

JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER MANPOWER—NOW AND FOR THE DECADE AHEAD *

by ALFRED DOBROF

Director, Personnel Services, National Jewish Welfare Board, New York

The State of Manpower Shortage

ANY meeting of two or more workers in the Jewish community center field today is certain to include a discussion of some aspect of the manpower problem. The discussion may be of the *hand-wringing* variety, or it may be a *head-holding* session, or an hour of *brain-storming* may lead to a crash program. The manpower shortage is not unique to the Jewish Centers. It is endemic in every sector of American social welfare. The gap between supply and demand of personnel continues to widen. The annual reports of national and local agencies, of units of government, and of schools of social work tell, in mournful numbers, of new projects deferred or existing services cut back, all because of lack of staff. Executives of Jewish Centers, live daily with the problem and frustrations attendant on the manpower shortage. I propose to discuss some approaches to the problem which seem to offer promise to Centers and to other fields of practice in the social welfare system of our country.

It is a chastening experience to review reports of professional conferences and articles in our journals during the years

since World War II. The harbingers of today's crisis were plainly visible.

In 1951, for example, Benjamin Youngdahl wrote:

When qualified social workers are not available in numbers required to meet demand, agencies are forced to employ untrained or partly trained personnel. This in turn may lead to practices endangering the standards of competence evolved over a period of years and to some public misconceptions as to social work's performance, content and competence.¹

Dr. Youngdahl also noted the growing need for more professionally trained workers supplemented by other workers to meet the demands for service. He also advised us in those years that "There is also a need to prepare a body of workers with basic equipment for certain positions on the operating level involving less responsibility." . . . and that ". . . effective demand for professionally trained workers now exceeds the supply—."²

The harbingers went largely unnoticed and the calls to action unheeded during the 1940s and 1950s. It was not until the present decade that the dimensions of the problem and its impact on services registered with such force that the shortage is no longer ignored, and

* Presented at the National Jewish Welfare Board Intermediate City Center Executives Seminar, Atlantic City, May, 1967.

¹ Benjamin E. Youngdahl, "Social Work as a Profession," *Social Work Year Book*, 1951, p. 494.

² *Ibid.*, p. 494.

action no longer postponed. Now the manpower shortage is a priority item on the social welfare agenda. Subsumed under the rubric of manpower are a variety of items, including among others: recruitment, personnel practices, salaries, differential use of staff, scholarships for graduate education, training, administration and job satisfaction.

The change in the Jewish community centers is that we recognize the complexity of these needs and the number of items which must be taken into account. But clearly we must limit ourselves to certain of these items, if our deliberations are to be useful.

I have chosen to concentrate on the subject of *utilization of manpower*. Here we will find some promising approaches to the manpower problems of today and of the coming years, but though this is a promising approach, it should not obscure the harsh reality that no panacea exists for the solution of our manpower problems. A number of approaches will have to be developed if we are to close the gap between the demand for services and the supply of manpower to deliver these services.

Useful Classifications of Personnel

Speaking to this point, Robert Barker and Thomas J. Briggs say:

Developing new schools of social work, better recruitment techniques, new means of service delivery, and more efficient uses of social work personnel of many levels of training are all compatible and inter-related, and all must be pursued with relatively equal vigor. The first three of these solutions are, in large part, those over which social work has only partial control. The profession can do much to speed up the process by which to implement these three solutions, but by themselves they will inevitably be rather slow in producing the needed numbers of manpower that are immediately required. *The fourth proposed solution is one which is not so subject to evolutionary laws and which can be an immediate answer for adding vast numbers of*

*personnel to the manpower pool if certain problems can be worked out.*³ (Emphases added)

I use the words "*utilization of manpower*." Barker and Briggs talk about *more efficient use of social work personnel of many levels of training*. Laura Epstein calls for "*differential use of staff*," as a method to expand services.⁴ Frank Reissman labels "*the new non-professional*" as a revolution in social work.⁵ In each case, the goal is to increase our manpower supply and to enhance the effectiveness of our utilization of staff. In all of these discussions, there are subsumed classifications of key variables, such as the nature of the service, the complexity of the problem, the educational or professional backgrounds of the staff members.

Such a classificatory system, properly used, should permit us to tease out certain elements of the social worker's job, which may be assigned to less well or differently trained workers, without distortion or dilution of the agency service.

A review of the literature provides us with findings and experiences from other fields of practice in social work and from other professions which we may build on and learn from, and which also alert us to problems we will face and dilemmas still to be resolved.

For example, the medical field has made significant progress in the differential use of staff. This is obvious to any hospital patient trying to match the medical care functions to the many different uniforms of those marching in and out of his room. There are successes, but not all the problems associated with dif-

³ Robert T. Barker and Thomas L. Briggs, *Trends in The Utilization of Social Work Personnel: An Evaluative Research of The Literature*, Report Number Two, NASW, June, 1966, p. 42.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

⁵ *Ibid.*, page 26.

ferential use of staff in the medical services field have been solved.

In an era of chronic disease and of specialized medical practice, the need for a central coordinator within a team structure is compelling. Beyond this easy generalization, the details are unclear. Research is required into the desired composition of the basic health care team, the needed supporting consultants and assistants. The process of team function, the nature of group records, the matter of optimum size, the design of joint facilities, the structure of administrative systems—all need clarification if the seemingly inevitable trend toward group organization is to lead to improvement in the effectiveness of medical care.⁶ (emphases added)

In Jewish community centers, the development of job descriptions that differentiate between the role of the professional social worker and the college graduate (to be called social work associate) appears to present more difficulties for us than does the task of differentiating between the social worker and staff members trained in other professions. For example, the tasks assigned to the cultural arts or physical education staff member and those assigned to the social worker are generally more sharply defined and more carefully delineated than are those for the professional social worker, as distinct from the social work associate.

I think most would agree that we have not always been successful in our efforts to define the job of the social worker in the Center and to say in what ways his job may be distinguished from the assignments of the non-M.S.W. Fortunately there are available to us reports on experiences in other settings and fields of practice on which we can build

our own body of knowledge. A particularly useful project was that recently completed by the Veterans Administration, and despite the fact that this project had to do with casework, not group work services, we can take hope from the V.A. experience in distinguishing between the job of the M.S.W. and the social work associate: "The work of assistants (case aides) could be constantly differentiated from that of social workers despite some overlapping of work done by both levels of staff. . . ."⁷

Despite some degree of success in organization of the Jewish Center interdisciplinary team, the utilization of those trained in other professions still demands our attention and study. We need to consider now and evaluate periodically: (1) the structural relationships between other professions on the Center staff and the social workers and social work associates; (2) job descriptions for these professionals to insure the best use of their knowledge and skill; (3) the definitions of tasks for the professionals which take into account different levels of education and experience; (4) training programs designed to increase their effectiveness as staff members in the Jewish Center and also to add to their knowledge and skill in the practice of their own professions.

This paper will not deal with the interdisciplinary staff team, but will concern itself primarily with the social work team in the Center, giving particular attention to: (1) the differentiation of the assignment of the M.S.W. from that of his social work associate, and (2) the staff structure which seems to permit maximum and best use of these two staff groups. The social work associate is de-

⁶ E. Richard Weinerman, "Research Into The Organization of Medical Practice," *Health Services Research*, Health Services Research Study Section U. S. Public Health Services, Reprint Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, October, 1966, Vol. XLIV, p. 129.

⁷ Jean M. Dockhork, *A Study of The Use of The Social Work Assistant in the Veterans Administration*, Dept. of Medicine and Surgery, Veterans Administration, Washington, D. C., July 1965, p. 45.

defined as a person performing professional functions under professional direction.

I am assuming for the moment that in the process of planning for the most efficient utilization of manpower in Centers, inappropriate responsibilities will be removed from the job loads of all professional staff members to give them time to perform services for which they were trained and for which they were employed. I also assume emerging staff models for Centers permits us to provide a higher quality of practice, resulting in better service to members by all professional groups in our setting.

By examining two typical approaches that have been used in developing workable staff models, we can more readily identify the problems that arise with each. The first approach starts with the client or Center member or Center group and seeks to evaluate the degree of complexity of his request for service. The *level of complexity* then determines the *level of training* of the worker to be assigned to the member or the group: grossly stated, complex problem—highly trained worker; simple problem—beginning or lesser skilled worker. There are in the literature some recent reports on studies and projects in which criteria for differential use of personnel were stated in terms of level of complexity. Worthy of particular attention is the work done by Margaret Heyman of the Hunter College School of Social Work faculty.⁸

I suggest also that this approach, in a less sophisticated, rational form has been a typical one in Centers for at least the last two decades. All of us, as division supervisors, program directors and executives have allocated our precious social work staff to the "most difficult,"

⁸ Margaret Heyman, "Criteria For The Allocation of Cases According to Levels of Staff Skill," *Social Case Work*, July, 1961, pp. 325-31.

"problem," "high risk," "vulnerable" members and groups. To our "run of the mill," "typical," "uncomplicated," "normal" groups, we have assigned our high school volunteers, our college part-time paid staff, our full time B.A. staff member. Few of us have been satisfied with this approach. We faced the problems which seem inevitably associated with this approach, although we have done little systematic reporting and analysis of our experiences. To cite one such problem: Is it the *problem the member brings*, which is the unit of complexity, or is the *complexity a measure of the service to be provided?* There are other problems and pitfalls which we could list but let us not permit our knowledge of the pitfalls to blind us to the usefulness of the approach.

A second approach to differential use of staff calls for the *task* or the *service* to be the unit of differentiation. The careful studies of this approach come from the casework agencies so that the reader must make some correctives to make use of these studies profitable for staffs of group service agencies. It becomes immediately apparent that use of the task as the unit is, as was the complexity approach, a familiar idea to the Jewish Center executive. A very low level and obvious example: a youngster comes in on registration day. He wants to play on a basketball team. He wants to join the Ham Radio Club. He and four of his friends want to start a club of their own where they will decide what they want to do. Characteristically, a physical education professional provides the first service; a licensed ham, the second; a social worker, the third. But the club turns out to be interested in nothing except gymnastics. The Radio Club has in its membership four boys whose acting-out behavior obstructs the group from its chosen activity. The basketball team wins the city-wide cham-

pionship, and in the process becomes a tightly knit group whose members want to continue together after the season and off the court.

Or another example, the Great Books Group is staffed by a very competent man with a Master's Degree in Adult Education. In the group is a lady who has come seeking a respite from the anxious and frightened feelings which plague her. The group and its leader become very important to her. She eagerly awaits each Wednesday evening meeting. She volunteers for extra reading assignments and other tasks associated with the group. As the weeks pass, it becomes clearer and clearer that her ability to cope with her problems is deteriorating. She needs very skilled social work help, but the only staff member whom she can talk to is the Great Books discussion leader, chosen by the agency to provide an adult education, not a social work service. Again, these are only examples of the problems we encounter if we use *the task* as the unit of differentiation in deployment of personnel. And again, as I indicate problem areas, I also emphasize the possibility that this approach will prove useful—if not over the long run, at least as one step in our analysis of the job of our Centers and the manpower requirements for this job.

"Episodes of Service"

There is also now a model in the developmental stage that might have relevance to staff utilization in Jewish community centers. The design, called "Episodes of Service" comes from the NASW project on "Utilization of Social Work Personnel in State Mental Hospitals."⁹ One of the research aims in this project has to do with the construction of a "conceptual framework" which can be used in the development of a logical approach to

utilization and assignment of staff in the mental hospital and in other agencies and institutions.¹⁰

I find the "Episodes of Service" an interesting formulation particularly in the promise it seems to offer us in our search for a rational approach to utilization of personnel. To illustrate, using our Ham Radio Club with its membership of 12 teen-agers, including the four whose acting-out-behavior obstructs the group from its group purposes and task: Our club leader explores the dimensions of the problem, in his own mind and with the boys. He and the boys agree that the behavior of the four is making it impossible for them to use their time together as they desire, but that the eight do not, at least for now, want to ask the Center to prohibit the attendance of the four. They want help in dealing with the problem in the group, and they and the leader agree that the leader has not been able to give this help, that the complexity of the problems requires the services of the M.S.W. The M.S.W. is brought in and remains in the episode, until the problem is resolved, and his service can be terminated.

Or as another example, let us return to our troubled member of the Great Books discussion group. The data which the leader acquires about the lady's behavior makes him conclude that the member is becoming decreasingly able to cope with her fears and worries. The leader quickly decides that the problem is of a nature and complexity that requires "a service management conference" with the M.S.W. on his team. He asks *Mrs. Troubled Member* for permission to schedule this conference, and he and *Mrs. T.M.* talk about the nature of her problem and the kind of service the M.S.W. team mate can provide.

Mrs. T.M. continues to participate in the Great Books Group, and she also,

⁹ R. L. Barker and T. L. Briggs *op. cit.* p. 41.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

during this episode of service, sees the M.S.W. alone or with the Great Books leader.

These have been simple illustrations of "The Episode of Service," to convey a sense of this approach in action. Moreover, in the months to come, careful study of the report on the NASW project will be possible, and then we shall be able to talk in a more useful way about its relevance to the Jewish Center.

The Differentiation of the Core Social Group Work and Other Skills

To the task of testing various approaches to utilization of staff, we, in the Center field, bring a particularly rich history of practice. It was during the 1940's that group work ended its flirtations and alliances with recreation, adult education and sundry other fields of service or professions, and found its niche in the social work profession.¹¹

In the two decades since, we have defined social group work as the "core method" in the Jewish Center.¹² At the same time, however, our Centers have been "multi-function" agencies and, therefore, the Center team has been an interdisciplinary one. And, typically, our social group work service has been delivered by non-M.S.W. staff, albeit trained and supervised by the M.S.W. Division Supervisor. Seldom in our Centers have the M.S.W.'s been engaged in direct practice; characteristically the M.S.W. is the Executive, the Program Director or the Division Supervisor. Social Work students, part-time paid staff and volunteers are the practitioners of social work in our Centers.

It is this history which accounts for

the special expertise Jewish Center executives and supervisors can bring to the task of testing out various approaches to differential use of personnel. It is this history which also accounts for the ambivalence in our thinking about this approach to the manpower problem. It is this history which may explain a certain defensiveness we sometimes feel about the quality of social work service we provide, or about the job descriptions of most of the M.S.W's now employed in the Jewish Centers of the United States. And for the moment, we must attend the origins of our mixed emotions.

This ambivalence and defensiveness are, I think, of recent origin. In 1949, when the most widely read and influential group work textbook was published, its authors clearly took for granted, and felt no constraint to explain or justify a job description for the group worker which included administrative and supervisory tasks. They analyzed social group work as "practiced in four areas which may be distinguished as (1) basic social group work practice, that is, work with primary groups, (2) supervision . . . (3) administration. . . (4) community planning. . ."¹³

Similarly, in the Schools of Social Work of the 1940's and 50's the casework students moved through a sequence of courses, from casework I through Casework IV, while group workers travelled in step in Groupwork I and II, but then separated from our casework friends into Supervision during the third semester and Administration and Community Organization for our fourth methods class.

We re-read Wilson and Ryland from today's vantage point, and find clear evidence they were among those aware of the manpower shortage in the group service agencies of the nation, and that

¹³ Gertrude Wilson and Gladys Ryland, *Social Group Work Practice*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1949, p. 27.

¹¹ William Schwartz, "Group Work and The Social Scene," in Alfred Kahn, ed., *Issues In American Social Work*, New York, 1959, pp. 117-26.

¹² Sanford Solender, *Unique Function of The Jewish Community Center*, National Jewish Welfare Board, New York, 1955.

they dealt in this book with this shortage and its implications for service.¹⁴ There is no evidence, however, that their picture of the group worker as the supervisor and administrator was a response to the manpower shortage. Nor, do I think, they view the inclusion of supervision, administration, and planning in the basic group work sequence as an evil necessity forced on the schools by the realities of the field. On the contrary, they found that “. . . some very fine social group work is now carried on . . . (using untrained paid workers and volunteers) . . . (There should be) . . . more attention given to supervision and the use of record writing as a teaching device. . . . (in order to make) . . . much more effective use . . . of the volunteer and employed untrained worker. . . .”¹⁵

In the Jewish Centers of this period, Wilson and Ryland's injunctions were heeded: careful attention was given to orientation, in-service training, supervisory conferences, record writing. We, no less than Wilson and Ryland, were quite sure that some very fine social group work indeed was being carried on by the untrained worker. So long as the supervisor was a group worker, and so long as boards of directors acknowledge the centrality of the group work method in the Center, neither Miss Wilson and Miss Ryland nor most of us in the Centers had question about the *nature* of the service our untrained club leaders were providing. We worked hard to improve the *quality* of the service, but its nature—that it was, in fact, a social work service—this, we took largely for granted.

Today's picture is one of sharp contrast. Late in the second half of the decade of the '50's, first the academicians and then many practitioners were no longer so sanguine about the *nature* or the *quality* of the service provided by

the untrained-but-supervised-worker in our and other “traditional” group serving agencies.

*A special handicap facing the social group worker is that a great deal of the actual direction of group activity is still in the hands of volunteers, usually leaving to the professional group worker supervision only and not action on the operating level. (emphasis added)*¹⁶

Now the absence of the M.S.W. at the practice level can no longer be taken for granted; in fact, this absence is a “special handicap” and “*The problem of defining the nature of the helping process as it is carried out by the social group worker, has been rendered more difficult by the fact that it 'has been a profession without professionals' . . .*”¹⁷ (emphasis added)

It turns out in the view of one academician that group workers talk *social work, not social group work*, not because we are generic, but because there really isn't that much *group work theory* to talk about. Our “profession without professionals” apparently can do little theory building, and, as a consequence, “. . . social group work is essentially good citizenship, good human relationships, consciously practiced . . . in an enabling way. . . .”¹⁸

In our “salad days” of the 1940's and early 1950's, the Jewish Centers were preferred student placements, and in every city, the Jewish Center was the showcase for group work practice at its best. Ten years later, although we in the traditional group service agencies assert that ours are social service agencies, we find, in fact, the absence of the M.S.W. at the direct service level and our apparent inability to build a respectable group work theory mean

¹⁶ Frank J. Bruno, *Trends in American Social Work*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1957, p. 275.

¹⁷ William Schwartz, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

¹⁸ Frank J. Bruno, *op. cit.*, p. 422.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 606.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 607-608.

that we are largely unable to warrant our claim. Only in the treatment or special settings, it is argued, is the task of the social work specified and elaborated in a professional fashion. Only when the service to the client is delivered by an M.S.W., can the label *social work service*, be affixed. The measure of our fall from grace may be inferred from the paragraph in Bruno and Towley's final chapter on social group work. There is a brief account of the development of group therapy programs, primarily in child guidance centers, and the authors conclude:

It is needless to add that only the professionally equipped group worker is employed in the use of social group work for therapeutic purpose. *It would be dangerous to use volunteers however skilled and proficient they may be in ordinary group activities in a project requiring specialized training as well as demonstrated skill.* (emphasis added)¹⁹

Thus is a full turn completed: as we, in the 1930's and '40's consigned the recreation worker to "ordinary group activities" and reserved unto ourselves the "individualized," "the quality," "the complex," so in some quarters in the 1950's is the group service in the Center dismissed with airy disregard, and real group work becomes that which the real group worker *does*—not what he *supervises*.

Supervision and administration continue to be salient components in our job description for M.S.W.'s. Small wonder, then, that we respond somewhat defensively to our fellowship student who tells us during his fourth semester that he would prefer a job in the new unit in the general hospital. He will, of course, honor his Jewish Center scholarship commitment, still indicating he prefers to give what he (and the school) consider the most direct social group work service, i.e., direct group leader-

ship in a therapeutic setting. An occasional rereading of the introduction to the NASW Code of Ethics about, ". . . the marshalling of community resources to promote the well being of all without discrimination."²⁰ might help students incorporate the value system of the profession which calls for service to all racial, religious, ethnic and socio-economic groups in our society.

We feel some ambivalence about the relationship between the schools of social work and our field of practice when we are told by one of our academic colleagues that we in the Center have laid unfounded claims to rehabilitation goals and tasks; that we have employed more professional social workers than the quality or priority of our services warrant, thus contributing to the shortage in the rehabilitation and treatment agencies; and concentration of professional social workers in Jewish community centers and settlement houses has meant denial of service to those most in need.²¹

Faulted as a profession without professionals on the one hand, and on the other criticized for employing too many M.S.W.'s, we in the Jewish Centers may wish sometimes to retreat from our historical connections with schools of social work, and we may sometimes want to give up our location in the main stream of American social welfare, to return to what seems to be the safety of our own field of practice. I have said that our years as workers in multi-function agencies, our wide experience as members of agency teams, composed of workers representing a variety of levels of education and skill have provided us with a

²⁰ *NASW Personnel Standards and Adjudication Procedures*, NASW, 1963, page 1.

²¹ Robert D. Vintner, "New Evidence for Restructuring Group Services," *New Perspectives on Services to Groups*, NASW, 1961, pp. 64-65.

¹⁹ *Ibid*, p. 277.

treasure trove of practice wisdom in this matter of utilization of personnel.

Ironically, it is precisely because we have utilized non-M.S.W. staff in the delivery of service to members that the nature of this service has been questioned by our social work colleagues, particularly those now of the academic world. There is an Alice-in-Wonderland quality in the fact that at this moment when we are being criticized by others, the Department of Welfare in New York City and in many other major cities in the nation, the Veterans Administration, hospitals and chronic care facilities, even the traditional family service agencies are studying their staff deployment and the nature of the services they provide. The goal of this activity? The development of service teams, composed of indigenous workers and Baccalaureates, and captained by M.S.W.'s—with each member of the team having clearly stated and appropriately assigned tasks to perform. The dream? That as the nursing team of the R.N., the L.P.N., and the aide has provided the single most effective approach to the critical shortage of nursing personnel, so also will our team of aide, associate, M.S.W. prove of value in narrowing the gap between *demand* for social work services and *supply* of available personnel to deliver the services.

No real alternative is available to us. Our sense of identity with the profession of social work is no less strong than our allegiance to the Jewish Center. We begin therefore with a careful assessment of our present staff, table of organization and assignments. *Practices*, long taken for granted, seldom or never questioned, now must be subject to careful study and assessment. *Decisions* with respect to staff assignments—made almost without conscious awareness of the act of deciding, justified by a series of assumptions which were never made explicit, never subjected to scrutiny or

test, now must be approached with self-conscious objectivity. An example: how do we decide the qualifications of the intake worker in the Center? Is intake essentially a clerical procedure, or is intake part of the social work service of the Center? If so, can we specify units or areas of the service which may be assigned to the social work aide? the associate? What kind of training does the aide or the associate need to make the service decisions necessary to the intake process? Or an example of an approach to differential use of staff in which the key variable is the nature of the service: the Jewish Center is organized after the pattern of the neighborhood public school. There are classes, activities, special interest groups and clubs. There is also a school social service department, which, like the guidance department, is available at the request of the student, by referral from the teacher or club leader, or in response to the mother's plea for help in dealing with her "wild" son. Here the worker's task is cast in the classic mold of the medical or public school social worker. She is called in for "episodes of services," when the member needs help in negotiating the system, or when there are obstacles blocking his use of the agency, or when special information must be interpreted by the social worker so the member understands the information, and is helped to make decisions with respect to it.

Components of Function of MSW in Center

A final example, which we begin with specification of the components that make up the functions of the M.S.W. in the Jewish Center. The Center social worker now functions as *administrator* (executives and sub-executives for policy and service planning) and *supervisor*. To these let us add *staff trainer*

and direct *practitioner* with individuals and groups requiring highly specialized social services. In the intermediate size Centers, perhaps Division Heads and Directors of age group services could be experienced and well-trained social work associates. In the large city Center, the number of members, volume of service and size of staff within an age division may require that the Division be headed by a highly experienced social work associate *or* a social worker. In the small city Center, it is likely that one social worker (the executive) will perform all four functions.

This pattern of staffing does not automatically solve specific issues of differential task assignments for social workers vis-a-vis other professionals and social work associates. However, it does provide a starting place and suggestions for experimentation and demonstration. Essentially, I am suggesting that we define the job of the social worker in the Center with reference to these four functions of *administrator*, *supervisor*, *trainer*, and *practitioner*. If we can then follow the lead of the V.A., as stated earlier, and work on differentiation in *practice* of the task of the M.S.W. from that of his associates and aides in performance of these functions, there may be some real pay-off. For example:

1. We should be able to deliver more services, without increase in the number of M.S.W.'s, and there is even the possibility that fewer social workers will be required in some Centers, although increased numbers of other professionals and social work associates with increased training will be needed.

2. We should achieve greater flexibility in organization of staff for small, intermediate and large Centers if preliminary decisions are made on the number of supervisees, trainees, and the size of a case or group load for each professional social worker.

3. The possibility exists that laymen will get a more focused picture of the role and function of the social worker, and few would argue about the implications of lay support of social work in Centers if this happens.

4. There should be feed-back from this approach which can be used to enrich the ongoing process of definition of role and function of the social worker in the Center. Certainly precision in analysis of social work function and accuracy of job descriptions would be useful to Boards of Directors and Personnel Committees, providing ammunition for Centers with Federations at allocation time.

The formulation of function proposed for the social worker in the Jewish Community Center requires additional work and calls for value judgments and determination of priorities. Agreement on the number of supervisees and trainees assigned to the social worker and analysis of case and group load to set realistic standards of work are the first steps. The content and method of training and the training of the trainers also require immediate decisions, and the educational gap for beginning social workers in supervision and administration can be closed by adequate training programs and new forms of supervision. Finally, decisions must be made and operational plans developed to assure career lines for other professionals and social work associates in order to retain them in the Center field. Realistic personnel practices are called for, and we must be prepared to deal with the difficult interpersonal problems which are characteristic in the multi-discipline staff settings. Again, we are reminded of the special expertise social group workers bring to this work—expertise hard won in their years of creative experience in the Center.

The job descriptions of the supportive staff groups (clerical, maintenance,

business managers, drivers) must also be reviewed if this or any staff deployment scheme is to work. Realistic job descriptions and standardization of numbers of supportive staff required for each of the three staff groups in Centers are also key items for the agenda.

Conclusion

In this paper an attempt was made to highlight the issues and problems we encounter as we seek new approaches to differential utilization of staff. The task is to explore all models and strategies and to develop new staff formulations for the specific setting in which we practice. Our rich history in the differential use of staff has within it a potential source of knowledge. When analyzed and factually ordered, it could move us rapidly toward our manpower goals. Along the way some professional

“sacred cows” might be tested and found no longer sacred in the social work world of 1967. The “one to one” relationship, use of age divisions as the unit of organization and the primary group as the basic unit of service, may be among the casualties of the testing.

Scientists have time after time forced us to adjust to completely new ideas about the physical world we live in, as for example that matter can fall up and that the shortest distance between two points is not always a straight line. The same demand for change inheres in any search for new ideas and approaches. Surely this is a demand we cannot deny and surely, too, it is the group workers in Jewish Community Centers who must meet this demand, and it is in their own agencies and under their leadership that new approaches to utilization of staff must be developed, tested and evaluated.