UC Berkeley

Title

An Overview of Program Evaluation Activity in Rehabilitation Services programs: Current Status nd the Problems Ahead

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0vw00096

Author

Collignon, Frederick C.

Publication Date

1973-02-01

AN OVERVIEW OF

PROGRAM EVALUATION ACTIVITY

IN REHABILITATION SERVICES PROGRAMS:

CURRENT STATUS AND THE PROBLEMS AHEAD

Frederick C. Collignon

February 1973

Working Paper No. 207/RS019

Frederick C. Collignon, Project Director - Michael B. Tetiz, Principal Investigator

Project for Cost Benefit Analysis and Evaluation of Rehabilitation Services

PREFACE

In this paper I shall attempt to review the status of program evaluation activity within the vocational rehabilitation program, to describe probable future directions, and to identify problems lying ahead and possible solutions. The focus shall primarily be upon the organizational aspects of evaluation activity rather than the research aspects. The perspective is that of an individual who has been intensely involved at the Federal, state, and client organization levels and who is more concerned with the impact and long-run structure of the rehabilitation program than with the advancement of an academic discipline or the "science" of evaluation, or with the growth or survival of existing rehabilitation agencies.

This paper was prepared for and presented to the Symposium on Evaluation and Research sponsored by the A.R.C.A. division at the national meetings of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, in San Diego, California, on February 11, 1973. The paper was originally titled "An Overview of Program Evaluation Activity in Rehabilitation Services Programs: Where We Are, Where We're Going, and the Problems Ahead."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. THE STATUS OF CURRENT EVALUATION ACTIVITY

Societal Backdrop

The 1960's witnessed a phenomenal innovation and expansion of
public sector activity in social programs. The 1970's in contrast appear
to be a decade in which society reviews past experience, attempts to im-
prove the management of programs, and seeks to weed out programs and
strategies which have not proven effective. The sense that programs
have not worked is shared not only by politicians, the taxpayers, and
the citizens who were to be the beneficiaries of programs, but also in-
creasingly by university researchers, Federal and state government ad-
ministrators, and the professionals who were the vehicle for carrying
out programs.[1]

The timing of this shift in public attitude is rather unfortunate
for those of us in the rehabilitation field. As the H.R. 8395 legisla-
tion clearly indicated, those concerned with the needs of the disabled
have finally concerted their efforts and desire a dramatic transformation
and expansion of the rehabilitation program into new areas. The veto
message which at least temporarily derailed the movement reflected the
growing public concern for accountability, examining costs in relation-
ship to benefits, and gradualism in implementing new programs and program
strategies. Although rehabilitation professionals have been confident
that the rehabilitation model is one which "works" and which can be

---

[1]Alice Rivlin, Systematic Thinking for Social Action, (Washington D.C.:
Brookings Institution, 1971).

expanded to new client populations, others outside the profession have been more skeptical. Nasty questions have been raised inside the Administration and also by Congress. How stable is the employment of rehabilitants? Why are the earnings of many rehabilitants so low that they still qualify as members of the poor? What kinds of programs and services are needed by the severely disabled and what will be the costs? How indeed does one define the severely disabled? Are follow-up services really justified in terms of benefits to society? Are services responsive to consumer-perceived needs, or only to consumer needs as defined by professionals? Are workshops more effective than subsidized on-the-job training or job creation as a manpower policy for meeting the needs of the disabled? Is a Federal program really necessary for rehabilitation, or could general block grants to the states achieve better or the same results? Are rehabilitation programs more effectively administered by categorical program bureaus, multifunctional social service agencies, or comprehensive manpower agencies?

Program evaluation has been one of the principal vehicles by which Federal policymakers and the elected governors of society appear to be testing the programs launched in the 1960's. Evaluation provides information on the public record which can be used by friends and foes of the program alike.[2] Thus, a mandate has emerged increasingly in legislation

---

[2]It is revealing that critics of the S.S.T. program in Congress relied for much of their information during hearings on a series of studies which had been completed in-house by various Administrations. Similarly, the debates over revisions of the welfare program, over busing programs, and over various educational manpower programs have found critics and proponents citing evaluation studies contracted by the government agencies sponsoring the programs.

In social programs sponsored by government, there are no profit statements or market-revealed behaviors to guide decisions on resource allocation. Evaluation findings in many ways serve as substitutes for such information, as do political pressures from interest groups and lobbies.

for ongoing evaluation to determine the actual effects of program inter-
ventions, to relate program benefits to the resource costs incurred by
programs, and to determine how to make programs function more effectively
and efficiently.

In turn, program managers have begun to stress program evaluation.
They have observed that evaluation evidence will be necessary to justify
requests for increased funds and new program authority to legislators,
bureaus of the budget, and -- in some states -- superiors in the multi-
functional superagencies that are the trend in state government reorganiza-
tions. They have less often observed that evaluation may be necessary to
provide the information necessary for good planning and management, to
discover ways to improve program performance, to justify management in-
itiatives to field staff, and to anticipate problems that might arise to
embarrass the program or at least to hamper program performance.

The great achievement represented by Congress' unanimous passage
of HR8395 last year revealed both the failure and the success of those
concerned with evaluation in the rehabilitation field. Time and again,
when the nasty questions were asked, there were few evaluation studies or

---

It could be argued that much of the thrust toward separating the eval-
uation function from line management, toward upgrading the academic cre-
dentials of evaluation staff, and toward monitoring the quality of evalua-
tion studies, represents an effort to "professionalize" the conduct of
evaluation. If evaluators were to look to academic and research audiences,
rather than agency directors and program managers, as their peers for de-
termining proper standards and judging the worth of their activity, the
quality and integrity of their findings might be improved. Then, program
outsiders could feel more confident that they are not being given data
subjected to self-interested agency manipulation or "fudging." The eval-
uator thus might perform a role akin to the C.P.A. who audits and certifies
a corporation's profit statement as accurately representing the organiza-
tion's financial status, in keeping with "proper" accounting procedures.

policy analyses to provide the answers.[3] Indeed, most of the innovative

aspects of the legislation were based on the widespread perception of

need, not on research or evaluative findings that the kinds of programs

authorized could be easily implemented or would necessarily be successful.

If the legislation were passed today, many state agencies and, I suspect,

R.S.A. and S.R.S. would find it very difficult to state what kinds of

services are actually needed by the severely disabled to achieve various

goals, to estimate the costs of these services, or to propose how most

efficiently to deliver these services. The definition of "severely dis-

abled" used in the legislation -- one based on costs of service and the

length of time in the rehabilitation process -- has quietly but widely

and rightly been criticized as possibly creating incentives for inef-

ficiency, favoring college-bound middle class clients, and dodging the

question of identifying those clients whose needs have been most neglected

in the past by rehabilitation programs.

On the other hand, the fact that Congress was willing to pass

the legislation in spite of the inability of those in the rehabilitation

program to answer the nasty questions is a tribute to the confidence

which the public has in the ability and integrity of those in the

---

[3]The otherwise excellent two-part survey of evaluation of rehabilitation
services in Rehabilitation Literature by Heferlin and Katz in 1971 is
insightful here. Although the authors note that costs and the relation-
ship of output to costs is a primary concern of evaluation, they do not
subsequently discuss this aspect of the many evaluation studies they re-
view. Their orientation toward evaluative research rather than program
evaluation is apparent throughout their survey. They are concerned with
the existence of effect and the ascription of causality to program inter-
vention, not with efficiency or how to increase program effect. The latter
are the principal concerns of the program decision-maker, however. If
there is no effect, how can effect be achieved? If there is some effect,
does it warrant the resources expended, and could the same resources deployed
differently produce even more effect? cf. Elizabeth A. Heferlin and Alfred
H. Katz, "Issues and Orientations in the Evaluation of Rehabilitation Pro-
grams: A Review Article," Rehabilitation Literature, 32, Part I (March,
1971), pp. 66-73, and Part II (April, 1971), pp. 98-106.

rehabilitation agencies. The passage signalled trust that the rehabilitation program, confronted with new challenges, would be able to respond effectively, just as the program had done over previous decades in expanding to serve those with mental disabilities and behavioral disorders. What was not currently known by program professionals would be learned quickly. This trust was built, at least in part, on evaluation efforts over the years which had consistently shown that rehabilitation programs were effective and that the economic benefits of rehabilitation programs greatly exceeded costs, whether measured from society's or the taxpayer's perspective.

Federal Agencies

In response to the increased concern in both the executive and legislative branches for accountability, and because of the challenges being confronted in program development, both R.S.A. and S.R.S. have in recent years given much more attention to program evaluation. R.S.A. has apparently been the catalyst in this shift. The reorganization of R.S.A. in 1970-71 featured the establishment within the Commissioner's office of a locus of responsibility for evaluating the overall program and for the development of evaluation methodology and approaches which could subsequently be used by state agencies. Simultaneously, a division was created under an Assistant Commissioner for Program Management which had the mandate both to monitor the performance of state agencies and special programs on an ongoing basis using R-300 and routinely-generated program data, and also to assist state agencies in developing their capabilities for program monitoring and evaluation. Both organizational units have given higher priority to state agency needs for evaluation in improving management, developing new program strategies, and assessing

performance, than to the research interests of universities. A set of
outside evaluation projects were funded which may form the core of efforts
to upgrade the evaluation capability of state agencies. A series of
short-term training conferences for state agency staff are also imminent.

More recently, S.R.S. has apparently begun to include program
evaluation on its research agenda in the rehabilitation field. The re-
gional offices have been especially vociferous in their pleading for more
assistance to the state programs in program evaluation. Most promisingly,
several of the R&T centers have expressed interest in moving into the
area of program evaluation to provide technical assistance and training
to state agencies. Finally, with R.S.A. support, the first graduate pro-
gram specifically for training program evaluators and policy analysts for
rehabilitation services programs has been established at the University
of California, Berkeley.

State Agencies

In response to the increasing demand for program evaluation in
recent years, state rehabilitation agencies have also begun to sponsor
formal evaluation activity. A recently completed survey of all state
general rehabilitation agencies[4] determined that 72% of the state agencies
had formally designated an organizational component with the primary re-
sponsibility for program evaluation. Larger state programs invariably
had such units, while smaller state agencies had difficulty apparently
in supporting such activity. Evaluation units are usually small; in
only 17% of the general agencies were more than three man-years devoted

_____

[4]Susan Shea Ridge, A Survey of Program Evaluation Activity in State
Agencies for Vocational Rehabilitation and the Blind, Institute of Urban
and Regional Development, University of California, Berkeley. Working
Paper -- forthcoming March, 1973.

to evaluation, and in a third of the states having evaluation components less than a man-year was allocated. Thus, half of all state agencies are apparently devoting less than a man-year to program evaluation.

Evaluation staff are comprised primarily of rehabilitation counselors promoted through the ranks. Only 45% of the state agencies reported that some of their staff has specific training in program evaluation, and only a few agencies reported that at least one of their staff had a formal background in economics, statistics, law, public or business administration, or even "research." Nor did most agencies ever employ consultants for evaluation. In only half of the states were district administrators involved in setting priorities, planning study designs, or interpreting the results of evaluation. Counselors were consulted in such activities by merely a quarter of the agencies, and in only five states were client groups or representatives ever involved.

An extensive exploration of the kinds of evaluation conducted by agencies revealed great disparity among states. Most agencies appeared to focus evaluation primarily upon traditional measures of program performance: costs per rehabilitation, rehabilitations per counselor or man-year, percentage of referrals accepted for service, percentage of clients accepted for service who are rehabilitated, and time in process. A mere 18 states (37%) reported calculating benefit-cost ratios. Only 37% of agencies reported that they routinely broke down costs and performance measures by disability groups, 43% reported that they had never conducted follow-up studies, and a mere six states claimed to have developed measures of nonemployment-related benefits. More promisingly, eleven states reported using control groups of some kind.

It was apparent from the questionnaires, however, that states varied widely in their use of evaluation terms. The language of "control

groups," "program evaluation," "monitoring," "efficiency," "discounting,"
etc. conveyed different meanings to different agencies.[5] For example,
when copies of follow-up studies were requested from those state agencies
which had reported conducting such studies, only a few states were able
to return completed studies which in fact surveyed the post-closure em-
ployment of rehabilitants. "Follow-up studies" were interpreted by
several agencies to mean that the agency had monitored employment for
at least three months prior to closure.

In summary, the survey revealed clearly that state agencies were
moving quickly into program evaluation and recognized a need to do even
more. But there was no common understanding across states of what pro-
gram evaluation activity should comprise. Agencies in returning question-
naires frequently would plead for help on methodology and in-service
training for their staff.

The 1972 I.R.S.

The interest and confusion of the state agencies concerning pro-
gram evaluation was well illustrated by the Prime Study Group of the
1972 Institute on Rehabilitation Services, of which I was a member. The
Institute (I.R.S.) is a unique institution among social programs. Each
year, state agencies identify critical problem areas needing investiga-
tion and the development of guidelines or training materials to assist
agencies in improving their performance. A Prime Study Group is then
assembled by drawing agency personnel across many state agencies. Ad-
ministrators, supervisors, university people, and occasionally counselors
participate within the study groups, R.S.A., Federal regional office,

---

[5]Confusion is compounded, moreover, by the traditional use of the word
"evaluation" in the rehabilitation field to mean "work evaluation," i.e.,
the assessment of a client's work skills and employment potential.

and state agency perspectives are all represented, although the dominant voice is that of the state agencies. Thus, a mechanism comes into existence for trying to identify solutions to problems, which draws on the expertise and wisdom of all segments of the program (with the exception of client groups). This process of developing proposals from "within" the program bequeathes a legitimacy to proposals which imposed Federal mandates cannot achieve.

In 1972, it was determined that one of the study groups of the I.R.S. would focus upon program evaluation. This decision was unique, because previously I.R.S. groups had focused solely upon topics of concern to field management and counselors (e.g. case closure criteria, principles for first-line supervision, the role of support personnel). Program evaluation, in contrast, involved broad-level policy questions of interest -- it was believed by study group participants -- primarily to central office staff, the agency director, and Federal program people. Similarly, previous I.R.S. groups had sought to develop training materials for use by universities and in-service training programs. The evaluation study group would be drafting a document more akin to a policy issues paper, a set of suggested guidelines to state agencies, a document having as prime audience the state director and a few central office staff.

When the I.R.S. study group on program evaluation gathered together, it set itself a humble set of goals. The members of the study group conceded that they were not experts on program evaluation nor were they in agreement on what program evaluation should comprise. We decided to prepare a pre-primer on evaluation, rather than a set of guidelines or a how-to-do-it manual. It was hoped that this pre-primer would help central office staff in understanding what evaluation was about and, most importantly, why they should be concerned with program evaluation. The

difficult task of developing detailed suggestions on how to conduct program evaluation would be left to later I.R.S. or other study groups.

In the preparation and subsequent reviews of the study report, the differences in perception of the role of program evaluation which exists in the rehabilitation field among state agencies and those in the program evaluation field, and which I would argue are mirrored in most other social program areas, became very evident.

I would like to review briefly these differences in perceptions (or emphases), because they are suggestive of the kinds of conflicts which may emerge in future years between evaluators and line staff, between evaluators in different state agencies or even within the same agency, and between Federal and state program evaluators. In outlining the differences I shall also try to convey some of the important points raised in the reports. I would like to encourage everyone concerned with program evaluation in the rehabilitation field to consult the actual I.R.S. report.[6] I believe that it represents an excellent starting point for seeking to understand what program evaluation is all about and how to

---

[6]Tenth Institute on Rehabilitation Services, Program Evaluation: A Beginning Statement (Social and Rehabilitation Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, May, 1972). The report is also available from the West Virginia Research and Training Center, which sponsored the I.R.S. study group. Also the following papers may be of interest: Frederick C. Collignon, Adam Zawada, Barbara Thompson, and Joel Markowitz, Guidelines and Criteria for Evaluating Vocational Rehabilitation Programs: A Discussion Paper for the Prime Study Group on Program Evaluation, Tenth Institute on Rehabilitation Services, Institute of Urban and Regional Development, University of California, Berkeley, Working Paper No. 173/RS003, April, 1972; Frederick Collignon and Barbara Thompson, The Evaluation Process in State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies, Institute of Urban and Regional Development, University of California, Berkeley, Working Paper No. 179/RS007, June, 1972; and Pat F. Sutherland, "Program Evaluation in Social Action Programs," State of Texas Commission for the Blind, 1971.

proceed within state agencies. Moreover, the report strongly reflects a state agency perspective rather than a Federal or university perspective. My own hope, which I believe is shared by other members of the study group, is that the report will stimulate interest and debate over program evaluation and will lead to much more Federal and state effort in the evaluation area.

1. <u>Purpose of Evaluation.</u> The study report reflects several different orientations on why agencies should engage in program evaluation. The first chapter on "Why Do It?" emphasizes both the legislative and administrative concern for accountability and the general need for evaluation to determine how to achieve the new mandates which the rehabilitation program is being given. This last concern is really one of planning, policy formulation and program development. The second chapter emphasizes the need for evaluation in organizational development -- a concern for better management and performance. Elsewhere in the report are images of evaluation as being a vehicle for producing innovation and change within the program.

All of these reasons for program evaluation are valid but they do suggest different roles for the evaluator. A primary orientation toward accountability can result in the evaluator being seen as an auditor, as the "conscience of the agency," or as a public relations arm of the agency producing the reports necessary to convince the legislature to appropriate more funds. An orientation toward using evaluation to determine how better to respond to mandates to serve new client populations or address new program objectives (e.g. nonvocational goals) sees the evaluator as a planner and policy analyst. Assessing current program performance becomes but one aspect of the evaluator's function. An orientation toward organizational development sees the evaluator as a problem-solving and

advice-giving specialist who provides feedback and staff support to line
management and conducts research and proposes solutions to problems iden-
tified by management. An orientation toward evaluation as an instrument
of innovation, an approach which is also consistent with organizational
development, sees the evaluator as a change-agent or gadfly who identifies
problems for the organization and acts as a catalyst in moving the organ-
ization to address and solve those problems.

   2. Methods. The report presents a shopping list of methods which
can be used by evaluators and attempts to describe the kinds of information
which different methods are most useful in providing. The list ranges from
statistical methods such as multiple regression and nonparametric statis-
tics, to "softer" techniques such as the Delphi technique, public hearings,
and consumer advisory panels. What is lacking to some extent in the report
is an overall focus on how to set up problems for formal analysis, some
overview on what comprehensive program evaluation would look like. Thus,
techniques which are useful primarily as management tools (e.g. PERT) and
broad styles of program planning and analysis (e.g. PPBS, systems analysis)
are lumped together with experimental design and benefit-cost analysis,
without establishing for the lay reader an understanding of the relation-
ship of the methods.

   This eclectic handling of method reflects the fact that agencies
and researchers in the rehabilitation field have been moving into evalua-
tion fairly independently, on a problem-by-problem basis, and without a
common model of what constitutes an "ideal" comprehensive evaluation system
for an organization. Since needs for evaluation may well differ among
agencies and since there is increasing disagreement among the so-called
"experts" concerning the scope and style of program evaluation, the eclec-
ticism of the state agencies may well be both desirable and inevitable.

3. <u>Utilization</u>. A striking innovation in the I.R.S. report is a chapter on the utilization of evaluation findings by agencies. It is one thing to establish that current program performance is not up to desired standards, it is another thing to determine why, and it is still another challenge to be able to change behavior and improve program performance.

The frustrating experience in many non-rehabilitation programs and in those state rehabilitation agencies which are more advanced in their program evaluation activity is that many evaluation studies remain "on the shelf" and do not lead to policy initiatives, revised resource allocation, or even decisions by program directors. Even when evaluation studies have produced decisions and actions directed at producing change, change has been hard to achieve. The implementation of change has emerged as a major problem in its own right.

The problems of utilization and implementation usually have received attention only after evaluation activity has gone on for several years. The attention often is coupled with cynicism on the part of line managers and even evaluators that anything can be done. Because a whole series of planning and management techniques were oversold in the 1960's as "cure-alls" for program shortcomings -- program budgeting, benefit-cost analysis, operations research, systems analysis, management-by-objectives, program evaluation, and now policy analysis -- cynicism is rampant in many program areas concerning the prospects of program improvement as a result of internal organizational analysis and initiative. The fact that rehabilitation agencies are moving into program evaluation with an awareness of the problems of utilization from the outset is thus very encouraging. False hopes may be avoided, patience developed, and greater long-run impact achieved.

However, although university researchers are giving increasing attention to the problems of utilization and the implementation of change and some theory has emerged, clear and proven guidelines do not yet exist. In the meantime, guidelines on utilization are necessarily eclectic, based on practical experience, and belonging more to folk wisdom than science. It does seem clear that the guidelines which will eventually emerge will emphasize participation and the process of conducting evaluations more than the collection, analysis, and presentation of data.[7] The chapter in the I.R.S. report is an excellent summary of what has been learned to date in the area of research utilization.

4. Staffing. The report emphasizes that both field experience and analytical skills are needed in evaluation units within state agencies. Most state agencies staff their units now primarily with individuals who have come up from the counselor ranks. They would rely on in-service training programs to provide the analytical skills necessary for evaluation to these former counselors. Only a few agencies emphasize formal academic training for their evaluation staffs. Balance is clearly needed. In my judgment, however, it is simply not true that the creative ability to identify policy, program, and resource allocation issues and to formulate those issues in ways appropriate for analysis and decision-making is something which can routinely be acquired in a short-term training course. Moreover, many years of experience in counseling can develop loyalties and ways of looking at the program which inhibit the self-critical, curious question-raising which is essential to effective program evaluation. At the same time, the ability to gain rapport and trust

_____
[7]Cf. Glenn Siebert, Implementation of Evaluation and the Systems Approach in Government: A Literature Survey and Conceptual Model, Institute of Urban and Regional Development, University of California, Berkeley, Working Paper No. 201/RS016, January, 1973.

and to communicate effectively with agency staff at all levels is necessary if evaluator wishes to have his analysis affect the program. Some individuals with extensive technical training find these interpersonal skills difficult to master. Similarly, there may be a tendency for such individuals to be hypercritical and insensitive to the problems which are experienced by counselors and program managers. I would therefore conclude that short-term training programs need to focus on interpersonal and organizational skills as well as research methods, administration, planning, and analysis. I also believe that state agencies need to expand their staff recruitment to include more evaluation specialists (or rather, generalists in public administration and policy).

5. <u>Content and Focus of Evaluation</u>. Those in the rehabilitation field currently do not agree on what kinds of activities constitute or should receive priority in program evaluation. Most state agencies, especially the smaller states and those just moving into the evaluation area, perceive program evaluation as primarily case review. Other state agencies, which have been engaged in evaluation activity longer, perceive program evaluation primarily in terms of the analysis of case flow. They review changes in the balance of various statuses within the case load, monitor overall acceptance and rehabilitation rates, and frequently focus on attempting to expedite total client movement through the system as the best way to maximize the number of rehabilitations produced in a fiscal year. A few state agencies perceive program evaluation as concerned with assessing the impact of the program upon clients, analyzing the relationship of impact to the kinds and costs of services delivered, and determining more effective ways to allocate resources and meet client needs. Finally, there is the university perspective, which tends to equate program evaluation with "evaluative research," the effort to understand the

causal relationship between program intervention and changes in the client's situation, using scientific methods of research such as experimental design.

Each of these perceptions of program evaluation is associated with different emphases on what is organizationally required to launch effective program evaluation. The case review advocates emphasize the development of clear agency policies and standards for casework, the training of teams of auditors (usually former counselors) to go into the field to sample and review case folders, and the expanded role of the first-line supervisor in monitoring the record-keeping and casework of the counselors under his authority. The case flow analysts emphasize the development of management information systems which can routinely generate statistics on case movement, compare performance against standards, and identify counselors, field offices, or cases where performance is remiss. Both perspectives tend to accept at face value the validity of the 26 closure as a measure of successful program performance in dealing with a client. In contrast, those concerned with the impact of the program tend to look more often at the change in client earnings, employment, and other behaviors. They are more likely to be concerned with the conduct of follow-up studies, the comparison of alternative program strategies and (unfortunately) program success rates in dealing with different kinds of clients, and the cost-effectiveness of programs. Generally, they tend either to view the evaluator as preferably totally segregated from other functions of state programs, or alternatively, to see the evaluation function as so interrelated with planning and budgeting functions that they cannot view the evaluation function as distinct from these other functions. The university researcher, and there are some evaluators in state agencies who identify primarily with this role,

sees evaluation as primarily an activity of research and keeping the program "honest" about the extent to which its intervention was actually responsible for client outcomes. How to use evaluation findings to improve program performance is perceived by the university researcher as the task of the agency director and line management, not the evaluator.

These depictions of perceptions, of course, represent archetypes. Most evaluators have concerns that range across these archetypes. I believe, however, that the archetypes do fairly represent the different dominant approaches to program evaluation represented by individuals and state agencies.

In trying to synthesize these perspectives, the I.R.S. study group reached what some have called an unsatisfactory compromise. The study group united in agreement that one of the principal goals of the group's report should be to convince state agencies that case review was not the end-all of program evaluation. Indeed, the study report goes so far as to deny that case review is properly an activity of a program evaluation unit. Rather, case review is depicted as a function of line management. The study report includes all the other activities as legitimately part of the program evaluation function, without trying to set priorities. The concern of the university perspective for "scientific" research standards, control groups, experimental design, and imputing causally is somewhat downgraded. The discussion of methods tends to emphasize case flow analysis rather than analysis of the relationship of program inputs to outputs or an assessment of the overall impact of the program.

The reaction to the published report by others has also reflected the varying definitions of evaluation prevailing within the rehabilitation field. Smaller state agencies or agencies just moving into rehabilitation

have sometimes condemned the report for being too ambitious in its guide-
lines and providing no suggestions on how to improve performance in that
evaluation activity which they perceive as having first priority: case
review. Individuals in agencies with more developed evaluation activities
have criticized the report as too conservative and placing too much em-
phasis on improving management rather than assessing the success of the
program in achieving its objectives. Those in the universities and in
some sections of R.S.A. have criticized the report both for its lack of
sophistication in presenting evaluation methodology, and for its primary
focus on the role of program evaluation in improving agency performance,
rather than in protecting the interests of the client and the public.

     6. Evaluation Criteria. Throughout the development of the I.R.S.
report, the greatest disagreements arose over efforts to develop or even
give examples of evaluation criteria and standards. The report does
argue strongly the deficiencies both of the 26 closure as a measure of
program impact and of the use of unweighted aggregates of 26 closures
to judge state or district performance. The report does not present al-
ternative indicators or standards of success, however, except perhaps for
an emphasis on change in client earnings as a preferable measure of im-
pact as compared to the 26 closure.

     The reasons for this forebearance are several. First, any attempt
to recommend alternative indicators implicitly requires a definition of
the goals of the program. In the rehabilitation field, we disagree among
ourselves on goals, or at least on the priority among goals. The concern
of the new legislation with nonvocational goals or at least with develop-
mental goals where employment is a coveted, but distant objective in time,
suggests that these disagreements will increasingly surface in the future.

Second, those in the evaluation field disagree on the right of the evaluator to suggest goals and standards. Many agency staff, as good organization-men respecting the chain of command, believe that the definition of goals and the choice of standards for evaluating a given program performance are the prerogatives of the state agency director. Others, usually with more academic backgrounds, refuse to make judgments on the worth or goals of programs because such judgments rely on value statements and thus fall beyond the scope of science and their domain of expertise. They perceive that their task is to obtain from the director at the outset of a study the goals and standards to be used, and then to describe program performance in terms of these goals. Still others, myself included, perceive that organizations invariably resist setting explicit goals except at the most abstract level, and that one of the functions of evaluation is to help the organization discover the goals and tradeoffs among possible goals which are implicit in the organization's behavior.

Third, developing indicators, even when one has a firm sense of goals, is a very difficult conceptual task. We've done disturbingly little research on the development of indicators in the rehabilitation field, and thus we have few ideas, much less consensus, on alternative indicators to the 26 closure.

The guidelines on evaluation presented in the I.R.S. report do suggest give broad types of criteria for evaluating programs: client and community impact, higher-order program efficiency, program effectiveness, lower-order program efficiency, and program management. Specific criteria or standards are left to the agency to choose.

Case review is directed at evaluating program performance in terms of program management criteria. Individual cases are reviewed in terms of conformity of counselor actions to standards for professional practice set out in state manuals or policy pronouncements. The actual impact of services upon the client is not examined, except perhaps to note whether the closure status of the case appeared appropriate in view of the recorded information on the change in the client's situation.

Case flow analysis is directed at evaluating the program in terms of program input (e.g., the turnover of clients within various statuses, the overall balance among statuses within caseloads, costs of services per status change or over some unit of time). The criteria are those of lower-order program efficiency and program management.

Overall program impact assessment is directed at the other three types of criteria. This type of activity tries to analyze program output and relate output to program input.

At the simplest level, most state agencies monitor the total number of rehabilitations per year, per counselor, and per 100,000 base population. These measurements represent an evaluation of program effectiveness. Unfortunately, such evaluation accepts at face value the validity of the 26 closure status as a measure of rehabilitation and thus program impact, even though the placement of a client in that status is based often on highly judgmental and arbitrary decisions by counselors. Moreover, the 26 closure measure fails to provide information on the quality of rehabilitation or the magnitude of improvement of the client's situation. The measure, unless adjusted, also fails to distinguish the relative difficulty of cases.

The evaluation of the program in terms of client and community impact represents a dramatic leap in the quality and sophistication of

an agency's program evaluation activity. The actual impact of the program upon the client which is hidden behind the 26 closure status becomes the focus of attention. The change in earnings, occupation, and other client functional capabilities receives much attention. Client evaluation of the usefulness and quality of services received may be directly solicited. The stability of program impact over time may be explored by follow-up studies of clients whose cases had been closed several years. Such studies may reveal increases in client earnings over the earnings level at closure which are attributable to program impact. Such studies may also reveal, however, that some clients have dropped out of employment or suffered a deterioration in homemaking capability due to worsening of disability, shifts in client motivation and morale, and perhaps the insufficiency and poor quality of the rehabilitation services received earlier.

The final phase of program impact assessment activity is the evaluation of the program in terms of higher-order efficiency. Only in this phase are final program outputs directly related to program inputs. At the simplest level, state agencies have routinely measured costs per 26 closure. This efficiency measure again suffers the limitation of accepting the closure status at face value. As agencies advance in sophistication, they may begin to substitute change in earnings for the 26 closure status as the output proxy in efficiency analysis. The program is then evaluated in terms of dollars of increased client earnings per dollar of program costs. Evaluation in terms of this criterion resembles, but is not the same as, benefit-cost analysis, which represents the most advanced form of evaluation currently practiced. Benefit-cost analysis looks at comprehensive social benefits rather than simply change in client earnings or benefits which can be given monetary values. Lifetime earnings changes are also examined rather than simply the observed immediate change in earnings. Also, social costs

are analyzed rather than solely the costs borne directly by the rehabilita-
tion program. The relationship of benefits to costs, expressed often in
terms of benefit-cost ratios, internal rates of return, payback periods, or
net present values, becomes the criterion for evaluating the program.

There is a further phase of program impact assessment identified
in the I.R.S. report which is fundamentally important: exploration of
the causal role of program services via experimental design and the use
of control groups. This type of evaluation, which university researchers
often consider the only type of valid evaluation, is called "evaluative
research" because of its use of "scientific" method and basic research
techniques. The operational difficulty of assembling experimental and
control groups, the questionable morality and the political difficulty
in denying control groups services, and the costs of such evaluation
studies have discouraged state agencies, the Federal government, and
university researchers from undertaking this phase of evaluation. Thus,
the question of what would have happened to clients in the absence of
services, remains unanswered. The extent to which rehabilitation ser-
vices actually "caused" the improvement in the client's situation is
not known. Pessimists and cynics might speculate that all observed im-
provements would have occurred anyway, even without services. Those
more sympathetic to the program maintain that the improvement observable
in a before-after comparison of the client's situation is directly (caus-
ally) attributable to program intervention and the receipt of services.

7. Participation and Process. The I.R.S. report emphasized the
need in program evaluation to involve counselors, field office super-
visors, and especially clients. All three groups are currently left
out of the process of deciding what problems should receive priority
for evaluation or analysis, interpreting the meaning of the findings

of data analysis, and formulating recommendations for agency action.
As a result, field staff too often view central office evaluators with
suspicion. Evaluators become seen as auditors or as the collectors and
generators of meaningless numbers. Too often, when field staff give
time and cooperate with central office evaluators, they never get to
see the final reports which are produced by the evaluation. Similarly,
the failure to involve clients often results in a superficial acceptance
of agency data and the 26 closure as meaningful performance indicators.
The quality of services, and of the rehabilitation process, and the mag-
nitude and stability of program impacts are often given less importance
by central office staff than might be the case if clients themselves
were to participate in evaluation. The I.R.S. report proposes that
client involvement be "maximized" in evaluation, and presents a long
list of the kinds of information which clients are uniquely in a position
to provide to a state agency.

Future Directions

In the next few years, several innovations can be anticipated,
if discussions with R.S.A. staff and others in state agencies and the
universities are to be believed. Of course, the changing priorities of
the new Administration may result in budget cutbacks and Federal re-
organizations which could upset anticipations.

1. Mechanisms for frequent interaction and exchanges of ideas
across state agencies and between state agencies, the universities, and
the Federal government need to be created. We have much to learn from
each other. In particular, various state agencies on their own have
developed evaluation approaches for particular program areas which have
apparently been very effective and which could serve as models for other

agencies. R.S.A., S.R.S., and perhaps N.R.A. should assume the responsibility for sponsoring such exchanges.

2. Many of the new program areas into which state agencies will be moving -- for example, programs serving the severely disabled, drug addicts, alcoholics, and other groups, or new efforts at meeting the nonvocational needs of clients -- require the development of basic evaluation methodology. Piecemeal evaluation efforts by agencies or demonstration projects usually cannot muster enough resources to provide adequate evaluation. What is needed is the joining of agencies and projects in developing and using a common evaluation design.[8] Such an approach would permit comparison of program experiences across projects and agencies, and thus yield more useful and reliable information. Again, R.S.A. or S.R.S. leadership is required.

3. Research is required on the development of new indicators to supplement the 26 closure and to measure the impact of the program on clients' needs other than employment. The call for revision of the R-300 and the provision of better information on a routine basis for evaluation has been sounded so often that the ear becomes deaf. Such revision remains a high priority need, however. R.S.A. and S.R.S. leadership is desirable, but the revision process must emphasize input from the state agencies. Several state agencies have shown that much can be done on agency initiative without waiting for Federal help in removing the burden of the current R-300 system.

---

[8] Several research efforts may serve as precedent. The tests for measuring psychological well-being being developed at the University of Wisconsin R.R.R.I. can routinely be used by state agencies at minimal costs, thus permitting comparison of agency performance in terms of a new indicator of client impact. Similarly, the benefit-cost and payback period models developed at the University of California, Berkeley, under R.S.A. funding, were programmed for easy and inexpensive use by state agencies.

4. Experimentation with weighted case closure is currently
being conducted in several states, and more will be done in the near
future. Most proposals involve weighting the traditional 26 closure
to reflect the difficulty of the case, rather than policy priority.[9]
The process of implementing weighted case closure in the ongoing manage-
ment and evaluation of counselor activities will require special atten-
tion. The impact of weighted case closure on counselor behavior will
need to be evaluated.

5. State agencies will require technical assistance and in-
service training and perhaps direct funding to develop evaluation cap-
ability. As always, more Federal funds will be called for. Leadership
here, in my judgment, belongs to the state agencies and the universities.
University personnel need to be more responsive to agency needs for in-
service training and to make themselves available for consultation.
State agencies should be more prepared to reallocate Section II funds
to evaluation, instead of relying solely on special funding. Unfortunate-
ly, past agency behavior suggests that many agencies will not innovate in
the evaluation area without the incentive of Federal funds.

6. Because of the difficulties in defining goals and measurable
indicators, new approaches to evaluation may be forthcoming which introduce

---

[9]Most state agencies experimenting with weighted case closure under R.S.A.
sponsorship appear to be using variations of the difficulty indices de-
veloped by Duane Sermon. Cf. Duane T. Sermon, "The Difficulty Index --
An Expanded Measure of Counselor Performance," State of Minnesota Depart-
ment of Vocational Rehabilitation, Research Monograph No. 1, March, 1972.
More recently, an alternative set of indices have been developed for pro-
gram evaluation at the University of California, Berkeley, and have been
used to evaluate programs in the states of California and Washington. Cf.
David E. Serot, Indices of Cost, Output and Productivity for Use in Eval-
uating Rehabilitation Services Programs, Institute of Urban and Regional
Development, University of California, Berkeley, Working Paper No. 187/
RS013, August, 1972; and Philip A. Armstrong, Program Analysis: Patterns
of Cost, Output, and Productivity Among Districts in a State Rehabilitation
Program, Institute of Urban and Regional Development, University of Califor-
nia, Berkeley, Working Paper No. 204, November, 1972.

the qualitative perspectives and the judgments of counselors and clients. Peer review, an approach currently in vogue in the health services field, may increasingly be used in state agencies. That is, counselors will review and critique the casework of fellow counselors. Peer approval and disapproval then becomes a major incentive to improved performance. The peer review approach presumes that what constitutes effective case-work or at least good professional practice is commonly understood and that professionals are best able to judge the work of other professionals. Unfortunately, experience in the health field suggests that professionals during peer review are often as concerned with protecting one another's autonomy and interests as with protecting the consumer's interests or increasing program effectiveness.

Other approaches similar to peer review but emphasizing the per-spective of the disabled client may be introduced in various places. The concern in the current Administration for simulating markets may result in demonstrations of voucher schemes where clients receive some choice in the selection of services and service providers. More likely, there will be more attention to client evaluations of services they receive. Such evaluation may at times be solicited by agencies via questionnaires, advisory panels, or structured encounters between counselors and clients. Given the emergence of more militant organizations of the disabled and the examples being set by consumer groups, Nader's Raiders, the Sierra Club, and organizations of the elderly and of welfare recipients, dis-abled clients may occasionally initiate their own evaluations of re-habilitation services.

7. More applied research on policy and program operations can be expected from the universities. This shift will reflect not only changing funding priorities by the Federal government, but also a general

trend in the university in many social science disciplines and professional schools to emphasize applied research, "relevance," and public policy. This trend, along with the specific training programs funded by S.R.S., will result in more trained generalists in program evaluation, planning, and public management being available for hiring by state agencies. At Berkeley, we are specifically encouraging applications from severely disabled students who are interested in careers as program analysts and policy planners, because we believe that the commitment of these individuals to careers in rehabilitation services programs will be greater than for non-disabled students. Disabled or not, the graduates coming out of the universities with this kind of training may bring a very different perspective into the agencies in which they eventually go, and hopefully will be a source of creative innovation and leadership in the program over the decades to come.

    8. In order to improve the quality and integrity of program evaluation, and to assist the program nationally in identifying when research has produced important findings which should influence policy and program management, reviews of major evaluation studies may be undertaken at the national level by panels of social scientists. Such reviews may be controversial but could increase the impact of evaluation research by increasing the confidence which decision-makers, especially those outside the rehabilitation program, have in research.

II.   PERSPECTIVES

A Functional Model of the Evaluation Process Within Organizations

Some of the differences among evaluators in defining the scope of program evaluation become more understandable when an organizational approach is taken to evaluation. During the evaluation process, a series of functions must be performed within an organization if the conduct of a program is to be "improved." The differences among evaluators to a great extent are disagreements in defining how many of the functions should be the concern of an evaluation unit.

Briefly, the functions can be described as follows.

Description. The first function to be performed in any evaluation effort is to describe what is currently happening in the program. This description includes enumeration of program output or client impact, the resources being expended on the program, and the actual process or operation of a program by which its outputs are produced. The description function includes the designation of indicators for possible program impact. Within the description function are included the traditional research tasks of sampling, data collection, and data analysis.

Understanding. This function requires the establishment of the relationship between program inputs and actions, on the one hand, and program outcomes, on the other hand. The attempt to establish causality through formal research design falls within the function of understanding. In the absence of control groups and experimental design, the researcher implicitly or explicitly relies on theory to posit causal relationships.

In any case, the understanding function is essential to identifying how the program produces its described outcomes, and thus to formulating recommendations.

Judgment. One of the core functions of evaluation is the judgment concerning whether described program outcomes are "good" or "bad," or "good enough" or "not good enough." The judgment function, which is considered outside the province of science by many researchers, implies a set of values and program objectives and the existence of standards. The judgment function is often left to the program administrator by the evaluator, even though administrators may also require help in determining what standards are appropriate for judging the worth of the outcomes which the evaluator has described and ascribed to the program. In making judgments, it is often difficult to determine who should be the client whose values or perspective should be used: the program director, the disabled consumer of services, the disabled target population, the taxpayer, the agency as an organization, "society," etc.[10]

Formulating Recommendations. Once a judgment is made, the challenge becomes to formulate meaningful recommendations for how program performance can be improved. The ability of the evaluator to be effective in this function is obviously dependent on the comprehensiveness and quality of the performance of the understanding function. Simply recommending that performance be improved is not meaningful. In most cases, the administrator will not know how to improve performance without more information from the evaluator. The evaluator must be able to identify whether the cause of poor program performance was poor implementation of program strategies, or the implementation of ineffective program strategies. If strategies

---

[10]Martin Rein, "Social Policy Analysis as the Interpretation of Beliefs," Journal of the American Institute of Planners (Sept., 1971), 297-310.

were poorly implemented, the administrator needs information on whether the poor implementation was due to insufficient resources, ill-trained personnel, poor supervision, inadequate support from central office, or other factors.

Selling Recommendations. Once the evaluator has convinced himself concerning the cause of poor program performance, and what needs to be done to improve performance in the future, he still must convince the administrator of his analysis and recommendations. In the literature on research utilization, this function is protrayed often as one of "selling" the administrator. Emphasis is placed on the presentation of evaluation findings, the rapport between administrator and evaluator, and the evaluator's ability to identify the organizational constraints upon the administrator so that recommendations focus on what is feasible instead of ultimately desirable.

It can be argued, in contrast, persuasion and participation are more necessary than selling. Only when the administrator (and indeed agency staff) come to understand in their own terms that current program performance is problematic and that something needs to be done, will the personal commitment to change emerge.

This alternative approach emphasizes that the kinds of evidence and process which are sufficient to convince the evaluator that particular kinds of change are needed are usually different in kind than the kinds of evidence which convince administrators and line staff. A rigorous statistical analysis is often only convincing to someone who has been socialized to think in terms of the logic of scientific method and indeed quantitative analysis. Program people may require different kinds of evidence, (e.g. case studies, opinion surveys, personal discussions or even confrontations with clients or field staff). The evaluator should

analyze carefully at the outset of the study the kinds of evidence which will be necessary to convince his administrator, rather than waiting to develop selling techniques when the study has been completed. One solution may be to involve the administrator in the design and conduct of the evaluation study.

The evaluator will also often not know enough about the operation of the program and the constraints confronting line staff at all levels to formulate truly viable recommendations. Again, what may be necessary is that a process be created where the line staff draw on their own resources and knowledge to assess current performance and to develop recommendations for improving their performance.

Implementation. Once a recommendation has been adopted, or at least a decision has been made, in response to an evaluation effort, it is still necessary to implement that decision effectively before program change can occur. Many agency staff still accept the image that an agency director's decisions, once issued, are routinely carried out. The experience in many agencies is quite the reverse: program directors find it difficult to change behavior in the program even when they have given firm directives.[11] One response on the part of management analysts has been to emphasize follow-through. Program directors are encouraged to assign the responsibility to a second party to monitor whether in fact the decision has been successfully implemented by the line manager given the responsibility of implementation. A second response has been to emphasize that the task of the executive is essentially to persuade and create incentives for line staff to carry out directives. In the

---

[11]My understanding of the problems of management and organizational innovation has been heavily influenced by the disparate work of Chester Barnard and Warren Bennis. Cf. Chester I. Barnard, Functions of the Executive (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1938), and Warren G. Bennis, Changing Organizations (N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1966).

evaluation field, the emphasis again is placed on the process of evalua-
tion. By involving the staff who would have to implement any recommen-
dation for change in the evaluation effort, the evaluator helps to (1)
convince the line staff of the need for the change, and (2) educate or
alternatively permit the line staff to determine on their own what needs
to be done to improve performance.

In traditional discussions of program evaluation in terms of
evaluative research, the functions of evaluation cease at description
and understanding. It is only the recognition that many evaluation
studies end up "on the shelf" that has brought increasing concern for
formulating and selling recommendations and implementation. Clearly,
the problem-solving or management-oriented approach to evaluation re-
quires that the evaluator give some attention to all six functions,
even if the primary responsibility for particular functions (e.g. judg-
ment, implementation) is ultimately assigned to others.

The concern for the functions of selling and implementing recom-
mendations and implementation also have led to a greater emphasis on
participation of line staff evaluation. Such participation also can
become important in judging program results, since what might be satis-
factory to administrators in terms of performance may not be satisfactory
to counselors or clients. Conflicts over objectives among the various
levels in a program system are the rule rather than the exception in
evaluation. Confrontations over values and objectives can be useful in
increasing the mutual understanding of individuals within an organization
and clarifying the obstacles before innovation and change. Participation
in the process of evaluation is a way of structuring confrontation.

Moreover, the participation can be useful in providing ideas concerning how to improve performance and in preparing agency staff for change.

A concern for implementation and the stages of formulating and selling recommendations also fundamentally changes how the description and understanding functions are to be carried out. If the evaluator waits until after a study is completed to gather the information for formulating recommendations, the recommendations he advances are likely to be based on empirically untested theory and best guesses by agency personnel. A concern for implementation requires that the evaluator attempt to speculate from the very outset of the study the kinds of rec-ommendations which the study might ultimately propose. Having engaged in this kind of speculation (akin to "contingency analysis"), the eval-uator is more likely to formulate questions for research investigation which are meaningful to policy and decision-making. The evaluator is also more likely after such analysis to specify the collection of the kinds of evidence or to structure a process of involvement during the evaluation which will facilitate the function of persuading the agency decision-maker and staff.

Emerging Conflicts

A series of conflicts or at least disagreements are likely to emerge among evaluators in the future, reflecting the issues we have raised in the previous discussions. The resolution of the conflicts will determine the definition of the scope and the impact of evaluation upon the rehabilitation program. I shall describe some of these possible conflicts briefly.

1. There is a major conflict brewing between the problem-solving, management-oriented approach to evaluation and the traditional research

orientation to evaluation.[12] The latter approach is often indifferent to the need to identify what was the cause of poor program performance or how program performance might be approved. The former approach is indifferent to formal scientific determinations of the causal impacts of program intervention; the manager's perspective and needs may be placed above those of the taxpayer and client. The problem-solving approach often tends to accept at face value the assignment of causality to the before-after comparisons of client situations following program interventions. The research approach remains deeply skeptical of the efficaciousness of any program. The problem-solving approach accepts that programs and organizations exist, and that any improvement probably involves incremental change that improves the effectiveness of existing organizations and programs. The research approach is more prone to identifying the need for major new program efforts without being able to identify specifically what those new efforts should be or how they can be politically or organizationally brought into being.

There is also a difference in the backgrounds of individuals who adopt problem-solving and research approaches. The researchers tend to come from the academic environs of psychology, sociology, education, and health. The problem-solvers tend to come from economics, political science, planning, public policy, public administration, and business administration. Both groups tend to be reformers and trouble-makers from the viewpoint of state agency administrators. But the problem-solvers tend to adopt recommendations in terms of the present constraints of existing legislation or organizations, while the researchers tend to admire the prophetic qualities of the nay-sayer who

---

[12]Cf. K.A. Archibald, "Alternative Orientations to Social Sciences Utilization," (Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, P-4294, Jan., 1970). Also in Social Science Information, 9 (April, 1970).

keeps the program honest and challenges the program and society to invent more effective strategies or programs for service delivery.

2. A conflict may also exist between those who narrowly define the role of evaluation to be the determination of current program impact and those who define evaluation to include as well research which seeks to anticipate the consequences of new programs and policies. This latter kind of anticipatory evaluation is sometimes called "policy analysis." Policy analysis often involves the computation of ballpark estimates of the need for services and the capacity of the existing program network to provide those services. Policy analysis similarly draws in eclectic ways upon the theory and method of social science and upon the perceptions and opinions of those currently in the program system. Evaluative research, in contrast, is primarily concerned with the establishment of existing performance in accordance with the norms of science. The often "softer" approaches of policy analysis become anathema.

I would argue that the primary need of rehabilitation programs at this point in their evolution is for policy analysis and program development. Within policy analysis, there is a need for certifying the extent to which program intervention produces client impacts which are stable or predictable (i.e. statistically significant). The need for policy analysis is different in kind, however, from identifying laws of behavior. The mandate of rehabilitation programs is rapidly expanding and agency directors need advice on how to respond to those mandates. Subsequently, as new ideas are demonstrated, the more customary role of the evaluator in determining actual impact will become appropriate. In the meantime, decision-makers need advice based on rigorous use of theory and analysis which anticipates the impact and problems to be encountered by alternative program strategies. This type of anticipatory evaluation

is akin to planning. Many will argue that this is an important function but one which should not be assigned an evaluator. Yet organizationally, the individuals in agencies with the analytical talents for policy analysis are most likely to come from evaluation units.

3. Although all would agree that much more work needs to be done in developing indicators of program performance, there is less understanding that different kinds of indicators are needed for internal and external audiences. The kinds of indicators which may be most useful for management are not likely to be useful for demonstrating the worth of the program to legislators and the public. Multiple indicators are probably more useful for internal management and for accurately describing program impact. A legislator lacks the time and interest for such complex measures, however. Simple measures such as the number of rehabilitations produced or benefit-cost ratios are likely to be more persuasive. As long as the same evaluation data is developed for both internal (management) and external audiences, the external audience is likely to have the dominant influence and major improvements in the quality and usefulness of evaluation for improving performance would be difficult to achieve. Just as the management accountant distinguishes between the set of books kept for the tax collector and the set of books kept for internal management decisions, so too the evaluator must keep the needs of the manager and the legislator/budgeter clearly distinguished.

4. Because the concerns of organizational personnel are important determinants of the ability of an organization to implement change, an increased concern for implementation will force the evaluation process to become more explicit about conflicts over values and goals within the rehabilitation system. Goals with which agency personnel do not agree are difficult to achieve organizationally. If goals in rehabilitation

services increasingly reflect the perspective of the disabled client or the taxpayer, conflicts will arise because the rehabilitation system has historically made the counselor the ultimate arbiter of the goals of service. The controversy over "professionalism" and the unwillingness to give the judgments of professionals unique respect and legitimacy -- challenges increasingly being raised in the fields of medicine, education, and social work -- may also come to characterize the relationship between disabled clients and their counselors.[13] Deciding whose values should form the basis for judging programs will become more volatile. The evaluator may find himself in the middle of these conflicts because evaluation is the one organizational function which requires a clear specification of goals and values.

5. Similarly, a concern for utilization of evaluation findings will increase the extent of staff involvement or participation in evaluation. Most academically-oriented researchers have little experience with group processes; they are more accustomed to remaining in back-room offices performing their analysis and writing reports. Thus, the evaluation process may henceforth require a different style on the part of the evaluator. Many individuals currently in evaluation units may find it difficult to adjust. Some evaluators will also feel guilt, because participatory evaluation will appear to dilute the scientific rigor of evaluation findings. Again, the traditional orientation of the program evaluator to the research community, rather than to the program or organization sponsoring the evaluation, will be challenged.

I have tried simply to suggest some of the conflicts which may increasingly emerge in program evaluation activity. None of these

---

[13]Elliot Friedson, Professional Dominance, (N.Y.: Atherton Press, 1970).

conflicts may emerge. Conceivably, the Administration or state agencies could decide that evaluation receive low priority. Alternatively, those who define program evaluation narrowly as evaluative research may win the debate at the Federal level and be able to place great pressures upon the state agencies to conform to their definitions. I think these scenarios are unlikely, however, especially if the new legislation is passed. At a time when most state agencies have barely begun to move into the evaluation area, and when many counselors and program managers are deeply skeptical about the usefulness of evaluation, it may seem premature to speculate on differences among evaluators concerning style and mandate. I would hope, however, that better understanding of the differences from the outset will help prevent the emergence of actual conflict and encourage many evaluators to define their organizational function more broadly.