Made in Budgets</td>
<td>Goal Not Reached</td>
<td>Approve adjustments in Agency Budgets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
third appears to offer considerable potential for application and is the one that is proposed.

Several years of detailed work and consultation with various agencies together with other developments in the social welfare field has led to the belief that an effective PPBS approach to fund allocation requires two distinct levels of funding. **Program Funding** should be the major means of financing agencies while **Emergency Need and Demonstration Funding** should be used to finance problems and needs that arise outside the normal planning, programming, budgeting cycle.

1. **Program Funding**

The first level of funding suggested relates to the financing of specific programs that are proposed by member Financially Participating Agencies. It is proposed that agency budgets should be presented in a program format which encompasses the basic activities of services that are essential components of each distinct program area.

Programs that are presented for funding should be developed and defined in a fashion that capitalizes on the unique expertise, experience and skills of each agency and should be addressed to meeting one or more specific problems or needs deemed to have priority in the community.

It is felt that implementation of a "program" format will allow a great deal of flexibility in that it will permit agencies to develop and define the program strategies that they feel represent effective ways of utilizing their particular skills and experience. Such an approach will also result in the minimum imposition of controls placed upon agency activities by UCS.
While the programs developed by individual agencies will, by their very nature, be unique and provide little basis for clear comparison in terms of dynamics and activities (since services are mixed and matched in unique combinations) the common point of comparison will be the particular problem to which the programs are directed. Indeed, one would hope for and encourage, different program approaches to similar problems. Such diversity will make it possible to compare and assess the differential effectiveness of alternative program approaches to similar problems. Such a state of affairs will enable both the agencies and UCS to become more discriminating in developing and funding program proposals.

H.A. Wallin (1972) in his study of Family and Individual Counselling made a recommendation which was very similar to the above proposal when he suggested that UCS fund programs rather than services and that decisions as to which programs to fund should be based upon adequately conceptualized proposals which request support for new or continuing social service programs. Walling pointed out that:

"The major working committees of UCS ... find it increasingly difficult to make very informed decisions because details concerning the content of programs or services being funded are frequently lacking or vague. Data concerning the effectiveness of those programs and services are virtually non-existent. Committees have had to rely upon a system-wide service classification scheme to get some notion about the precise content of the services and programs each agency is offering and upon statements of belief to get some sense of the effectiveness of those offerings." (Wallin, 1972, op. cit.)

In addition to the above, it was suggested that the current reliance upon fixed service definitions is dysfunctional since what is designated as a service by one agency is significantly different from that designated by another even though the same service heading or definition is used by
both. In addition, many of the present service definitions are more closely related to program components than they are to mutually exclusive service activities.

Given the above discussion it is suggested that a program budgeting format that is based upon the current functional accounting service definitions be adopted.

Each year a Priorities Report containing a detailed analysis of each problem of concern should be prepared by UCS and widely distributed to community and client organizations as well as to member agencies for use in formulating their program proposals. It is suggested that attempts should be made to complete the Priorities Report by May 1st of each year and that agency program proposals should be submitted to UCS by October 1st. (See Timing of the Allocation Process).

The program proposals developed should follow the standardized format (Appendix II) and should identify the following.

- The problem or need to which the program is addressed (following a set typology)
- A brief analysis of the problem as seen by the agency
- The target population and its geographic location
- The objectives of the program
- Basic program dynamics, methods and techniques
- Special requirements - staff, equipment etc.
- Previous research and/or experience to support the proposed method
- Proposed method of evaluation and maintenance of statistics

Detailed budgets for proposed programs should follow the basic chart of accounts of UCS and should be consistent with the format set out in Appendix III.
Funding commitments for acceptable program proposals could be given for up to three years with a review of progress taking place at the end of each year. This would ensure some agency stability and a sense of security should programs be operating as expected.

a) **Program Budgets**

It is suggested that each program proposal should focus upon one or more problems and be centred around one basic service as currently defined. The inclusion of other services in the program should be seen as ancillary to and supportive of the basic service of the program. The basis of program identification should be the present service definitions. An agency would, therefore have the choice of identifying a basic service (such as Day Care) or a program based on a core service but containing elements of other services which would be identified but not individually costed. Many of the present service definitions are more closely related to program components than they are to mutually exclusive service activities. The agency would also identify the problem(s) to which the service or program is intended to respond.

The rational for this proposal is that many agencies feel that attempting to identify discrete services does not accord with actual practice as they provide a combination of services (referred to as a program) to respond to the clients' needs. An example is Day Care. The day care service is by definition concerned with taking care of a child for the major portion of the day while the parent or parents are at work or are unable otherwise to discharge their usual daytime responsibilities. In practice, however, it is felt by many that this is purely a
custodial service and not an adequate response to the family's or child's needs and that components of other services such as counseling, development, adjustment, and enrichment are essential in providing a day care program. Clearly certain services, (e.g. family and individual counselling), may form an ancillary component of a number of programs, and may also appear as separate services where appropriate.

Each agency should therefore group services into programs, so as to accord with their operational practice. Each program should then be identified by the number of the core service (i.e. the main service around which the program is designed) and prefix the number with the letter "P" to distinguish it from a single service. Thus, a day care program would be labelled "P/20" and the numbers of the ancillary services would be listed. A simple day care service would simply be identified by the number 20.

Forms B7A and B7B are the budget forms that are suggested for use in developing a program budgeting approach at UCS. In the space on Form B7A, above that provided for identifying the service or program, the numbers of the ancillary services making up the program should be inserted (Appendix III). In this case the first program P/20 is a day care program which is enriched by the ancillary services 18 - Family and Individual Counselling, 54 - Nursery School Services, 25 - Group Work Services, Social Adjustment and 29 - Groupwork Services, Social Development. Above this, several spaces have been provided to identify the problem or problems to which the program is directed.

A synopsis of community needs and problems has been developed and given unique code numbers (in Appendix V). Each problem has also been
defined in a separate document. The coding will enable the agencies to indicate the problem or need to which each program or service is designed to respond. Where a program responds to more than one problem agencies should indicate the relative proportions of problems to be dealt with as shown in the example (Appendix III). Here the day care program P/20 responds in 75% of the cases to 410 - Delegated Parental Responsibility (Day) and 420 - Personal Development (Pre-School Children); in 15% of the cases to 580 - Developmental Lag (Social) and in 10% of the cases to 230 - Family and Individual Social Malfunction. The budget forms and the way they should be set up for this example are presented in Appendix III.

The units for each program should be those suggested for each core service. Appendix IV sets out the units applicable to each service.

b) **Ongoing Programs vs New Programs**

Agencies will be given the option of submitting

- completely new proposals to meet new problems and needs or those that have existed for some time; or

- programs that have been in operation for one or more years.

If ongoing programs are presented, evaluation reports produced by the sponsoring agency should be submitted together with a program description to the appropriate Program Review Committee to justify its continued funding.

c) **Program and Service Statistics**

In addition to the basic "units of service" delivered, standard statistics should be developed for each problem or need in the synopsis
and be maintained on an ongoing basis. In addition, it is suggested that, where appropriate, agencies submitting budgets to UCS should adopt the Common Caseload Reporting System that is being developed, tested and refined by a special committee of the PPBS Project. This reporting system will be discussed later in Chapter IV.

Two essential statistics that should be maintained in order to satisfy the needs of the allocation process are:

1) The amount of program resources expended on each problem for a specified period of time (budget year).

2) The average quantity of resources used to solve or deal with each problem.

It is also suggested that some form of Statistical Audit, similar to a financial audit should be implemented to establish the reliability of statistical data presented.

2 Emergency Need and Demonstration Funding

Since emergency needs and community problems do not emerge according to fixed budget schedules, it is proposed that UCS adopt an on-going funding procedure which will provide the freedom and encouragement to member agencies to develop and demonstrate new programs to meet new needs as they arise in the community. This proposal will avert the current problem of not being able to respond to new situations after the normal budgeting process has been completed. Presently it is contended that the time period between priority and funding decisions, and actual service delivery, is too long to have the immediate impact that is required.

Program proposals developed to meet new needs or demonstrate new
approaches to existing problems should be developed as suggested under the Program Funding section and should identify the need, target population, objectives, program dynamics, method of evaluation and maintenance of statistical data.

The maximum term of Emergency or Demonstration programs should permit adequate demonstration before the program is placed in the category of a "program" under the annual Program Review. At the annual Program Reviews, agencies should have the option of presenting their new programs along with their other program proposals, or dropping them because of unsatisfactory results or a decrease in the need situation to which they are directed.

Emergency Need and Demonstration funds should be administered by a special committee composed of the chairman of the Program Review Committee, the chairman of the Management Review Committee, and two members of the Priorities Committee.

The proposed Emergency Need and Demonstration Fund should be restricted to UCS Financially Participating Agencies. In order to provide for the possibility of funding projects presented by non-member organizations, the present Demonstration and Development Fund should be retained but possibly at a reduced level.

V Setting Program Objectives

The setting of specific program objectives has been a much neglected area in most PPBS schemes and frequently program objectives are not formulated even with the expenditure of large sums of money. Indeed, it has been the problem of setting objectives that has proven to be one of the major stumbling blocks in implementing a PPB approach.
Well formulated objectives are of critical importance in providing a referent with which to evaluate the output of a program, and to determine whether the program or service has had the expected impact upon the problem or situation it was designed to meet. In many cases a single objective for a program cannot, and should not, be specified and it is more appropriate to specify multiple objectives.

Two major difficulties can be identified when setting program objectives.

1. Frequently they are stated in terms so broad and vague that it is impossible to determine how well the program is doing in achieving them.

2. Objectives are often stated in input rather than in output terms because it is frequently difficult to specify and measure the outputs of the program.

W.S. Reddin's (1973) publication "Effective Management by Objectives - The 3-D Method of MBO" is particularly helpful in gaining an appreciation of how to set out objectives for major program areas.

Reddin approaches MBO from the concept of "managerial effectiveness", which he defines as "the extent to which a manager achieves the output requirements of his position". This can apply equally as well to a supervisor, direct service worker or a total program.

Great emphasis is placed upon four basic concepts which Reddin feels must be understood in order to set sound objectives. These four concepts are as follows:
I Effectiveness - The extent to which a person achieves the output requirement of his position.

II Effectiveness Areas - The general output requirements of a position.

III Effectiveness Standards - The specific output requirements and measurement criteria of a position.

IV Objectives - Effectiveness standards which are as specific, as time bounded, and as measurable as possible.

While the idea of objectives is central to MBO, the other three concepts represent the basic foundation upon which objectives are set. The following represents an adaptation of Reddin's concepts.

The concept of Effectiveness Areas is based upon the view that all programs are best seen in terms of the outputs that are associated with them. For example, the effectiveness areas of a sales manager could include 1) Sales Policies, 2) Sales Levels, 3) Sales Costs and 4) Line Profitability. Similarly the effectiveness areas of a multi-service social agency could include 1) Neglected children, 2) Young offenders, 3) Single parent families and 4) Unemployed employables.

Every necessary program has effectiveness areas associated with it and these general areas define the true function of the program in the organization. The process of identifying effectiveness areas can be assisted by probing the following questions with respect to each program in the organization.

1) What is the program's unique contribution?

2) Why is the program needed at all?

3) What would change if the program were eliminated?

4) Where does asking "why?" lead?

5) What would change if the program were highly effective?
Three simple rules are suggested when specifying effectiveness areas:

1) Use from one to four words
2) Avoid directional indicators such as "increase", "decrease", "maximize".
3) Avoid quantities and timing

When formulated each effectiveness area should

1) Represent output not input
2) Lead to associated objectives which are measurable
3) Be an important part of a program
4) Be within the actual limits of authority and responsibility

The most typical error is identifying input areas rather than output areas. Inputs are what a program does or is to do, rather than what is achieved or to be achieved. For example, Family Counselling is an input area, whereas Family Stability is an output area.

**Effectiveness Standards** are subdivisions of effectiveness areas which incorporate measurement criteria either explicitly or implicitly. For example, effectiveness standards for the effectiveness are Young Offenders might include the following:

1) Recidivist Rate, 2) Social Adjustment, 3) School Performance.

**Objectives** are essentially effectiveness standards that have numerical values and time limits attached to them. After effectiveness areas and standards for a program are established they are conferred into objectives which are as specific, time bounded, and as measurable as possible. They are highly specific statements about what is to be accomplished, and when, for each particular standard. A single effectiveness
standard usually produces a single objective.

Objectives are only attainable if they can be measured and if they are not measurable it is impossible to determine whether they have been achieved.

To summarize, a good objective should be measurable and specific, rather than general so that what is being measured is unambiguous. It should focus on results or outputs rather than activities or inputs and it should be time bounded with clear limits for completion. In addition, it should be seen as being realistic and attainable.

The concepts of effectiveness areas, effectiveness standards, and objectives can be related in the following chart which depicts a social agency with one basic program which deals with young offenders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness Area</th>
<th>Effectiveness Standard</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recidivist Rate</td>
<td>Decrease recidivist rate by 60% for cases dealt with during 1973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Adjustment</td>
<td>Improve Personal Adjustment as objectively measured by the Glueck scale in 75% of the cases dealt with in 1973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Performance</td>
<td>Improve the grades of 50% of cases dealt with by 20% in 1973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be noted that the objectives of the above program are very specific and couched in output terms which lend themselves to specific measurement and evaluation. It will be noted that a program can have a
number of effectiveness standards or areas of measurement, each of which
has an objective associated with it. This should assist in taking into
account the multi-dimensional aspects of many programs.

It is suggested that agencies set clear, specific and measurable
objectives as a critical component of the program proposals that they
put forward for funding. This will assist them in monitoring and evalu­
ating the effectiveness of programs on an ongoing basis and it will
assist Program and Review Committees to make more reasoned decisions as
to which programs should be supported.
CHAPTER IV
Suggested Approach to Implementation

Given the content of Chapter III which proposed a method of operationalizing a PPBS approach within United Community Services of the Greater Vancouver Area (UCS), this chapter will suggest a method of implementing the proposal. It will focus upon the committee structures and decision-making procedures that are felt to be necessary for effective implementation.

I Committee Operations

Figure 9 presents the suggested relationships between the various committees that are felt to be necessary to fully implement the proposal. The following will outline the suggested mode of operation and tasks the committees should follow in allocating funds to member agencies.

a) Priorities Committee

Given the proposal (Chapter III) that UCS adopt a program budgeting format, it is suggested that the Priorities Committee of UCS change its focus from a service orientation to one that is based upon problems and needs. Under this orientation, the Priorities Committee would focus its attention upon community problems and needs of concern to UCS rather than upon services.

The current procedure of indicating which services should receive increases, decreases and nil funding from UCS provides limited direction both to agencies and review committees. The questions that immediately arise are as follows:
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- "What does a special increase, or decrease mean?"
  "Relative to what and how much?"
- "Where should a service be increased or decreased?"
- "To what target groups with what problems in what areas of the community?"
- "Are the services which agencies are delivering homogeneous one with the other for any given service category?"
  The Wallin Report and general experience suggests that they are not. (i.e. Family and Individual Counselling)

These and other factors result in less than optimal guidelines for both agencies and UCS.

In order to overcome these difficulties it is proposed that a standardized typology or synopsis of problems and needs be developed and modified with experience and use.

An initial Synopsis of Problems and Needs which might be considered as a starting point has been developed but must be field tested, refined and modified as required. This is found in Appendix V. It is suggested that the Priorities Committee should examine each problem or need in the synopsis with regard to a) its incidence in the community, b) its ramifications, c) its geographic location, and d) its importance for UCS and the voluntary sector.

The report of the Priorities Committee should contain a complete analysis of each problem of concern to UCS and should be widely distributed to agencies, UCS Committees and other community groups as a guide for generating and evaluating program proposals.

The Priorities Committee should be broadly representative of community, client, agency and government constituencies and should meet on an ongoing basis.
Objectives
- To identify and document community problems and needs
- To guide the allocation of UCS funds to the various problems and need areas of concern to UCS.

Functions
- Analyse and document community problems and needs specifying their incidence, ramifications, geographic location, characteristics of persons affected, and relevance for UCS and voluntary sector
- Develop a yearly report for distribution to UCS agencies, client and community groups, and government bodies.

b) Allocations Committee

It is proposed that an Allocations Committee, composed of the Table Officers of the Agency Operations Committee of UCS (TOFF), should use the report of the Priorities Committee as a guide in allocating sums of money to problems deemed to be of concern to UCS. This allocation process would set the upper limit of funds available for programs proposing to deal with each specific problem of concern to UCS.

Objectives
To develop and implement an approach to allocating funds to major problem areas of concern to UCS that takes into account the findings of the Priorities Committee, assessments of the effectiveness of various program approaches in dealing with various problems, and the appropriate pattern of government and voluntary financing.

Functions
- Review and analyse the data and recommendations prepared by the Priorities Committee.
- Receive and analyse presentations from agencies, community self-help and client groups.
- Review data relating to the differential effectiveness of alternative program approaches in dealing with problems of concern to UCS.
- Develop and adopt a general approach to allocating sums of money to major problem areas which reflect the above inputs as well as the appropriate pattern of government and voluntary financing.
- Recommend annual allocations to major problems; taking into consideration the recommendations of the Priorities Committee, presentations from agencies, community, self-help and client groups, assessments of the relative effectiveness of various approaches to meeting specific problems, and the pattern of government and voluntary financing.

c) Program Review Committees

In order to implement a program format to budgeting at UCS, it is suggested that Program Review Committees be established around each major problem or need area rather than around agency groupings. At the present time, review committees are based upon groupings of agencies. This provides a limited basis upon which to examine the total set of agency activities or programs directed toward a given community need or problem.

It is suggested that at least 9 Program Review Committees be established, each one of which would specialize in program proposals focussed at meeting the general problem area which they are responsible for.

The general areas of need around which each Program Review Committee should be established are set out in Appendix V which identifies a
suggested synopsis or classification of problems and needs. Some of the general problem areas are quite large and may require more than one committee to handle the volume of proposals generated while others might be combined under one committee.

**Objectives**

- To analyse, evaluate and select for support, program proposals that are focussed on community problems and needs deemed to have priority for UCS funding.

**Functions**

- Review program proposals submitted and in particular:
  - Evaluate the ability of agencies to carry out the proposals they submit (assisted by the report of the Management Review Committee).
  - Tentatively allocate its available funds (as determined by the Allocations Committee) to program proposals that meet basic criteria and have some potential for dealing with specific problems in specific areas of the community.
  - Recommend for each program proposal, a guideline allocation which would influence the decisions of Agency Review Committees.
  - Establish in consultation with agencies, recipients and others, qualitative and quantitative measures for each problem.
  - Review by problem areas the effectiveness of the programs of various agencies.

It is expected in a short period of time that the members of the Program Review Committees will develop expert knowledge in assessing and evaluating the potential of program proposals.
d) **Agency Review Committees**

In order to maintain continuity and coordination, it is proposed that Agency Review Committees be established to examine and evaluate total agency budgets and make final allocations to each agency as is the current practice. They should have the recommendations of the Program Review Committee as basic information and the report of the Management Review Committee. Each agency will be required to appear before only one Committee which can deal with its overall operation.

**Objectives**

- To review and evaluate total agency budget submissions and recommend a total allocation to each agency.

**Functions**

- Review and evaluate total agency budget submissions in the light of the reports and recommendations of the Priorities, Allocations, Program Review and Management Review Committees, and formal presentations by agency representatives.
- Make an overall allocation to each agency, based on individual allocations to programs presented in the budget.

e) **Management Review Committee**

To ensure that standards of management and administration are maintained at an acceptable level in UCS Financially Participating Agencies it is proposed that a Management Review Committee be established. The committee should be composed of volunteers with special interest and/or expertise in agency management and administrative practices.

The committee should assess and report upon the standards of management and administrative practice in each financially participating agency
of UCS at least once every 3 years. The reports of the Management Review Committee should be used by the Agency Review and Program Review Committees and the Emergency Need and Demonstration Fund Committee as a source of information to assist in judging the ability of agencies to carry out the program proposals that they put forward.

A guide for assessing the administration and managerial capabilities of social service agencies is found in Appendix VI. Should an agency fail to meet acceptable standards it should be given a specified period of time, and the needed assistance to satisfy requirements.

**Objectives**
- To develop criteria for assessing agency management and administration.
- To encourage and assist agencies in management and organizational improvement and to review their progress.

**Functions**
- Conduct programs to encourage and assist agencies in the improvement of their management and administration practices and performance.
- Obtain the necessary information to provide a basis for reviewing and evaluating agencies on their management practices and performance.
- Develop mechanisms and processes by which agencies may be reviewed on their management practices and performance. A suggested schedule adapted from several sources will be found in Appendix VI.
- Prepare recommendations and a brief report on the overall management effectiveness of each agency that will influence the allocation of funds for specific program proposals.

The need for periodic administrative review of agencies has also been put forward by H.A. Wallin:

"In the interest of accountability to the community from which the voluntary dollars come, UCS and its member agencies should continue their efforts to upgrade the quality of the network in which they together are the primary constituents. Agencies need to have a clear notion as to what is currently held to be 'an adequate structure and functioning'. It is important therefore to re-examine the minimum basic criteria upon which membership in the network is first granted and later maintained. So that the community can be assured that its voluntary dollars are being distributed only to adequately functioning agencies, some attention should be given at an early date to assessing the adequacy of existing machinery for undertaking periodic reviews of the structure and functioning of each of the member agencies."

(Wallin, op. cit. pp. 67 - 68)

f) Emergency Need and Demonstration Fund Committee

To ensure reasonable spreading of the onerous tasks and consistency of funding, a separate Emergency Need and Demonstration Fund Committee should be established.

It should meet on a regular basis throughout the year, or as necessary, to deal speedily with project submissions. Its approach and operations should be flexible and its membership should represent all levels of the program budgeting process: the Priorities Committee, the Program Review Committees, the Allocation Committee and the Management Review Committee. The reports of these committees should provide a valuable resource in evaluating proposals.
II Timing of the Program Budgeting Process

The timing of the present process in determining priorities and allocating funds to agencies has been frequently criticized on the grounds that there is a long period of time between the formulation of priorities and the funding of services, and actual implementation in the community. The following changes in scheduling are suggested.

a) Campaign Goal Setting

One of the reasons for the current timing of the budgeting process (budget in April/May '73 for application Jan-Dec. 74) is to establish a needs figure to be used in determining the campaign goal for October each year (e.g. 1973).

Figure 10 shows that the needs figure arrived at and the campaign goal actually established bear little relationship to each other. More important, however, is the fact that the amount of funds actually raised bears no-relationship to either the needs goal or the actual target set. It is therefore suggested that the campaign goal be set on a different and more realistic basis.

It is suggested that the campaign goal could be set more realistically on the basis of economic forecasts and internal divisional quota or objective setting. This would obviate the need to establish a needs figure in May to influence the October campaign goal.

b) Program and Agency Reviews

If the above proposal is accepted, it would not be necessary to hold budget reviews in April and May 1974 to influence funding for 1975.

It is suggested that Program Reviews should take place in October each
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year, that total Agency Reviews take place during the month of November and that agencies be informed of their program budgets on December 1 for application on January 1 the following month. Figure 11 outlines the proposed sequence of the Program and Agency Reviews.

c) **Priorities Report**

The Priorities Report should be completed in May each year and be circulated as a guide to agencies and other UCS committees. It should be used by the Allocations Committee in October when it makes allocations to problem areas, and by the Program Review Committees in October when they review agency program proposals. Implementation of the Priorities Report will become functional on January 1st the following year. This will result in a six month time lag between priorities formulation and actual implementation.

d) **Emergency Needs and Demonstration Funding**

Program proposals designed to meet emergency needs or demonstrate new program approaches should be dealt with on an ongoing basis as is the current procedure of the UCS Demonstration and Development Committee. This will allow flexibility and rapid response to need situations arising between the formulation of priorities and the program budgeting processes.

e) **Management Reviews**

It is suggested that management reviews of agencies should take place on a continuous cycle with each agency being reviewed once every three years. The orientation of the Management Review Committee should be one of encouraging the development and maintenance of sound management and administrative capabilities within agencies. Agencies with resources and/or capabilities not being fully utilized should be encouraged to generate
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new proposals for emergency need and demonstration funding.

To summarize the suggested timing of program budgeting process it is proposed that a new schedule should be considered. Its main features would be:

1. The Priorities Committee Report would be available by May 1.
2. Agencies would submit program budgets by October 1.
3. The Program Review Committees would consider program proposals during the month of October.
4. Agency reviews would take place in November.
5. Agencies would be notified of their allocations in December.
6. The Management Review Committee would operate continuously.
7. Emergency Needs and Demonstration Committee would meet when necessary.

It will be noted that the determination of agency needs in a spring budget process enabling a budget needs figure to enter into campaign goal-setting will no longer occur. This fact must be carefully considered by any United Fund contemplating the adoption of this rescheduling. The merit of the proposed schedule is that the time between the formulation of priorities, the funding of programs, and their actual delivery is reduced to a minimum.

III The Distribution of Funds Between Funding Levels

Once the campaign target has been set, the following procedure is suggested to distribute provisionally the available monies between the two levels of funding:

1. $200,000 or some other agreed amount is reserved for Emergency Needs and Demonstration Projects.
2. The balance is the amount available for program budgeting.

3. This balance is distributed by the Allocations Committee to the various problem fields.

Should the campaign fail to meet its target, the amount reserved for the Emergency Need and Demonstration Fund may be reduced so that the original allocation for program funding can be preserved.
CHAPTER V

Information for Decision-Making: Sources and Potential Uses

The essence of the PPBS approach has been described as the relationship of various levels of decision-making and the provision of appropriate information at each level.

To satisfy the process described, a basic data system should provide the information to:

1. Identify actual and potential social problems and needs in the community;

2. Evaluate and assist in the identification and articulation of problems and needs by client and community groups, as well as agencies;

3. Identify and rank community priorities on a geographically specific basis;

4. Formulate major policy and broad courses of action;

5. Define broad system objectives and evaluate the degree to which these objectives are achieved over time;

6. Select appropriate services and program strategies to achieve defined objectives;

7. Facilitate internal agency control and planning as well as case management; and finally

8. Provide the data necessary for the detailed research and evaluation required to determine the program dynamics and techniques most appropriate in meeting the problems addressed by the total system and its component agencies.

Many of these requirements can be satisfied by developing the following major sources of information:
Standard Caseload Reporting

The development of a common (standard) case reporting system is a vital component of the Vancouver PPBS Project and has obvious advantages for both agency and broader systems planning in implementing a PPBS approach.

The rationale for developing a common caseload reporting system is:

- A profile is needed of the various cases and problems handled by the total system of agencies in the Vancouver area. This becomes possible when agencies report in a common format using standard categories. Without standardization there is little basis for comparison, analysis or synthesis.

- Identification and evaluation of alternative intervention techniques applied to various problems is necessary for effective planning and fund allocation.

- Planning, in some instances, requires the development of client profiles in order to identify patterns of need, program requirements and requirements to be met.

For many agencies, the required system should serve as a basic planning and management tool at three functional levels:

- At the total social service systems level, it should permit the identification of basic client characteristics, problems dealt with, and intervention techniques employed on a broad basis. At this level individual client identification is not desired and appropriate safeguards should be developed to ensure that the confidentiality of individual clients and reporting agencies is respected.
At the individual agency level, it should help identify problems presented, case characteristics, intervention techniques employed and their success in achieving the organizations' objectives and the need of its clients.

At the worker level, the system should provide an up-to-date listing of cases together with significant case movement, goals and critical review points.

Ideally, the system should identify and maintain:

- Salient client characteristics, backgrounds and geographic location compatible with the basic demographic data provided through Statistics Canada.
- Presenting problems and needs and, for some, a diagnosis and a prognosis for each case.
- Case goals and treatment plans, services provided and review dates.
- Case movement as evaluated by the worker, supervisor and client.

More knowledge of the causal factors of social problems such as family and individual breakdown, and of the dynamic variables associated with program to ameliorate these problems will improve decision-making and service delivery. At the present time, we have limited information upon which to base decisions, to build practice theory, or to evaluate results. Much fundamental "action" and "practice" research is required and is only possible if data become available. Such data can largely be provided from a basic reporting system.

In an attempt to develop a common caseload reporting system that would have the potential to meet the above expectations a special Task Force of the Vancouver PPBS project was formed to work on the development
of an appropriate system. The members of the task force were as follows:

- Ward Moir - Family Service Centres
- Ruth Chisholm - Children's Aid Society
- Ken Levitt - Jewish Family Services
- Virginia Langdon - Y.W.C.A.
- Art Rippon - Dept. of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement
- Cy Toren - West Vancouver Social Service Dept.
- Roger Patillo - Staff, Vancouver PPBS Project
- George Weldwood - Student, School of Social Work

The task force worked for several months identifying the variables that were felt to be important for planning, administrative and case management purposes. Following this, a coding form and instructions were developed.

Appendix VIII, pages 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, and 190 presents the instructions together with the coding form upon which the case of Mary Q. Sample has been coded. Page 191 in Appendix VIII shows how the data for Mary Q. Sample's case appears in the print-out form. Page 192 is another example of how a case profile is presented. For each case, the worker completes a separate coding form and receives back a separate profile print-out. Cases are updated by submitting new coding forms on which only those variables to be updated are coded.

Page 193 of Appendix VIII is an example of a summary of the caseload of Jean. Here, Jean's caseload is grouped by case type and within each grouping she is able to have the values of the variables she is most interested in, printed out. The program will output this type of summary statement for each worker who uses the system.

For supervisory, administrative and planning purposes a variety of cross-tabulations can be developed using the variables that are maintained
in the system. Pages 10 through 14 are examples of the types of cross-

tabulations that can be produced.

To demonstrate the procedure and make the necessary refinements, the
West Vancouver Social Service Department was selected as the initial test
agency. This organization was selected because it had a manageable case-
load which represented all types of cases, and approaches to services,
that are dealt with and delivered by the Department of Human Resources of
the Province of British Columbia. In addition, the workers of the agency
are well trained, experienced, competent and willing to try new approaches.

There are still some refinements to be made in this reporting system.
When they have been made and the procedures are functioning smoothly, the
system will be recommended to all agencies of UCS who deal with clients
on a case basis. When more agencies report their service activities and
caseload characteristics in a standardized fashion into the system it will
provide a large base of data upon which to base program and funding
decisions, and carry out detailed research studies.

Computers and Privacy

Since it is suggested that a number of agencies report their activi-
ties and caseload characteristics into a central data processing system
and since the basis of this reporting will be individual client records,
a number of important questions concerning client, agency and worker
confidentiality are raised.

The computer program that we are using provides for a number of con-

fidentiality levels to be set depending upon the nature of the variable in
question and the desired level of confidentiality. It is proposed that
any identifying information concerning the client be placed under the
highest level of confidentiality. This would mean that only the reporting agency will be able to retrieve client specific information. On the other hand it is important to be able to draw upon the full set of cases in the system for planning, and administrative purposes, for example, the characteristics and service approaches used for all cases in the system exhibiting a particular problem.

To guard against abuse we have developed the following statement dealing with computers and privacy.

"Computers linked together through high-speed telecommunications networks are destined to become the principal medium for making, storing, and using records about people. Innovations now being discussed throughout government and private industry recognize that the computer-based record keeping system, if properly used, can be a powerful management tool. Its capacity for timely retrieval and analysis of complex bodies of data can be of invaluable assistance to hard-pressed decision makers. Its ability to handle masses of individual transactions in minutes and hours rather than in weeks or months, as was formerly the case, makes possible programs of service to people that would have been unthinkable in the manual record-keeping era."


As we embrace this new technology it is essential that we appreciate the fact that the tremendous potential benefits which can be realized from data processing are not without their attendant costs. We are determined to take action on this issue.

While our system of data collection and processing is primitive by comparison with some systems, we are nevertheless aware that the type of system we propose, (where each bit of data is associated with a name), is inherently one of the most threatening to the privacy and rights of the individual. Personal data associated with names would be of invaluable assistance to those who would wish to control or coerce data subjects.
In order to protect the rights of the data subjects, we propose, as a first attempt, to adopt many of the suggestions set out in the report of the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Automated Personal Data Systems. (July 1973)

To wit:

1. The purpose of the data is that it is to be used. Data will not be collected on such premises as "more is better than less" or that "since we have the system we had better use it" or that "we want to reduce unit costs and that can be achieved by utilizing the system more". Such attitudes generate information which is of little value but has the potential for misuse. Also unrestrained requests for information may discourage people from taking advantage of the services of an organization, and could reduce the effectiveness of the relationship between the client and the organization.

2. Only when it is absolutely necessary will the data be personalized (i.e. have a name attached to it).

3. The client will be informed as to which data is a pre-condition of receiving service (mandatory data) and which data is not.

4. The data subject will be made aware of all uses to which this personalized data is put.

5. The data subject will be made aware of all users of his personalized data.

6. The data subject will have the right to challenge the accuracy and appropriateness of the data.
7. A particular social service agency will be able to obtain personalized data only on those persons who are clients of that particular agency.

8. There will be no "hook-up" with other data systems without the prior consent of the data subjects in our system.

9. There will be a separation of the data for administrative and research purposes. Thus, when the data is to be used for, say, planning purposes, personal identifiers will be removed wherever possible.

II Census Statistics

The second major source of information is the basic demographic and socio-economic data provided by Statistics Canada. This is fundamental for broad community planning and individual agency decision-making. Basic census data which include the demographic, family, household and labour force characteristics of the population are essential in developing a general profile of the community.

We are most enthusiastic about the type and format of information that is available from Statistics Canada and the 1971 census. We are particularly interested in the new geo-coding program. This program makes it possible to obtain basic tabulations and cross-tabulations from the 1971 census for virtually any geographic area of interest. The ability to obtain cross-tabulated information is a major development in the use of census material by planning bodies, agencies and individuals.

Tabulations can be produced for any area in Canada. The geo-coding program automatically selects small spatial building blocks to which census data records have been coded and aggregates these to each area specified by
the user. In the 14 largest urban centres in Canada, the basic units of
the system are street block faces, defined as one side of a street between
two intersecting streets. In other parts of Canada, census enumeration
areas are used as the units for user specified areas.

In addition to basic and more detailed information in tabular form,
it is also possible to request map plots. For example, if an agency or
planning body wishes to know the best place to locate a new day-care
centre, it could request a map showing the number of single and two parent
families, in which there are children under six years of age and in which
there is also a working mother. This information could also be broken
down by levels of income to determine the need for subsidies.

Maps 1 and 2 are examples of how the types of data can be presented.
Map 1 shows for each of the specified areas of Vancouver the percentage of
children 0-14 who have only one parent at home. Map 2 presents the same
information by census tract.

This basic data should be incorporated with other data into a statis­
tical information system, providing a frame of reference within which to
view and evaluate client characteristics, problems, expressed and unexpressed
needs, potential gaps in service delivery, and agency program proposals.

III Address Conversion

The third source of information is the wealth of unused data developed
by other service systems. This includes information maintained by City,
Municipal and Provincial Welfare Departments, Hospitals, School Boards,
Police Departments, Medical Insurance Agencies, Probation and Parole
Departments, Family and Children's Court, Adult Court, Workmen's Compen­
sation Board, Manpower and many others.
* Isoline (contour) map based on data points at the approximate geographic centres of the census tracts. Data points are indicated by blank squares.
If available, this information would have great use in planning effective service delivery. The problem is gaining access to it and integrating it with the other information available from the census and a case management system.

The one consistent item of information that is maintained by almost all agencies is the client's address. The address conversion component of the geocoding program of Statistics Canada places addresses within any specified geographic area and codes and plots them directly. We are currently cooperating with Statistics Canada, who have made their programs available to our project and we are adapting them to meet our needs. It will be soon possible from a list of client addresses of any agency to obtain sets of tables or maps of clients' locations in the community providing another major component of the information that is required for effective planning, program delivery and coordination. Figure 12 sets out the essence of the proposed adaptation of the programs of Statistics Canada. The final modifications are currently being made to the programs and when completed we will encourage service providers to use them for their own purposes.

This cooperation will expand our abilities to identify problems and needs in the community and to see the impact and relationship of other service systems. For example, it now appears to be possible to have a more accurate picture of the location of crime and delinquency in the community in terms of reported crimes, arrests and convictions; to determine the areas where family and mental breakdown is located; and to develop a profile of the distribution of school dropouts, truancy, absenteeism, child neglect and those in need of special education classes, always
SUGGESTED USE OF ADDRESS CONVERSION PROGRAM OF THE GEOCODING DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS CANADA

User Areas Defined

Area Master File (Statistics Canada) → Address Conversion Program (Statistics Canada) → User Area → Tables and/or Maps for each User Area as Defined

Address Centroid

User Address files (Variable) (Option) → Census Data
respecting the confidentiality of the individual. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that overall profiles and not individual information are involved.

IV Community, Client and Agency Opinion

It is felt that the information developed by UCS should be available to all agencies and organizations in the community in order to allow them to more effectively identify and document the problems and issues that concern them directly. It is also felt that such information should not be the sole source of data used for decision-making. Statistics by themselves are sometimes seen as cold and sterile, are subject to time lags and differing interpretations and do not provide the full complement of information required for effective decision-making.

There should be inputs from citizens and client groups, government bodies and agencies directly concerned with community problems. These sources will always be of critical importance. The demographic, client and service statistics described provide a framework within which to identify and evaluate needs, and assist in determining progress in responding; given the limited resources available.

V Financial Data

The final source of information vital to rational decision-making in allocating funds is standard financial data. Before the start of the present PPBS Project, a computerized functional accounting system and functional budgeting procedures were developed and implemented to meet the needs of a wide range of health, welfare and recreation organizations.
Functional accounting is a form of cost accounting. It examines in detail the items of income and expense for each function, service or program offered by an organization and permits the development of accurate unit costs: for example, the cost of an hour of family counselling, the cost of a patient hour of psychotherapy, or the cost per child-day of residential treatment.

The computerized functional accounting program provides financial statements covering a total agency, statements for each branch and statements for each service or program, in addition to a general ledger and balance sheet.

By implementing the standard functional accounting program and developing program budgeting procedures it becomes possible to clearly identify the exact amounts of money spent by agencies on programs in the community, individually and collectively. The budgets can then be analysed and evaluated by Agency and Program Review Committees in terms of the programs that are proposed and the general efficiency of the agency.

Functional accounting procedures have already shown their value in that many agencies have been able to clearly identify program and service costs and to negotiate with government and other funding bodies by offering their services and programs at realistic prices.

The above types of information should go a long way in assisting the type of decision-making that is demanded under the PPB approach to budgeting that is proposed herein.
CHAPTER VI

Conclusions and Suggestions for Further Study

I.

General Conclusions

Perhaps the single most important conclusion that has been reached in developing this thesis is that a standard, classical PPBS model cannot be simply transferred and applied to an existing organizational system. The standard PPBS approach must be adapted and modified to reflect the basic nature, tasks and environment of the organizational network to which it is to be applied. It is very difficult to apply the classical PPBS model to the social service field where the identification of problems and needs is in its infancy; where the measurement of program benefits, results and costs is still in the beginning stages; and where reliable social statistics or social indicators are unavailable. These difficulties are compounded in an organizational network such as United Community Services where there are over 60 independent and autonomous agencies to which funds are distributed. The conclusion reached, therefore, is that the concepts and overall spirit of the PPBS approach should be preserved, while modifying their exact nature and application to reflect the needs and characteristics of the system to which they are to be applied.

It is suggested that attempts to implement PPBS, regardless of the setting (be it in the health, welfare, education or commercial fields) must give consideration to the necessity to make special adaptations to reflect the basic nature of the system to which the approach is to be applied. This
conclusion relates not only to the introduction and implementation of PPBS but to other management approaches as well. Many difficulties are encountered by attempting to transplant a standard or established management approach from one organization or service system to another without making the appropriate modifications and adaptations to reflect the special characteristics of the organizations to which they are to be introduced.

The approach taken in this thesis has been to give consideration to the special nature and characteristics of United Community Services and to design a PPBS approach that will have the potential for immediate application and later refinement, as technological and analytical expertise is developed both within UCS and its member agencies. While the proposed approach to operationalization and implementation has several areas of weakness which will be discussed later, it does represent a practical approach that reflects the basic nature and operating constraints of the organization. It also attempts to reflect the present stage of development of the social service field and provides a basis for refinements and the gaining of greater understanding and sophistication in the future. As more experience is gained in developing, assessing and funding specific programs designed to meet specific problems or needs in specific areas of the community and as more data becomes available regarding the nature, characteristics, and incidence of social problems, as well as the efficacy of alternative program approaches, it will be possible to incorporate more sophisticated decision-making processes into the proposed system. It is hoped that the introduction of cost-benefit techniques will be one such future development.
The proposed approach put forward in this thesis contains the essential ingredients and concepts of the general PPBS model that has been used as a guide for this project. Referring to the general model (Figure 1) (Pages 8, 9, 10); information will be developed from a variety of sources and will be stored, synthesized and made available to the Priorities Committee, the Allocations Committee and the Program Review Committees, to assist them in their deliberations. Information sources and their potential uses have been dealt with in Chapter V.

The Priorities Committee using information from the data system and reviewing information presented by agency, community, client and self-help groups will identify and document community problems and needs of concern to UCS. The report of the Priorities Committee should present a detailed analysis of each problem of concern to UCS and should outline the priority problems and needs that UCS and its member financially participating agencies should focus upon during the next planning, programming, budgeting cycle.

Using the Priorities Report and other information, the Allocations Committee will allocate sums of money to each problem area of concern.

These allocations can be regarded as the overall objectives of UCS with respect to the problems or needs it wishes to address itself to over the next period.

Given the objectives set by the Allocations Committee, the task of the Program Review Committees is to select the most promising program proposals presented for funding by the agencies. The operating objectives of each program proposal will be specified in their program budget
proposals (Appendix II) and will be used as one criterion for evaluating outcomes in each problem area. The objectives of each individual program proposal recommended for funding by the Program Review Committees and Agency Review Committees should be consistent with the expectations of the Allocations Committee. This stage is equivalent to the "Program Strategies Set" component of the general model.

Agencies operating approved programs should maintain basic statistical data that will enable them to evaluate their performance and effectiveness of each program. They will also submit statistical information to UCS for assessment of the overall performance of the total set of programs funded in each problem area. The two essential statistics required by UCS are described on Page 96. When properly tested and refined, it is suggested that agencies adopt the common caseload reporting procedures that are currently being developed. This will standardize the data submitted.

Statistics and evaluation results will be maintained and synthesized for use by the Priorities, Allocations, and Program Review and Agency Review Committees as they examine the performance of the total system over the past period and plan for the next planning, programming, budgeting cycle.

It will be noted that the proposed process is consistent with the general PPBS model and offers many of the advantages of rational, systematic decision making while imposing minimum controls and restrictions upon agencies. Agencies will be given every opportunity to participate in the process and will be called upon to develop program strategies which best capitalize on their skills, expertise, experience and insights. A
great deal of further research and experimentation is required at all
stages in the proposed system from the collection and synthesis of data
to the appropriate mode of operation of the various committees. It is
felt that the model proposed provides the basis for such development
and experimentation.

II Areas Requiring Special Consideration

Some of the areas that will require special consideration before
full operationalization and implementation can proceed smoothly are as
follows.

a) **Development of Suitable Data for Decision Making**

The development of suitable data for decision-making at various
levels is perhaps the most critical problem confronting the successful
implementation of PPBS in general and this proposal in particular. In
order for the proposed Priorities Committee to function at an acceptable
level it must have properly synthesized data relating specifically to
each problem or need in the proposed Synopsis of Problems and Needs
(Appendix V). Such information should include the number of people
affected by the problem; their geographic location; the impact of each
problem upon others; the effect of known approaches dealing with each
problem; the level of resources currently directed toward solving each
problem and the causal factors related to each, to mention only the more
obvious. The development of such information is likely to be no small
task and will require considerable manpower to maintain and synthesize
on a systematic basis. In addition it is questionable whether a Priori-
ties Committee will be able to properly assimilate and order the large
amount of data that they will have to deal with unless it is properly condensed and summarized.

The systematic collection of data from agency, community, client and self-help groups will also present difficulties. These difficulties will likely centre around deciding how to assess the validity of agency versus community or client group opinion where there is divergence. For some problems, the development of data will be easier than others and this will also create difficulties since there may be a tendency to give a high rating to those problems for which data is available and a lower one to those where data is non-existent due to conceptual or measurement problems.

It is suggested that considerable effort will have to be expended in developing suitable standardized data for each problem or need in the synopsis. This will have to be properly synthesized and ordered to enable the Priorities Committee to make consistent and rational decisions.

The Allocations Committee will require specialized data in addition to that required by the Priorities Committee, if it is to reasonably allocate sums of money to problem and need areas. Two suggested statistics that might assist in this process are 1) the average amount of resources required to solve each problem and 2) the amount of resources spent on each problem in the time period.

These two statistics appear deceptively simple but it will take considerable effort to develop them on a systematic basis for each problem presented in the synopsis. Several difficulties are anticipated. First, there is the problem of determining when in fact a problem has been solved. Is a problem solved when the bearer is discharged from an agency's
services? If this is the basis of solution, it could lead to considerable manipulation. Can a problem be deemed to be solved in the short run or does it take a period of time to determine if this is really the case? Who determines the nature of the problem? Is it the one presented by the client or the one diagnosed by the worker? In addition there is the problem of determining what is the client's major problem since people in difficulty usually exhibit multiple rather than single problems.

To some degree the development of these statistics will be facilitated by the adoption of the Common Caseload Reporting System proposed earlier but for many problems and needs other approaches will have to be developed.

The data required by Program Review Committees is expected to be developed by the agencies who present program proposals. In addition to this, the various committees should have available and be conversant with pertinent research related to their areas of responsibility. It will take a major effort to accumulate and order such information in a fashion that can be readily assimilated and applied by these committees.

b) Committee Operations

The decision-making processes used by the various committees proposed in this proposal is an area that will require special study and consideration. The traditional model of decision-making used is consensus oriented, in which the committee members present their points of view and then vote to arrive at a majority decision. It is suggested that a variety of decision-making approaches should be explored with a
view to selecting the approach that best meets the nature of the particular committee's tasks. The Delphi method of successive rounds of voting with individual committee members explaining their reasons for voting a particular way after each round until reasonable consensus is reached may offer many advantages to the operating procedures of the proposed Priorities, Allocations, Program, and Agency Review Committees. This approach permits individual committee members to bring their expertise, insights and experience to bear on the eventual decision and to influence their fellow members in an orderly fashion. It is a demanding method, however, in that it requires that individual committee members defend their position in voting a particular way, but it encourages the maximum exchange of information.

c) Allocating Funds to Problems

It has been proposed that the Allocations Committee should allocate sums of money to each problem or need of concern to UCS. This will set the dollar constraints that Program Review Committees will have to work with.

The procedure by which this will be done must be developed and tested in practice. It will be necessary to test fully the procedure that is ultimately developed and modify it as required until it operates smoothly. It is suggested that the procedure adopted be experimented with several times on a trial basis before it is actually put into practice.

d) The Development of Program Proposals

It has been proposed that agencies should develop program proposals that best capitalize on their unique skill, expertise and experience and
which respond to specific problems deemed to have priority for UCS.

The development of program proposals designed to meet specific problems in specific areas of the community should be set out as explicitly as possible and should follow the outline presented in Appendix II. This element of the proposed system parallels quite clearly the Program and Financial Plan and the Program Memoranda employed by the U.S. Bureau of the Budget and should provide considerable information for Program and Agency Review Committees. Several problems are likely to be encountered in handling and assessing this data initially, owing to a variety of factors. These relate to 1) the inexperience of agencies in developing specific and concrete proposals; 2) the inexperience of Program and Agency Review Committees in dealing with and assessing program budgets; and 3) the volume of data that must be manipulated during each budgeting period. It is expected that these potential difficulties will be resolved after one or two years experience and that the logistics problems of assessing and manipulating the data contained in program proposals will be solved.

III Assessment of the Proposed Approach to Operationalization

In a recent article, James E. Frank (1973) outlined several factors contributing to the successful development and implementation of PPBS. These factors will be used to assess the proposed approach that has been put forward in this thesis.

The full implementation of PPBS involves changes in data configuration and in analytical procedures which can be classified as follows.
1) Data displayed by program category
2) Multiyear presentation of data Data configuration aspects
3) Inclusion of indirect costs
4) Measurement of outputs & effectiveness Analytical aspects
5) Examination of alternative programs
6) Examination of goals and objectives

PPBS attempts to be an alternative data configuration and analytical system within the context of a larger political-bureaucratic system of decision making. Within the data configuration realm, two major factors are likely to influence the successful introduction of PPBS: a) the amount of necessary modification in the information network and b) the amount of modification in the types of information passing through the network. Generally it can be asserted that the fewer modifications required in the way information is accumulated, reported, and compared, the smoother will be the introduction and implementation of PPB.

In the analytical realm two major areas affect successful implementation. The first relates to the state of the art or technology governing the production of analytical information. This is likely to affect a) the degree of difficulty encountered in specifying needed information; b) the development of research instruments and evaluative techniques for the acquisition of that information; c) the resources necessary to fund the analytical process; and d) the administrative skill required to organize, direct and coordinate the analytical effort.

Frank Suggests that "To the extent that the PPB system recognizes the very real, technical difficulties presented by the production of
certain kinds of analytic information, its chances of success will be enhanced." (Frank, J.E., Dec. 1973, pp. 527 - 543)

The second causal factor in the analytical area relates to the compatibility of the analytic cycle with the budgetary decision cycle. In many cases the analytic cycle is longer than necessary for PPBS to succeed as an analytic tool.

In addition to purely technical problems there are also political and bureaucratic elements to deal with in the successful implementation of PPB. "If PPB is successful to any significant degree, it will result, in most cases, in alterations in the political-bureaucratic elements of the larger decision system, including the rearrangements of roles, stakes, resources, and strategies of actors within that system." (Frank, Dec. 1973, p. 533)

Three critical factors can be suggested that will have an impact on the smoothness of these alterations. The first two involve the source of pressure for change in the decision system and the mechanism for assisting that change. The source of change or change catalyst, must be one of the key factors in the system. The third factor relates to the adaptiveness of the organizational system to which PPB is to be applied. Generally speaking the more flexible and adaptive the system the more readily will a PPB approach be accepted.

Relating the above factors to the proposal put forward in this thesis will assist in identifying where special consideration should be given in the implementation effort.

1) It has been suggested that successful implementation of PPB is closely linked to the modifications required in the information
network, and the type of information originating in the reporting units. In general, the degree of congruence between organizational structures and program structures will influence the amount of modification required. If the organizational structures of reporting organizations are relatively functional there is likely to be a high degree of congruence between organization and program structures, thus necessitating very minor adjustments. This is likely to be the case with the agencies presenting program budgets to United Community Services, since several years have been devoted to initiating and refining functional or service accounting and budgeting procedures, and this proposal suggests that program budgets be developed around major service activities. This should present little difficulty for most agencies at least in preparing their budgets in a program format.

2) Success in implementing PPBS is also vitally related to how different the new reporting information is from the old. This proposal calls for some new form of information which have not been systematically collected or prepared before. This relates to program characteristics, target populations, objectives, expected outcomes, and major problems to be addressed in addition to problem service units. It can be expected that it will take a period of time for the agencies to develop and present such information in a consistent fashion. Some experience with the UCS Demonstration and Development Fund, which requires detailed proposals to be presented in a format similar to that suggested herein indicates that the above requirements are not unrealistic. It is suggested that staff assistance be extended to agencies requiring assistance in developing full program proposals consistent with the format presented in Appendix III.
3) PPB tries to develop several kinds of quantitative measurement to improve information in the budgetary decision process. The degree of development of measurement systems and the general level of this technology at the time that PPB is implemented is a critical factor in successful adoption. This is important in a) specifying the output or effectiveness measures which usually involves negotiations between reporting agencies and the central budgeting organization, b) developing suitable instruments with which to produce the specified outputs or effectiveness measures, c) acquiring the necessary personnel and other resources to carry out the tasks of specification and instrumentation where these are not within the capacity of existing resources; and d) directing, organizing, and coordinating the entire process over time.

This proposal recognizes that the current state of the art of measurement is in its embryo stage of development and attempt to present a framework through which this weakness can be addressed. United Community Services and its member agencies have had considerable experience and have developed some expertise in developing and maintaining financial and statistical data relating to specific services. The proposal for program budgeting should cause little difficulty since service components (originally monitored) will be grouped into program activities. The measurement of program objectives, outcomes and effectiveness, however, is an area where few precedents exist and where considerable experimentation and analytical effort is required. Agencies should, therefore, be encouraged to develop techniques and approaches for specifying and measuring their program objectives, expected outcomes and effectiveness. The measurement of community social problems and needs on an ongoing basis is
also an area where analytical methods are weak and where a major effort will have to be made by UCS and its constituent member agencies. It is suggested that agencies be encouraged to develop the technical capacity to monitor their own program activities and carry out their own program evaluations. This could be facilitated by providing special consulting services to agency staff, and coordinating special workshops and seminars.

4) The problems of PPB installation are considerably magnified when attempts are made to analyse alternative programs. This occurs for several reasons, the major factor being the problem of specifying and developing alternative programs to meet pre-specified goals. A problem here has been the inability of the program unit to envision alternative strategies. This may involve a search for alternatives such as programs employed by similar agencies in other cities or a creative process of generating new, untried alternatives. Frank (1973, p. 536) suggests that the problem of establishing alternatives is one that operating personnel in existing programs are relatively ill-equipped to handle.

To a large degree the proposal put forward in this thesis attempts to overcome this problem by suggesting that agencies should be encouraged to use their insights, expertise and experience to develop program proposals which will be designed to meet specific problems in specific geographic areas of the community, and to monitor them on an ongoing basis. This is likely to result in a number of alternative program proposals being generated to deal with each major problem area. It is suggested that initially the program review committees should do
their best to fund all alternatives that meet minimum acceptable standards. In subsequent years the results of these program alternatives should be assessed with a view to determining the strengths and weaknesses of each. The results should then be circulated to agencies operating similar programs together with encouragement to revise their programs to reflect the strengths. This should be a major task of the Program Review Committees. The proposed approach would thus obviate the search "for alternatives for alternatives sake".

5) "The analysis of objectives within a PPBS framework is necessary to provide a foil against which systematic program analysis takes place. Without the analysis and explicit statement of goals and objectives, judgements about the efficiency of existing or recently designed programs cannot be made. It is only in the light of articulated goals and objectives that the remainder of the PPB process is justified." (Frank, 1973, p. 537)

The development and analysis of objectives must take place at several levels and ideally result in a hierarchy with lower level objectives contributing to those at higher levels.

Given the current state of the art, this proposal shows certain weaknesses and tries to get at the issue of goals and objectives "through the back door". This is done by suggesting that the allocation of sums of money to major problem areas will be equivalent to setting objectives. This is admittedly a severe weakness but one that may be realistic given the current level of conceptualization and the nature of UCS. Since UCS is but one minor funding body in the network of funding sources in the community, it is unrealistic to suggest that it could
set specific objectives with respect to juvenile delinquency, family breakdown or child neglect. The most that can be expected is that it identify the problems and needs that it wishes to play some role in influencing and specify the fashion in which it hopes to do so. It is suggested that this might be accomplished by allocating sums of money to problem areas where UCS feels it has some specific role to play and then funding program proposals that have objectives consistent with this role.

The specification of goals and objectives should be much easier for agencies since they may be able to formulate their objectives in terms of the clientele to whom their programs relate.

For examples: "To improve the knowledge and attitudes of all persons participating in the XYZ Sex Education Program as measured by an objective sex knowledge and attitude inventory." Such an objective would provide a basis for evaluating the effectiveness of the program.

It is suggested that this is an area where considerable research and experimentation is required in order to approach the full potential of PPBS.

6) Another determinant of the successful implementation of PPB is the ability of the installing unit to recognize and accommodate the fact that the analytics of program analysis may have a cycle time inherently different from the budgetary cycle time. The lead time necessary for program design often exceeds the normal three to six months warning which program units are given between the call for budgets and submission dates. The danger in not recognizing the difference between analytic cycle time and budget cycle time is that individuals who are
expected to provide in depth, expert analysis based on hard data are forced to make estimates which have no basis in policy research.

The approach taken in this proposal and within the Agency Operations Department of UCS is to recognize that budgeting decisions must be made each year regardless of the assessed quality or quantity of the information currently available.

While every effort is made to develop as much information as possible in order to facilitate decision-making, the information process and the information available at the time of budgeting must be used as it is for deciding upon allocations for the period. Weaknesses identified in the information are noted and hopefully rectified before the next budgeting period. While this appears to be a very pragmatic approach it is a necessary one to take since budget decisions must be made. The suggestions regarding the proposed timing of the analytical information gathering and budget review processes should assist in coordinating and synchronizing these cycles reasonably well.

7) A final factor that should be considered in implementing a PPB approach relates to the inevitable changes and alterations that will take place in the political bureaucratic elements of the organizational system including the rearrangement of roles, stakes and strategies of actors within organization network. Some of the requisites to the successful introduction of PPBS in any organizational system is an awareness of the need for change sufficient to stimulate movement toward adoption, and the availability of a change agent or mechanism to assist with the installation.
The need to develop and implement a PPB approach within United Community Services has been recognized and steps have been taken to develop the various components of the PPB approach over the past several years. This began with the development of a service based priorities report and was followed by the initiation and implementation of service or functional accounting and budgeting. These two developments stimulated the need to produce better information for decision-making and to fully integrate the activities of planning, programming and budgeting within a common system. The demand for change and for better information relating to needs, outcomes effectiveness has come primarily from the budget section of the organization and from the member agencies of UCS.

The PPBS project of UCS which has received major funding from the Federal Government, has acted as a change agent in initiating and implementing PPB in UCS and its member agencies.

It is hoped that the proposed approach presented herein will assist in the movement toward the development of a fully operational Planning-Programming-Budgeting System within UCS in the future. There are still many unknowns and countless technical and analytical difficulties will arise as implementation proceeds. The proposed model contains the essential ingredients and spirit of PPB and should provide a sound basis for further research, refinements and modifications. It is also hoped that the general approach and specific components presented will be of use to other fund allocating systems in the Health and Welfare field at local, provincial and federal levels.
APPENDICES I - VIII
## Analysis of Agency Income - 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Name</th>
<th>MUNICIPAL</th>
<th>PROV.</th>
<th>FEDERAL</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>UCS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activators Society</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>16,648</td>
<td>6,732</td>
<td>50,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bros. of BC - Lower Mainland Chapter</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,694</td>
<td>22,602</td>
<td>64,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy Scouts of Canada, Burnaby Region</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,818</td>
<td>14,132</td>
<td>31,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy Scouts of Canada, Vanc. Coast Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91,030</td>
<td>62,370</td>
<td>153,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys' Clubs of Vancouver</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56,714</td>
<td>112,633</td>
<td>325,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC Medical Research Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>12,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.M.H.A. - BC Vancouver Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,350</td>
<td>55,935</td>
<td>76,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.M.H.A. - North &amp; West Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>8,761</td>
<td>12,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.N.I.B. (incl. Burnaby &amp; Richmond)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>307,514</td>
<td>91,486</td>
<td>495,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Charities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85,645</td>
<td>40,887</td>
<td>126,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Family &amp; Children's Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>81,810</td>
<td>3,987,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Aid Society</td>
<td>3,880,989</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>209,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79,974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Centre</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Veterans Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Fry Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,100</td>
<td>4,190</td>
<td>209,999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Planning Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74,243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Service Centres</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>706,650</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,225,080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First United Church Summer Camp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl Guides Association, Burnaby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl Guides Vancouver Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Centre for Children - Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>112,864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Family Service Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36,005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Howard Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>232,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwassa N'hood Services Assoc.</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>3,940</td>
<td></td>
<td>51,841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasaika Lodge</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>82,072</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Services Assoc. Gr. Vanc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>757,161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Shore Neighbourhood House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>227,514</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retarded Children's Assoc. - B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>202,960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; - Burnaby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; - Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400,563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John Ambulance - Burnaby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>UCS</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John Ambulance - Vancouver Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seafarers Society of B.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Housing Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Indian Centre</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>55,750</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>14,454</td>
<td>106,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Jewish Community Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Neurological Centre:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. Parkinsons Disease Society</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,005</td>
<td>2,425</td>
<td>10,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Rehab. &amp; Cerebral Palsy</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>25,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,165</td>
<td>37,063</td>
<td>81,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myasthenia Gravis Fnd. of B.C.</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>2,425</td>
<td>6,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Epilepsy Centre</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,457</td>
<td>38,820</td>
<td>52,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Second Mile Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>900</td>
<td>15,147</td>
<td>16,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanc. Vets Service &amp; Welfare Bureau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>143,379</td>
<td>5,451</td>
<td>19,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.O.N. Burnaby Branch</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td></td>
<td>48,012</td>
<td>15,345</td>
<td>91,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.O.N. North Shore</td>
<td>15,129</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>71,886</td>
<td>30,195</td>
<td>129,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.O.N. Vancouver (incl. Richmond)</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>256,048</td>
<td></td>
<td>287,790</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>671,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Couns. Service for B.C.</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,902</td>
<td>5,841</td>
<td>56,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Bureau of Gr. Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,195</td>
<td>30,195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Institute for the Deaf</td>
<td>102,679</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,745</td>
<td>49,005</td>
<td>172,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y.M.C.A. Burnaby</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>19,473</td>
<td></td>
<td>42,629</td>
<td>56,973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y.M.C.A. of Greater Vancouver</td>
<td>242,686</td>
<td>146,124</td>
<td></td>
<td>388,810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y.W.C.A.</td>
<td>39,904</td>
<td>51,367</td>
<td>50,605</td>
<td>743,259</td>
<td>188,051</td>
<td>1,073,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Clubs of Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy Scouts Prov. Council BC &amp; Yukon</td>
<td>19,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58,130</td>
<td>19,478</td>
<td>97,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. Borstal Association</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>10,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,686</td>
<td>22,644</td>
<td>47,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARS - BC Div. (inc. Bby. &amp; Richmond)</td>
<td>253,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>742,572</td>
<td>125,898</td>
<td>1,121,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81,025</td>
<td>199,648</td>
<td>358,308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                                                     | 449,333   | 14,070,087 | 342,184 | 4,537,640 | 2,635,818 | 22,035,062 |
Appendix II

Suggested Outline for Developing Program Proposals

I  General Introduction and Summary of Proposal
   A. Brief description of the basic nature and focus of the agency submitting the proposal listing briefly all programs offered and proposed.
   B. Brief description of the problem or need situation to which the specific program is directed.
   C. Brief summary description of the nature of the specific program proposal.

II  The Problem or Need
   A. Detailed description of the problem or need, together with relevant statistics and supporting information.
   B. Actual or estimated number of individuals affected by the problem or need.
   C. Special characteristics of those affected by the problem.

III  The Proposed Program
   A. Goals and Objectives
      1. Major goals and objectives of the proposed program
      2. Subordinate goals and objectives
      3. Expected outcome of the proposed project
   B. Target Group
      1. Description of the population or group to whom the proposed program will be directed.
      2. The geographic location of the proposed target group.
   C. Mode of Operation, Dynamics and Strategies of Proposed Program
      1. Proposed method, techniques or dynamics of proposed program
      2. Relevant research and/or experience to support the proposed method and techniques of the program.
D. Special Requirements

1. Staff, facilities, resources, equipment
2. Detailed income and expenditure budget

IV Proposed Method of Evaluation and Maintenance of Statistics

A. Proposed method of evaluation

B. Statistical data that will be maintained to monitor the program and to carry out evaluation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY No.</th>
<th>AGENCY NAME:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1974 Total</th>
<th>1975 Total</th>
<th>Serv. 30</th>
<th>Serv. 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>776</td>
<td>Fees Paid By Fed. Gent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Fees Paid By Prov. Gent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>Fees Paid By Local Gent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>Fees other than Govt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Proactive Enterprises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Federal Government Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>Provincial Government Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>City of Vancouver Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>City of New Westminster Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>City of North Vancouver Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>Grants received from other cities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>Municipality of Burnaby Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>Municipality of Richmond Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td>District of North Vancouver Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>Municipality of West Vancouver Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459</td>
<td>Grants received from other municipalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Contributions and Subsidies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>Reimbursements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>Transfers from Capital Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>Other Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1019</td>
<td>UCCS Attachment/74 (Revenues/75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1020</td>
<td>UCCS Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1020</td>
<td>Other Unit End Requests (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1029</td>
<td>Prepayment of Admin. Inc. (Serv. 99)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1099</td>
<td>TOTAL INCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serv. 30</td>
<td>Serv. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY NAME:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURE</td>
<td>Percentage Proration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 Salaries of Agency Staff</td>
<td>1973 Actual Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200 Employee Benefits Expense</td>
<td>1974 Budget Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300 Building Occupancy</td>
<td>1975 Estimated Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400 Office Expense</td>
<td>1974 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 Recruitment and Education</td>
<td>1975 Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600 Promotion and Publicity</td>
<td>Serv. 99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700 Purchased Services—Non-Med.</td>
<td>Serv. 7/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800 Transportation</td>
<td>Serv. 7/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900 Health and Allied Services</td>
<td>Serv. 7/23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Food Services</td>
<td>Serv. 7/24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100 Clothing and Personal Needs</td>
<td>Serv. 7/25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200 Fuel, Heat, Light, and Water</td>
<td>Serv. 7/26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2300 Recreational and Educational Programs</td>
<td>Serv. 7/27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2400 Industrial and Craft Work</td>
<td>Serv. 7/28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500 Purchase for Resale</td>
<td>Serv. 7/29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2600 Miscellaneous Expenditures</td>
<td>Serv. 7/30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700 Research Allocations</td>
<td>Serv. 7/31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2800 Provision of Agency Expenses (Serv. 99)</td>
<td>Serv. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2900 TOTAL EXPENDITURE (1974)</td>
<td>Serv. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 SERVICE (SURPLUS OR DEFICIT)</td>
<td>Serv. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3100 TOTAL EXPENDITURE (1974)</td>
<td>Serv. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3200 UCS ALLOTMENT (1974)</td>
<td>Serv. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INDEX OF SERVICES AND UNITS OF SERVICE DELIVERY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Number</th>
<th>Service Title or Name</th>
<th>Units of Service Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community Planning, Coordination</td>
<td>Paid Professional Staff Hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>Paid Professional Staff Hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Research-Medical</td>
<td>Paid Professional Staff Hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Research-Welfare &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>Paid Professional Staff Hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Information &amp; Referral Services</td>
<td>Number of Inquiries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Intergroup Relations Services</td>
<td>Participant Hours of Direct Service Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Recruitment, Training, Placement and Supervision of Volunteers</td>
<td>Number of Placements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Adoption Services</td>
<td>Adoptions Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Blood Transfusion Services</td>
<td>Pints of Blood Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Camping Services — Day</td>
<td>Camper Hours Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Camping Services — Extended</td>
<td>Camper Days Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Volunteer Parental Substitutes</td>
<td>Child Hours of Direct Service Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Disaster Services</td>
<td>Hours of Direct Service Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Education and Training of the Handicapped</td>
<td>Client Hours of Direct Service Provided (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Environmental Sanitation</td>
<td>Paid Professional Staff Hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Family &amp; Individual Counselling</td>
<td>Client Hours of Direct Service Provided (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Family Life Education</td>
<td>Client Hours of Direct Service Provided (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Day Care of Children-Group</td>
<td>Child Hours of Direct Service Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Day Care of Children — Foster Family</td>
<td>Child Hours of Direct Service Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Day Care of Adults</td>
<td>Client Hours of Direct Service Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Foster Home Care</td>
<td>Child Days Care Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Friendly Visiting — Agency Sponsored</td>
<td>Direct Hours of Visiting Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Groupwork Services (Social Adjustment)</td>
<td>Client Hours of Direct Service (in groups) Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Groupwork Services (Social Development)</td>
<td>Client Hours of Direct Service (in groups) Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Health Education</td>
<td>Participant Hours of Direct Service Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Homemaker Services</td>
<td>Client Hours of Direct Service Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Housekeeper Services</td>
<td>Client Hours of Direct Service Provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) To Clients and/or Collaterals
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Number</th>
<th>Service Title or Name</th>
<th>Units of Service Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Homes for Aged — Nursing &amp; Rest Homes</td>
<td>Patient Days Care Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Housing Services</td>
<td>Number of Persons Served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Informal Education — Personal &amp; Social Development</td>
<td>Client Hours of Direct Service (in groups) Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Institutional Care-Dependent Children (Group)</td>
<td>Child Days Care Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Institutional Care-Emotionally Disturbed and Mentally Ill</td>
<td>Patient Days Care Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Institutional Care-Mentally Retarded</td>
<td>Patient Days Care Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Legal Advocacy and Counselling</td>
<td>Client Hours of Direct Service Provided (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Maternity Home Care</td>
<td>Patient Days Care Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Medical Care, Out Patient: Dental Services</td>
<td>Patient Hours of Treatment Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Medical Care, Out Patient: Medical &amp; Surgical Services</td>
<td>Patient Hours of Treatment Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Medical Care, Out Patient: Psychiatric Services</td>
<td>Patient Hours of Treatment Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Medical Care, Out Patient: Rehabilitation Services</td>
<td>Patient Hours of Treatment Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Medical Social Services</td>
<td>Client Hours of Direct Service Provided (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Medical Supplies</td>
<td>Number of Persons Served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Audiological Assessment</td>
<td>Number of Assessments Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Interpreting (Non-Verbal)</td>
<td>Client Hours of Direct Service Provided (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Nursery School</td>
<td>Child Hours of Direct Service Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Physical Fitness Programs</td>
<td>Participant Hours of Direct Service Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Probation, Parole and Correction Services/Juvenile</td>
<td>Client Hours of Direct Service Provided (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Probation, Parole and Correction Services/Adult</td>
<td>Client Hours of Direct Service Provided (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Protection Services for Children</td>
<td>Client Hours of Direct Service Provided (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Public Health Nursing — General</td>
<td>Hours of Direct Service Provided (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Home Nursing Care</td>
<td>Patient Hours of Treatment Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Meals on Wheels</td>
<td>Meals Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Recreational Services</td>
<td>Participant Hours of Direct Service Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Residential Facilities</td>
<td>Occupied Bed Nights Provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) To Clients and/or Collaterals
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Number</th>
<th>Service Title or Name</th>
<th>Units of Service Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Resident Treatment Centres for Emotionally Disturbed Children</td>
<td>Child Days Care Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Shelter Care for Homeless and Transients</td>
<td>Occupied Bed Nights Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Sheltered Work</td>
<td>Client Hours of Work Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Emergency Aid</td>
<td>Number of Persons Served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>Transportation Services for Disabled and Aged</td>
<td>Number of Persons Served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Vocational Counselling Services</td>
<td>Client Hours of Direct Service Provided (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>Vocational Training Services</td>
<td>Client Hours of Direct Service Provided (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>Job Placement Services</td>
<td>Client Hours of Direct Service Provided (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Medical Care, In-Patient:</td>
<td>Patient Days Care Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Acute and Convalescent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Medical Care, In-Patient:</td>
<td>Patient Days Care Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Long Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Medical Care, In-Patient:</td>
<td>Patient Days Care Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>Educational Consultation</td>
<td>Hours of Consultation Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Food Services — Commercial</td>
<td>None Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>Residential Service — Commercial</td>
<td>Occupied Bed Nights Provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>None Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) To Clients and/or Collaterals
### Appendix V

**SYNOPSIS OF NEEDS AND PROBLEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Ref. No.</th>
<th>Problem Description</th>
<th>Relevant Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 110</td>
<td>Community Planning Deficiency - Overall and Local</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 150 160 170</td>
<td>Citizen Incapacity for System Relationships</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 160</td>
<td>Absence of Adequate Knowledge - Non-Medical</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170 180 190</td>
<td>Absence of Adequate Knowledge - Non-Medical</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170 180 190</td>
<td>Social Discrimination</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170 180 190</td>
<td>Insufficient Resources (Emergency - Disaster)</td>
<td>15, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 190</td>
<td>System Lack of Human Resources</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 210</td>
<td>Family Stress - General</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230 235</td>
<td>Family &amp; Individual Social Malfunction</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235 280</td>
<td>Societal Maladjustment - Pregnancy</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 310</td>
<td>Parental Incapacity (Emergency)</td>
<td>35, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310 320 330 340</td>
<td>Parental Incapacity (Permanent)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320 330 340 350</td>
<td>Parental Incapacity (Long-term)</td>
<td>23, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330 340 350 370</td>
<td>Parental Incapacity (Short-term)</td>
<td>40, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340 350 370</td>
<td>Parental Incapacity (Emergency)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 370</td>
<td>Parental Incapacity (Absent Partner)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>Neglect or Abuse of Children</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Ref. No.</td>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>Relevant Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 410</td>
<td>Delegated Parental Responsibility (Day)</td>
<td>20, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 420</td>
<td>Personal Development</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Pre-School Children)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 440</td>
<td>Behavioural Problems (Children)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 470</td>
<td>Delegated Parental Responsibility (Day-Special)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 475</td>
<td>Emotional Maladjustment (Handicapped)</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 510</td>
<td>Personal and Social Development</td>
<td>11, 12, 29, 39, 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 520</td>
<td>Incapacity for Individual Leisure-time Utilization</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 540</td>
<td>Social Isolation</td>
<td>24, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 550</td>
<td>Lack of Knowledge of Resources (General)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 555</td>
<td>Lack of Knowledge of Resources (Specific)</td>
<td>38, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 560</td>
<td>Insufficient Resources (Long-Term)</td>
<td>Social Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot; &quot; (Medium-Term)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 562</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; (Short-Term)</td>
<td>65, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 564</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; (Emergency)</td>
<td>65, 67, 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 566</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; (Special Needs)</td>
<td>38, 44, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 580</td>
<td>Developmental Lag - (Social)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 590</td>
<td>Adjustment of Convicted Offenders</td>
<td>56, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 650</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; (Full)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 650</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; (Full)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 610</td>
<td>Geriatric Incapacity (Partial)</td>
<td>22, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 650</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; (Full)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Ref. No.</td>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>Relevant Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>EMPLOYMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>Employment Incompatability</td>
<td>72, 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740</td>
<td>&quot; Incapacity</td>
<td>73, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770</td>
<td>Unemployability except in Sheltered Environment</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>PHYSICAL HEALTH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810</td>
<td>Medical Need (Hospital)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820</td>
<td>&quot; (Non-Hospitalization)</td>
<td>46, 47, 49, 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>Medicament, Appliance and Prosthetic Needs</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>835</td>
<td>Inadequate Blood Supplies</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840</td>
<td>Paramedical Need (Non-Hospital)</td>
<td>49, 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850</td>
<td>Social Incapacity (Physical Disability)</td>
<td>49, 16, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>855</td>
<td>Communicative Incapacity (Oral and Aural)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>860</td>
<td>Impediment in Acceptance of Personal Medical Implications</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>870</td>
<td>Non-Attainment of Physical Potential</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880</td>
<td>Lack of Knowledge of Preventive Health Measures</td>
<td>33, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>885</td>
<td>Nutritional Deficiency</td>
<td>63, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890</td>
<td>Absence of Adequate Knowledge (Medical)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref. No.</td>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>Mental Retardation (Severe)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>Mental Illness (Children)</td>
<td>41, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; (Adults)</td>
<td>41, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>930</td>
<td>Emotional Disturbance (Children)</td>
<td>41, 48, 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>935</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; (Adults)</td>
<td>41, 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950</td>
<td>Social Incapacity (Mental Disability)</td>
<td>49, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>980</td>
<td>Addiction</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VI

A Guide for Determining the Management Effectiveness of Social Service Agencies

This guide for determining the management effectiveness of social service agencies has been developed to assist in assessing and evaluating management and administrative practices. It has been designed as a list of statements which will permit the analysis and evaluation of selected aspects of agency operations.

The topics covered here are by no means exhaustive and if the statements lead to additional avenues of investigation, these should be followed and reported.

Beside each statement is space for making a general rating of agency performance as well as additional comment.

The rating system is based on a five point scale as follows:

1. **Excellent** - No changes required at present time.
2. **Adequate** - Little improvement needed.
3. **Fairly Satisfactory** - Some improvement needed.
4. **Weak** - Considerable improvement needed.
5. **Lacking** - Much improvement needed.

The guide, if properly used should form the basis for writing a concise and reasonably brief report (3 paragraphs) on the general state of management and administrative practice in any given agency.

Any given statement should be seen as a starting point for discussion and evidence should be provided by the agency to assist in making a rating.

The statements fall under the following headings:

2. Board Operations.
3. Purposes, Goals, Objectives and Programs.
4. Organizational Control.
5. Fiscal Administration.
6. Personnel Administration.
7. Communications, Participation and Coordination.
8. Leadership and Direction.
9. Staff and Facilities.
10. Community Relations.
I. Structure and Formal Organization

1. An organization chart is available which outlines the formal structure of the agency together with the line of authority and the pattern of relationships.

2. The agency's formal structure is congruent with the performance demands of the agency and encourages maximum staff performance, effectiveness, accountability and coordination of effort in achieving agency objectives.

3. Each department of the agency is organized around the achievement of one or more major functions for which a single person is held finally responsible and accountable.

4. The agency's staff know exactly what they are responsible and accountable for, to whom they report, what are their sources of advice and channels of communication and the standards of performance that they are expected to achieve.
II Board Operations

1. The agency has a broadly based membership which elects the Board of Directors, receives reports and generally interprets the agency's work to the public.

2. The Board of Directors meet regularly, set policy and guide the overall direction of the agency.

3. The Board of Directors are properly informed as to their duties and responsibilities before they accept membership on the Board.

4. New Board members participate in a planned program of orientation.

5. The Board of Directors have appropriate committees to guide the overall direction and policies of the agency, e.g. Executive, Finance, Program, Personnel, Nominating, Property Management and Public Relations.

6. Meetings of the Board of Directors and special committees are well planned in advance with appropriate agenda.

7. Inactive Board members are replaced when their term expires.
8. The Board and special committee members are familiar with trends and developments in the community that may have implications for the functioning of the agency.

9. The Board and special committee members are familiar with the programs and functions of the agency.

10. The Board and special committee members concentrate their attention on policy matters and the overall performance of the agency. They refrain from becoming overly involved in day-to-day management and administration which is the role of the Executive Director.
### Purposes, Goals, Objectives and Programs

1. The agency has a well defined statement of purposes and policies which are congruent with the needs of the community.

2. These are reviewed at regular intervals.

3. The agency has a well defined statement of objectives which reflect its purposes and policies.

4. The objectives of the agency are expressed in quantifiable "output" terms which lend themselves to analysis and evaluation.

5. The agency's objectives are translated into concrete programs.

6. The agency's objectives are reviewed periodically and are adjusted and modified as required.

7. The program strategies adopted are appropriately investigated and documented and specify:
   - Specific objectives to be achieved
   - Time period for achievement
   - Resources required
   - Program dynamics
   - The nature of the target population

8. The agency's programs are effectively monitored to determine their progress in meeting objectives and appropriate statistics are maintained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Programs and services that do not prove to be effective in achieving objectives or meeting community needs are discontinued or revised.

10. New and revised programs are developed on an on-going basis to improve the quality of service and to fulfil agency objectives more effectively.

11. Emerging community and agency problems and needs are foreseen and long and short range plans are prepared to meet them.

12. Long and short range plans include:
   - An analysis of the problem or need to be addressed
   - Specific objectives for the planning period
   - A statement of the priority of objectives
   - Time schedules for achievement
   - Alternative program approaches for the achievement of objectives
   - Consideration of the characteristics of the target population to be served

13. Plans developed by the agency are designed so as to permit adequate monitoring, control and evaluation.

14. The agency can flexibly adjust to unexpected internal and external changes affecting its operations.

15. The agency has a reasonably detailed plan as to where it wishes to go in the future.
IV Organizational Control

1. Organizational and functional charts, time schedules and other basic controls are maintained to monitor the progress of programs in meeting their objectives.

2. Periodic Reports are prepared which satisfactorily portray the operating results of the total agency and its various programs.

3. These are used as effective management tools in evaluating and adjusting progress toward the achievement of objectives.

4. Statistical and management control systems and progress reports are directly related to the established objectives of the agency and to specific programs.

5. The agency employs effective and efficient methods and procedures in the preparation and maintenance of statistics, reports and records.

6. The statistical information maintained by the agency adequately reflects what is happening in various programs and in the total agency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
V Fiscal Administration

1. A detailed budget of income and expenditure is adopted officially each year by the agency's Board of Directors.

2. The budget is used as a management tool to guide the operations of the agency.

3. Variances from budgeted expenditures are analysed on a systematic basis and adjustments are made where necessary.

4. The agency uses functional budgeting and accounting procedures that are consistent with the standards set by the Community Funds and Councils of Canada.

5. The agency maintains a satisfactory set of financial records which are audited annually.

6. The agency maintains an efficient internal financial control system over liquid assets.

7. Financial statements are prepared for each major division of the agency and are used as a management tool to guide the total agency.

8. Regular reviews of potential sources of funds are conducted and documented to keep abreast of changes in funding patterns.

9. New approaches are developed and investigated to generate new sources of funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI Personnel Administration

1. There is a well defined job description for each position in the agency, outlining qualifications, duties, responsibilities, conditions of employment, which has been discussed with each incumbent.

2. The qualification standards for each position in the agency have been described in terms of the specific knowledge, skills and personal qualities required, and they are used to effectively select and promote staff.

3. There is a position evaluation process in operation in the agency in which duties and responsibilities are defined in terms of the objectives of the organization.

4. Employee performance is reviewed annually, at all levels in the agency, and is used for promotions and salary increases.

5. The agency has a written set of personnel practices which are periodically reviewed and revised as necessary and communicated to all appropriate staff.

6. The agency has a well developed procedure for handling employee grievances.

7. The agency has a formalized orientation program for new employees, Board members and volunteers.
Personnel Administration (cont'd)

8. Salary standards have been developed in terms of position classifications, grades and pay ranges applicable to every position in the agency and these are fully understood by staff.

9. The compensation standards are competitive in maintaining staff of high calibre.

10. The agency has a satisfactory system of employee benefits including sick leave, vacation pay, pension plans, health and disability insurance, etc.

11. All staff advancements are made upon the basis of merit performance and established documented standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## VII Communications, Participation and Coordination

1. There is consensus among the staff and Board of the agency regarding purposes, policies, objectives, programs, plans and schedules.

2. Lines of communication are well developed across all levels in the agency.

3. The impact of changes in the environment or in the agency's policies or objectives is effectively interpreted to the staff.

4. Subordinates are given opportunities to participate in the formulation of objectives, programs and service activities and see themselves as important and integral parts of the agency's operation.

5. A balance is maintained between the specializations of various departments and the needs of the agency as a whole.

6. The activities of the agency are effectively coordinated by the executive director so that the best results are achieved for the total agency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII Leadership and Direction

1. The agency fosters conditions and circumstances which encourage the staff to maintain high levels of performance.

2. The agency recognizes the self-development needs of its staff and plans work assignments and opportunities for advancement accordingly.

3. The agency appraises the need for staff improvement throughout the organization and plans developmental programs as required.

4. The senior management staff are skilled in conducting problem-solving conferences and group meetings.

5. The agency has a "management development" program designed to meet the needs and improve the performance of all key personnel.
IX Staff and Facilities

1. The staff of the agency are effectively utilized and are provided with proper supervision.

2. The educational and experience background of the staff is adequate to carry out the agency's programs.

3. Staff quality is maintained through in-service education and training programs, staff meetings and individual consultation.

4. The agency has sufficient full-time professional staff to provide supervision and direction to part-time and volunteer staff members.

5. The facilities of the agency are adequate in terms of their contribution to the overall image and programs of the organization.

6. The agency's facilities are effectively utilized and maintained to acceptable standards.

7. There is good rapport between staff and administration.
1. The agency involves people from a broad cross-section of the community on its Board of Directors and in committees and programs.

2. The agency works closely with the community groups and other agencies in dealing with social problems and issues.

3. The agency has an organized program to publicize and interpret its programs, purposes and achievements to the public.

4. The staff of the agency participate in multi-agency planning activities related to the effective delivery of coordinated services.

5. The services and programs of the agency are accessible to the client population to whom they are directed.
General Comments:
Caseload Reporting System

Coding Form and General Instructions

(1) The basic form with information on all variables should be completed once - usually when the client becomes a case.

(2) At the end of each month, a form for each active client should be completed. This form should identify:

A) The client's case number, agency number and worker number.
B) The time spent in providing services to the client.
C) Any changes in the client's status.

(3) Coding the case number - This should be completed for every entry

Code = (First four letters of the surname + last digit of century + year, month and day of birth + two initials + 2 tie breaking digits)

eg. (1) Reg. C. BROWN born January 3, 1933
(2) D.F. BROWN born January 5, 1933
(3) W.A. BROWN born January 3, 1933
(4) Ronald C. BROWN born January 3, 1933
(5) E.E. BROWN born January 3, 1883

Codes:
(1) B R O W 9 3 3 0 1 0 3 R C
(2) B R O W 9 3 3 0 1 0 3 D F
(3) B R O W 9 3 3 0 1 0 3 W A
(4) B R O W 9 3 3 0 1 0 3 R C O 1
(5) B R O W 8 8 3 0 1 0 3 E E

(4) Service or Program - #13 - A maximum of 3 services or programs can be coded using the code sheet. These are services or programs that are being employed to meet the needs of the client. The primary service or program should be listed first with subsidiary or ancillary services following.

(5) Presenting Problem(s) - #14 - Using Code #5, code the problem(s) presented by the client. The major or most important problem should be coded first, the second most important is to be coded second and the third most important third.

(6) Diagnosed Problem - #15 - Using Code #5, code the client's problem as diagnosed by the worker. The coding procedure used is similar to that for the presenting problem(s) with the most important problem coded first.
(7) Case Goal - #17 - The operational definitions for case goals are:

(1) Improvement: The client's norm of functioning is at less than a desired level, and client is considered to have the potential to achieve a higher norm.

(2) Maintenance: The client is functioning at an acceptable level but requires services input to prevent deterioration.

(3) Restoration: The client's usual norm of functioning is acceptable, but his present functioning is unacceptably less than this norm. Services input is required to return client to the previous norm.

(4) Enrichment: The client's norm of functioning is acceptable. He seeks to improve his position.

(8) Hours of Service Provided - #21, #22, #23 - The direct, indirect and total hours of service provided to each client should be recorded each month. Time should be recorded to the nearest half hour e.g. 10.5 hrs.

Time Sheets - It is suggested that a simple record of time spent (direct and indirect) on each client each day should be maintained. At the end of each month, add up the time spent for each client and enter this figure on the coding form.

(9) Local Area - #27 - This is an optional coding used to locate the client geographically. A six letter code is used which is a short form for the geographic area. The code can be found by referring to the directory for the appropriate municipality.

-----

Coding Convention

For key punching purposes one must distinguish between "0", the alphabetic character and "0"), the numeric character and between "Z", the alphabetic character and "7", the numeric character. The convention is to put a slash / through the alpha characters as shown:

Ø = the alphabetic character = e.g. TØP

Z = the alphabetic character = e.g. ZEN
### Codes for Variables

1. **Reason for Closing - Variable 8**
   - 1 = Client did not continue
   - 2 = Service completed
   - 3 = Worker terminated
   - 4 = Referred to other agency
   - 5 = Transferred
   - 6 = Other

2. **Source of Referral - Variable 11**
   - 1 = Self
   - 2 = Relative
   - 3 = Friend
   - 4 = School
   - 5 = Other agency
   - 6 = Court
   - 7 = Lawyer
   - 8 = Medical
   - 9 = Church
   - 0 = Other
   - A = Police/Prob.

3. **Type of Case - Variable 12**
   - 1 = Family Service
   - 2 = Social Allowance - Single
   - 3 = " - Couple
   - 4 = " - Two Parent Family
   - 5 = " - One Parent Family
   - 6 = " - Child with Relative
   - 7 = " - Mincome
   - 9 = Adoption Home - Pending
   - A = Adoption Home - Approved
   - B = Child in Adoption Home
   - C = Foster Home - Pending
   - D = Foster Home - Approved
   - E = Child in Care
   - F = Unmarried Parent
   - G = Health & Institutional Service
   - H = H P I A
   - 0 = Other

4. **Service or Program**
   This is an abbreviated list of the services most frequently used by the Department - a full list of all services is found on the last page:
   - 5 = Information & Referral Services
   - 8 = Recruitment, Training, Placement & Supervision of Volunteers
   - 9 = Adoption Services
   - 18 = Family & Individual Counselling
   - 19 = Family Life Education
   - 23 = Foster Home Care
   - 96 = Foster Home Care - Group Home
   - 25 = Group Work Services (Social Adjustment)
   - 29 = Group Work Services (Social Development)
   - 58 = Protection Services for Children
   - 69 = Emergency Aid
   - 87 = Social Allowance
   - 89 = H P I A
   - 90 = Mincome
   - 96 = Foster Home Care - Group Home
5. Presenting/Diagnosed Problem Typology - Variables 14 & 15

1. Employment & Financial
   - Employment - Work Adjustment & Performance
   - Unemployment
   - Unemployability
   - Financial: 141 Inadequate Income 142 Lack of Income
   - Financial Management, e.g. Debt/Credit
   - Transient
   - Other

2. Physical Health
   - Medical & Health Problems: 211 Chronic 212 Acute
   - Physical Handicap/Disability
   - Nutrition
   - Other

3. Mental Health
   - Retardation
   - Mental Disorders: 321 Chronic 322 Acute
   - Alcoholism
   - Drug Abuse
   - Other

4. Personal & Family
   - Personal Development & Adjustment
   - Deviant Behaviour: 421 Delinquency 422 Crime
   - Premarital
   - Marital Dysfunctioning
   - Parent-Child Relationships
   - Extended Family Problems
   - Family Life Skills
   - Geriatric Needs
   - Child Care (Family Support): 491 In Home
     - 492 Out of Home - Day Care
     - 493 Out of Home - Temporary (Separation)
     - 494 Out of Home - Permanent
   - Child Desired: 4A1 Temporary 4A2 Permanent
   - Child Neglect
   - Child Abuse
   - Other

5. Leisure Needs

6. Other
   - Shelter
   - Education
   - School Adjustment
   - Legal: 641 Family 642 Debt/Credit 643 Criminal 644 Other
   - Transportation
   - Lack of Knowledge of Resources

Example - If client's problem is one of inadequate income, code = 141
If client's problem is one of need for day care out of home, code = 492
If client wishes to adopt a child, code = 4A2
6. Case Movement - Variables 18 & 19
- 1 = Considerable Improvement
- 2 = Some Improvement
- 3 = Mixed Improvement
- 4 = No Change
- 5 = Regression
- 6 = Unable to evaluate

7. Location of Client - Variable 28
- 1 = Adoption Home
- 2 = Institution
- 3 = Foster/Group Home
- 4 = Own Home
- 5 = Relative
- 6 = Jail
- 7 = Hospital
- 8 = Hostel
- 9 = Friends
- 0 = Other

8. Religion - Variable 31
- 1 = Protestant
- 2 = Catholic
- 3 = Jewish
- 4 = Unknown
- 5 = N/A
- 6 = No Religion
- 0 = Other

9. Ethnic Origin - Variable 32
- 1 = Caucasian
- 2 = Native Indian (Status)
- 3 = Native Indian (Non Status)
- 4 = East Indian
- 5 = Japanese
- 6 = Chinese
- 7 = Negro
- 8 = Other

10. Citizenship - Variable 33
- 1 = Canadian
- 2 = Landed immigrant
- 3 = Non-Canadian

11. Legal Status - Variable 34
- 1 = Before the Court (PCA)
- 2 = Temporary PCA - Ward
- 3 = Permanent PCA - Ward
- 4 = Pre Sept 68 PCA Ward
- 5 = JDA Ward
- 6 = Non Ward
- 7 = Other Province
- 0 = Other (specify)

12. Schooling/Education - Variable 36
- 1 = None
- 2 = Elementary
- 3 = High School 1-2
- 4 = High School 3-5
- 5 = Some Univ.
- 6 = Univ.Grad.

13. Occupation - Variable 37
- 1 = Manag/Prof/Tech
- 2 = Cler/Sales/Serv
- 3 = Crafts/Prod./Proc
- 4 = Labourer
- 5 = Housewife
- 6 = Student
- 7 = Retired
- 8 = N/A
- 9 = Technical

14. Primary Source of Income - Variable 38
- 1 = Employment
- 2 = Unemployment Insur.
- 3 = Savings, Priv. Pension etc.
- 4 = Social Assistance
- 5 = Alimony/Sept. Pay
- 6 = Gov't Pension
- 7 = N/A

15. Stage in Family Life Cycle - Variable 49
- 1 = Couple without children - together up to 2 yrs.
- 2 = Family Unit, eldest child 0-30 mths.
- 3 = Family Unit, eldest child 30 mths - 6 yrs.
- 4 = Family Unit, eldest child 6 yrs. - 13 yrs.
- 5 = Family Unit, eldest child 13 yrs. - 20 yrs. and over
- 6 = Family Unit, eldest child 20 yrs. and over has left home, younger child at home
- 7 = Family Unit - all children have left home - parents not yet retired
- 8 = Retired Parents
- 9 = Persons who have never had children - including couples together over 2 years
- A = Single
- B = Unable to Categorize
- C = Extended Family
4. Service or Program - Variable 13 - Full List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Service/Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01.</td>
<td>Community Planning, Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.</td>
<td>Research - Medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.</td>
<td>Research - Welfare &amp; Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.</td>
<td>Information &amp; Referral Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.</td>
<td>Intergroup Relations Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.</td>
<td>Recruitment, Training, Placement &amp; Supervision of Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.</td>
<td>Adoption Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Blood Transfusion Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Camping Services - Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Camping Services - Extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Volunteer Parental Substitutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Disaster Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Education &amp; Training of Handicapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Environmental Sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Family &amp; Individual Counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Family Life Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Day Care of Children - Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Day Care of Children - Foster Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Day Care of Adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Foster Home Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Friendly Visiting - Agency Sponsored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Groupwork Services (Soc. Adjustment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Groupwork Services (Soc. Develop.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Health Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Homemaker Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Housekeeper Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Homes for Aged - Nursing &amp; Rest Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Housing Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Informal Education - Personal &amp; Social Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Institutional Care - Dependent Children (Group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Institutional Care - Emotionally Disturbed &amp; Mentally Ill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Institutional Care - Mentally Retarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Legal Advocacy &amp; Counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Maternity Home Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Medical Care, Out Patient: Dental Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Medical Care, Out Patient: Medical &amp; Surgical Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Medical Care, Out Patient: Psychiatric Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Medical Care, Out Patient: Rehabilitation Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Medical Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Medical Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Audiological Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Interpreting (Non-Verbal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Nursery School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Physical Fitness Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Probation, Parole, &amp; Correction Services/Juvenile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Probation, Parole &amp; Correction Services/Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Protection Services for Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Public Health Nursing - General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Home Nursing Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Meals on Wheels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Recreational Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Residential Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Resident Treatment Centres for Emotionally Disturbed Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Shelter Care for Homeless &amp; Transient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Sheltered Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Emergency Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>Transportation Services for Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Vocational Counselling Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>Job Placement Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Medical Care, In Patient: a) Acute &amp; Convalescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Medical Care, In Patient: b) Long Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Medical Care, In Patient: c) Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>Educational Consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Food Services - Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>Residential Service - Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>Social Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>H P I A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>Mincome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>OAS Supplement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>Supervision of Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>Foster Home Care - Group Home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SAMPLE CASE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Mary Q Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Born</td>
<td>January 5, 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>Jack Caseworker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Date</td>
<td>January 15, 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Commenced</td>
<td>June 3, 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral Source</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Case</td>
<td>Family Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Service Provided| 18 = Family & Individual Counselling  
|                 | 19 = Family Life Education |
| Presenting Problem | 440 - Marital Dysfunctioning  
|                 | 450 - Parent Child Relationships |
| Diagnosed Problem | 410 - Personal Development & Adjustment |
| Prognosis       | Improvement            |
| Case Goal       | Improvement            |

Case Movement (according to Client) 1 = Considerable improvement
Case Movement (according to Worker) 1 = Considerable Improvement

Hours of Service - direct  36.5
Hours of Service - indirect  12.0
Total Hours of Service  48.5

**Social Profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Client</th>
<th>4 - Own Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in Family Unit being dealt with</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>2 = Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1 = Protestant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Origin</td>
<td>1 = Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>1 = Canadian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>2 = Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Profile (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Some University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = Housewife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 = N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 = Mother with children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spouse of Family Head</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client is spouse of Family Head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Profile - General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Structure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = 2 parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Family</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Nuclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Month &amp; Yr'of birth of dependents at home</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) 1965 Feb = 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) 1970 June = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of children at home under 19</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage in Family Life Cycle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Family Income/month</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number working in family unit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Profile - Head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yr &amp; month of birth of family head</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status of family head</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic Origin of family head</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion of family head</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status of family head</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Full Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employability of family head</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Employable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schooling of family head</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 = High School - 3-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation of family head</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 = Sales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ENTRY INFORMATION**

1. **Case number**: Sample 7330/05-46
2. **Date of Entry**: 1/1/82
3. **Agency No**: 1 Branch
4. **Worker Number**: 1/1/13
5. **Agency Code for Case**: C
6. **Code 1 for New Entry, Blank for Update**: 1
7. **Case Status** (1 - open, 2 - closed, 3 - re-open, other)
8. **Reason for Closing** (see code 1)
9. **Review Date**
10. **Date Service Commenced**: 1/1/81
11. **Source of Referral** (see code 2)
12. **Type of Case** (see code 3)
13. **Service or Program** (see code 4)

**CLIENT'S SOCIAL PROFILE**

21. **Surname**: Sample
22. **First Name**: Mary
23. **Maiden Name**: Initials
24. **Residence Address**: Sample 7330/05-46
25. **Street Name**: Apple Way
26. **City/Municipality**: West Vancouver
27. **Local Area**: Sample 7330/05-46

**DATA ENTRY - DATA ENTRY**

**PROGRAM - TREATMENT ANALYSIS**

14. **Presenting Problem(s)** (see code 5)
15. **Diagnosed Problem** (see code 5)
16. **Prognosis** (1 = improve, 2 = no change, 3 = regress, 4 = D/K)
17. **Case Goal** (1 = improve, 2 = maintenance, 3 = restoration, 4 = enrichment)
18. **Case Movement - Client** (see code 6)
19. **Case Movement - Worker** (see code 6)
20. **Hours of Service Provided (Direct)**
21. **Hours of Service Provided (Indirect)**
22. **Total Hours of Service Provided**

**CLIENT'S SOCIAL PROFILE**

**Case number**: Sample 7330/05-46

28. **Location of Client**
29. **Number in Family Unit Being Dealt With**
30. **Sex** (1 = male, 2 = female)
31. **Religion** (see code 8)
32. **Ethnic Origin** (see code 9)
33. **Citizenship** (see code 10)
34. **Legal Status** (child welfare only, see code 11)
35. **Marital Status** (1 = single, 2 = married, 3 = separated, 4 = divorced)
36. **Schooling/Education** (see code 12)
37. **Occupation** (see code 13)
38. **If Student** (1 = general, 2 = university, 3 = post grad, 4 = tech)
39. **Employment Status** (1 = full-time, 2 = part-time, 3 = occasional, 4 = unemployed, 5 = retired, 6 = N/A)
40. **Employability** (1 = employable, 2 = unemployable, 3 = age, 4 = mental, 5 = physical, 6 = mother w/children, 7 = other)
41. **Monthly Income** (to nearest dollar)
42. **Primary Source of Income** (see code 14)
43. **(1 = family head, 2 = spouse of f.h., 3 = other)
**FAMILY PROFILE**

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

(A) If client is over 19 yrs and not (B) or (C) complete where relevant

(B) If client is a family head complete items 44-51

(C) If client is a spouse of a family head complete items 44-62

(O) If client is under 19 and not (B) or (C) complete items 44-63

* Case number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Family structure</td>
<td>(1-two parents, 2-male parent only, 3-female parent only, 4-other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Type of family</td>
<td>(1-nuclear, 2-broken, 3-bi-merged)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Year &amp; month of birth of dependent at home, oldest first</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Number of children at home (under 19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Number of non dependents at home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Stage in family life cycle (see code 15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Total family income/month (to nearest dollar)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Number working in family unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Case number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Sex of family head</td>
<td>(1-male, 2-female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Year &amp; month of birth of family head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Marital status of family head</td>
<td>(1-single, 2-married, 3-widowed, 4-divorced, 5-separated, 6-common law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Ethnic origin of family head (see code 9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Religion of family head (see code 8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Employment status of family head</td>
<td>(1-full time, 2-part time, 3-occasional, 4-unemp., 5-retired, 6-N/A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Employability of family head</td>
<td>(1-employable, 2-unemployable; 3-age, 4-physical, 5-emotional, 6-mother w.children, 7-other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Schooling/education of family head (see code 12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Occupation of family head (see code 13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Monthly income of family head (to nearest dollar)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Primary source of income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Separated from family of origin (1-yes, 2-no)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES

* Case number
### SOCIAL PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>TOWN_HOME</th>
<th>FAMILY STRUCTURE</th>
<th>2_PARENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO IN FAMILY UNIT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TYPE OF FAMILY</td>
<td>NUCLEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>YR &amp; MO OF BIRTH OF DEP AT HOME</td>
<td>6502 7006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHNIC ORIGIN</td>
<td>PROTESTA</td>
<td>NO OF CHILDREN UNDER 19 AT HOME</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZENSHIP</td>
<td>CANADIAN</td>
<td>NO OF NON-DEPENDENTS AT HOME</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL STATUS</td>
<td>?---------</td>
<td>STAGE IN FAMILY LIFE CYCLE</td>
<td>CHILD_6_13YRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL STATUS</td>
<td>MARRIED</td>
<td>TOTAL FAMILY INCOME/MONTH</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>SOME UNIV</td>
<td>NO WORKING IN FAMILY UNIT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>HOUSEWIFE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYMENT STATUS</td>
<td>N_A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYABILITY</td>
<td>MOTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTHLY INCOME</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY SOURCE</td>
<td>?---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAD/SPouse</td>
<td>SPouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FAMILY PROFILE -- GENERAL

#### FAMILY PROFILE -- HEAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>MALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YR &amp; MO OF BIRTH</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL STATUS</td>
<td>MARRIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHNIC ORIGIN</td>
<td>CAUCASIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIGION</td>
<td>CATHOLIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYMENT STATUS</td>
<td>FULL TIME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYABILITY</td>
<td>EMPLOYEE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>SALES, CLEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTHLY INCOME</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIM INCOME SOU</td>
<td>EMPLOYMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOTES:

- 

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>FAMILY PROFILE -- GENERAL</th>
<th>FAMILY PROFILE -- HEAD</th>
<th>CHECK HERE WHEN UPDATE IS REQUIRED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD IN FAMILY UNIT</td>
<td>TYPE OF FAMILY</td>
<td>SFX</td>
<td>PRINCE/ssou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBERS</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>INCOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIGION</td>
<td>YR &amp; MO OF BIRTH</td>
<td>MARITAL STATUS</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHNIC ORIGIN</td>
<td>MARITAL STATUS</td>
<td>ETHNIC ORIGIN</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF RESIDENCE</td>
<td>EMPLOYMENT STATUS</td>
<td>RELIGION</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHNIC STATUS</td>
<td>EMPLOYABILITY</td>
<td>EMPLOYMENT STATUS</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>DIRECT HOURS</td>
<td>CAREER</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYMENT STATUS</td>
<td>ADDITIONAL HOURS</td>
<td>INDIVIDUAL</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTHLY INCOME</td>
<td>TO DATE</td>
<td>ADDITIONAL HOURS</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY SOURCE</td>
<td>SOC/ASSIST</td>
<td>TO DATE</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAD/SPouse</td>
<td>NEITHER</td>
<td>ADDITIONAL HOURS</td>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CASE TYPE: ADOPT_APP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>PROB_PRES</th>
<th>REFER_SOURCE</th>
<th>CLIENT_LOC</th>
<th>EMPLOYABILITY</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>SCHOOLING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CDES_PERM</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>OWN_HOME</td>
<td>EMPLOYABLE</td>
<td>PROF_MANAG</td>
<td>UNIV_GRAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JL</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CDES_PERM</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>OWN_HOME</td>
<td>EMPLOYABLE</td>
<td>PROF_MANAG</td>
<td>TECHNICAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CDES_PERM</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>OWN_HOME</td>
<td>EMPLOYABLE</td>
<td>PROF_MANAG</td>
<td>HIGH_1_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CDES_PERM</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>OWN_HOME</td>
<td>EMPLOYABLE</td>
<td>SALES_CLER</td>
<td>UNIV_GRAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CDES_PERM</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>OWN_HOME</td>
<td>EMPLOYABLE</td>
<td>PROF_MANAG</td>
<td>UNIV_GRAD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CASE TYPE: ADOPT_HME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>PROB_PRES</th>
<th>REFER_SOURCE</th>
<th>CLIENT_LOC</th>
<th>EMPLOYABILITY</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>SCHOOLING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CDES_PERM</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>OWN_HOME</td>
<td>EMPLOYABLE</td>
<td>SALES_CLER</td>
<td>HIGH_3_5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CDES_PERM</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>OWN_HOME</td>
<td>EMPLOYABLE</td>
<td>SALES_CLER</td>
<td>HIGH_3_5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CDES_PERM</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>OWN_HOME</td>
<td>EMPLOYABLE</td>
<td>PROF_MANAG</td>
<td>UNIV_GRAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CDES_PERM</td>
<td>LAWYER</td>
<td>OWN_HOME</td>
<td>EMPLOYABLE</td>
<td>SALES_CLER</td>
<td>HIGH_3_5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CDES_PERM</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>OWN_HOME</td>
<td>EMPLOYABLE</td>
<td>SALES_CLER</td>
<td>HIGH_3_5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CDES_PERM</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>OWN_HOME</td>
<td>EMPLOYABLE</td>
<td>SALES_CLER</td>
<td>HIGH_3_5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CASE TYPE: ADOPT_PEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>PROB_PRES</th>
<th>REFER_SOURCE</th>
<th>CLIENT_LOC</th>
<th>EMPLOYABILITY</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>SCHOOLING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CDES_PERM</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>OWN_HOME</td>
<td>EMPLOYABLE</td>
<td>PROF_MANAG</td>
<td>UNIV_GRAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJR</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CDES_PERM</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>OWN_HOME</td>
<td>EMPLOYABLE</td>
<td>PROF_MANAG</td>
<td>UNIV_GRAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJ</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CDES_PERM</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>OWN_HOME</td>
<td>EMPLOYABLE</td>
<td>PROF_MANAG</td>
<td>UNIV_GRAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CDES_PERM</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>OWN_HOME</td>
<td>EMPLOYABLE</td>
<td>PROF_MANAG</td>
<td>SUME_UNIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJ</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CDES_PERM</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>OWN_HOME</td>
<td>EMPLOYABLE</td>
<td>PROF_MANAG</td>
<td>UNIV_GRAD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CASE TYPE: CHLD_IN_C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>PROB_PRES</th>
<th>REFER_SOURCE</th>
<th>CLIENT_LOC</th>
<th>EMPLOYABILITY</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>SCHOOLING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>CCRE_PERM</td>
<td>RELATIVE</td>
<td>OWN_HOME</td>
<td>UNEMP_OHER</td>
<td>N_A</td>
<td>HIGH_3_5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CCRE_PERM</td>
<td>OTHER_AGENCY</td>
<td>OWN_HOME</td>
<td>UNEMP_OHER</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>HIGH_1_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>OTHER_AGENCY</td>
<td>INSTITUTION</td>
<td>UNEMP_OHER</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLE</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CCRE_PERM</td>
<td>RELATIVE</td>
<td>FOSTR_HOMME</td>
<td>UNEMP_OHER</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAV</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>PAR_CH_RL</td>
<td>RELATIVE</td>
<td>FOSTR_HOMME</td>
<td>UNEMP_OHER</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CDES_PERM</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>RELATIVE</td>
<td>INSTITUTION</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>N_A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>RELATIVE</td>
<td>INSTITUTION</td>
<td>INEMP_OHER</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>N_A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>NUTRITION</td>
<td>RELATIVE</td>
<td>INSTITUTION</td>
<td>INEMP_OHER</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>N_A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>CCRE_TEMP</td>
<td>RELATIVE</td>
<td>OWN_HOME</td>
<td>UNEMP_OHER</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>N_A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CCRE_TEMP</td>
<td>RELATIVE</td>
<td>OWN_HOME</td>
<td>UNEMP_OHER</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>N_A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>CCRE_PERM</td>
<td>OTHER_AGENCY</td>
<td>FOSTR_HOMME</td>
<td>UNEMP_OHER</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>N_A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CCRE_TEMP</td>
<td>RELATIVE</td>
<td>INSTITUTION</td>
<td>INEMP_OHER</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>N_A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>CCRE_TEMP</td>
<td>OTHER_AGENCY</td>
<td>FOSTR_HOMME</td>
<td>UNEMP_OHER</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>ELEMNTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>CCRE_TEMP</td>
<td>RELATIVE</td>
<td>FOSTR_HOMME</td>
<td>UNEMP_OHER</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>ELEMNTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CCRE_TEMP</td>
<td>RELATIVE</td>
<td>FOSTR_HOMME</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>CCRE_TEMP</td>
<td>RELATIVE</td>
<td>FOSTR_HOMME</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## All Clients by Case Type and Worker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE TYPE</th>
<th>Jean Jarvis Count Case No</th>
<th>June Emmott Count Case No</th>
<th>Libby Kelly Count Case No</th>
<th>Mary Paisley Count Case No</th>
<th>7___ Count Case No</th>
<th>Subtotal Count Case No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fam_Serv</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Par</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Par</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single_High</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt_Pend</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt_App</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt_Hme</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fost_Pend</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fost_Appr</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child_In_C</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmar_High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hlth_Inst</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7___</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>191</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>508</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### All Closed Cases by Closing Reason and Case Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE TYPE</th>
<th>CLOSING REASON</th>
<th>OTHER COUNT</th>
<th>CLIENT CASE NO</th>
<th>COMPLETE CASE NO</th>
<th>WORKER CASE NO</th>
<th>REFERRED CASE NO</th>
<th>? CASE NO</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL CASE NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAM_SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA_SING</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA_CPLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA_2PAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA_IPAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA_CHILD</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA_MINC</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADOPT_PEN</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADOPT_APP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADOPT_HME</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOST_PEND</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOST_APPR</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILD_IN_C</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUTKPAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLTH_INST</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPIA</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?---------</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Elapsed Time**: 00:00:50.856 sec.
**ASAP CPU Time**: 00:00:04.055 sec.
**Sort CPU Time**: 00:00:00.213 sec.

No errors issued.

Execution terminated.
### ALL SOCIAL ALLOWANCE CLIENTS BY EMPLOYABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPLOYABILITY</th>
<th>SA_SING</th>
<th>SA_COUP</th>
<th>SA_2PAR</th>
<th>SA_1PAR</th>
<th>SA_CHILD</th>
<th>SA_MING</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYABLE</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMP_AGE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMP_SEC_EMU</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMP_PHYSIC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMP_MENTAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMP_MOTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMP_OTHER</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## All Social Allowance Clients by Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>SA_SING</th>
<th>SA_COUP</th>
<th>SA_2PAR</th>
<th>SA_1PAR</th>
<th>SA_CHILD</th>
<th>SA_MINC</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF_MANAG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALES_CLER</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAFT_PROD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIM_LABOR</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSEWIFE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RETIRED</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N_A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>?</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ALL EMPLOYABLE SOCIAL ALLOWANCE CLIENTS BY OCCUPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>SOCIAL ALLOWANCE TYPE</th>
<th>SA_SING COUNT</th>
<th>SA_COUP COUNT</th>
<th>SA_2PAR COUNT</th>
<th>SA_1PAR COUNT</th>
<th>SA_CHILD COUNT</th>
<th>SA_MINC COUNT</th>
<th>OTHER COUNT</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROF_MANAG</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALES_CLER</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAFT_PROD</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIM_LABOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housewife</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retired</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.a</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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