

HUMAN RESOURCES PROFESSIONALS PROGRAM

FINAL REPORT

by

Robert McPherson*
Jane Stendebach

August 1982

Grant 31-48-78-07

This report was prepared under a contract with the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under authority of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973. Researchers are encouraged to express their own judgment freely. Interpretations of viewpoints stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Labor.

*Robert McPherson is Project Coordinator of The Center for the Study of Human Resources, The University of Texas at Austin.

Jane Stendebach is Student Development Specialist, Center for the Study of Human Resources, The University of Texas at Austin.

Center for the Study of Human Resources
107 West 27th Street
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas 78712
(512) 471-7891

Preface

This final report is fourth in a series of annual reports on progress toward developing and implementing the Human Resources Professionals Program (HRPP), an education and training program supported by institutional grant funds from the U.S. Department of Labor. In contrast to earlier reports which concentrated on specific activities, problems and accomplishments, this one concentrates on the successes and failures relative to each of the program's major goals. Special consideration is given to the results of efforts to institutionalize HRPP at the University of Texas at Austin.

For a complete and detailed account of this effort, the four annual reports should be considered together.

Table of Contents

Section		Page
I	The Nature of the Program	1
II	Major Program Activities and Results	3
III	An Assessment of the Results	7
IV	Recommendations	13
	Attachments	

I. The Nature of the Program

The Human Resources Professionals Program (HRPP) was designed to develop competent managers with a functional program specialization in human resources for responsible management positions, primarily in the employment and training delivery system. This particular focus was based on a number of underlying assumptions. First, many of the shortcomings of this decentralized system were not the result of poor policy decisions, but due to problems associated with implementation and management. These problems, in turn, were directly related to the competence and commitment of key decision makers at all levels in the system. By focusing resources on developing better managers, the efficiency and effectiveness of these programs could be significantly improved over time. Second, the successful managers of employment and training programs possess a unique mix of knowledge, skills and behaviors that help them function effectively in a complex, uncertain environment. Third, these competencies could be developed through various combinations of formal education, on-the-job training and practical life experience. Of these, providing formal education and facilitating on-the-job training were determined to be the most appropriate focus for a university-based effort. Further, the assumption was that the requisite education was not available within any single academic discipline, but would require a combination of courses from a number of separate departments.

Three major goals provided focus for HRPP functions and activities:

- o to attract and train high quality students for management positions in the employment and training field;
- o to increase the quality of in-service training and technical assistance available to managers already working in the delivery system, particularly in federal Region VI; and,
- o to institutionalize (i.e. to ensure the continuation of critical program functions) the program in the University community.

Consistent with the philosophy and goals, HRPP activities were organized into three major components of program development, student

services and training and technical assistance. Since the major emphasis was on developing the on-campus portion of the program, most of the staff resources and activities were concentrated on program development and student services. Providing technical assistance and training for practitioners currently managing human resource programs, while important in the short-run, was a second priority. The program was sponsored by the Center for the Study of Human Resources which offered a convenient vehicle for developing interdisciplinary programs and for bringing together the expertise of University faculty and the practical experience of managers of public programs. The major thrust of program activities in each of the major components are summarized below.¹

¹Specific program approaches, activities and techniques for the first three years have been included in previous annual reports. Here, these activities along with those for the fourth year are combined and summarized.

II. Major Program Activities and Results

A. Program Development

Program development activities were the result of two concurrent, but separate, assessment efforts. The first was an effort to determine the mix of knowledge, skills and behaviors required to be an effective manager of human resource programs and the second was an assessment of the University's curriculum to determine whether or not the requisite education and training was available. This systematic analysis provided a rational framework for developing and teaching specific courses to fill identified gaps, for developing human resource management concentrations within existing degree programs and for counseling and advising interested students. Moreover, this information supported the decision to develop individualized degree programs, primarily for those students interested in getting a master's degree. By using the flexibilities in degree programs in four areas--economics, government, public affairs and management--a human resources management concentration was designed which took into account job requirements and the prior education and work experience of each student. Regular curriculum offerings were augmented by new courses, seminars and workshops, and an internship program was added to provide relevant work experience for skills development. The program's emphasis was on developing generic management skills, but at the same time, helping the student developing in-depth expertise in one public policy area, i.e. human resources.

As a result of the program development efforts, human resource management concentrations were developed in each of the four areas. In addition, program staff developed and taught seven separate courses in three different departments, involving a total of 239 students (see Attachment A). Fourteen students were employed in jobs in the employment and training area as a result of the internship program. A list of those students, their host agency and the individual work assignments are included as Attachment B.

B. Student Services

The focus of the student services component was on counseling and advising, developing internship opportunities, job development and placement for those students actively participating in the program. The approach was wholistic. For interested students, program staff provided an integrated set of services and activities to more closely relate their education and work experience to their future employment as a human resource program manager.

As expected, students opted for various levels of involvement with the program. Some only wanted one or two services such as counseling or internship assistance while a small core group of career oriented students took full advantage of all the available services. Student involvement has been classified into several categories with the levels of participation for each as follows: those requesting information about the program--70; those making formal contact and receiving minimal levels of guidance or counseling--65; those taking courses taught by HRPP staff--239; those receiving substantial counseling, internship assistance and participating in workshops--31; and finally, those core students actively involved in the program--20. Follow-up information on the 20 core students indicates that 12 have graduated, five of the remaining eight will complete their work in the next school year. Twelve of the 20 core students are currently employed at an average annual salary of approximately \$20,825. The median salary for the group is \$19,200. A list of the core students and those receiving more than a minimal level of services is included as Attachment C.

C. Training and Technical Assistance

The program's approach to providing training and technical assistance for current managers of human resource programs was to develop the technical capability on the project, identify University faculty with relevant expertise and experience providing assistance to practitioners, to communicate the availability of these resources to the employment and training community and then to respond to their specific

requests for assistance. As with the other components of the program, the focus of the training and technical assistance activities was on management. One major effort was related to the development of a management institute to provide substantive training in management decision making for directors and their top management staff working in the CETA delivery system. Two seminars--"Confronting Uncertainty with Effective Management" and "Phasedown Management"--developed and offered in Region VI represented the visible results of these efforts. Approximately 60 staff from CETA prime sponsors in federal Region VI completed these seminars.

Proposals for continuation and further development of this management training capability were submitted to both the national and regional offices of the Employment and Training Administration (ETA). Staff work in this area has attracted the attention of related ETA-funded efforts in other regions. Program staff have served as advisors, consultants and instructors for the New England Institute in Bangor, Maine and the Applied Institute of Manpower Management (AIMM) in Baltimore.

Program staff have provided technical assistance to a wide range of government agencies throughout the country. For example, assistance has been provided to ETA's Office of National Programs in the design of a management system for Targeted Outreach Programs, to numerous CETA prime sponsors on an array of management problems and to a local community group organizing a community-based agency for providing employment and training services. These activities were supported in part, and in many cases totally, with institutional grant funds.

D. Efforts at Institutionalization

Activities in each of these major components were always guided by the goal of long-term institutionalization of the program at The University of Texas. Accomplishing this goal required the commitment of resources other than those provided by the institutional grant to continue supporting the critical elements of the program. Institutionalization could have occurred in a number of ways. For the on-campus

portion of the program, University colleges or departments could have incorporated the human resources concentration as a formal track in their degree program or Center staff committed to developing human resource managers could have been hired in tenure track positions in one of the participating departments. For the staff development and technical assistance component, continued funding of these activities through the Office of Management Assistance or by one or more of the states in federal Region VI would have represented institutionalization.

Efforts at institutionalization have been frustrating and the result is most disappointing. Neither the staff nor the major program elements are likely to survive beyond the grant. One or two people associated with the program may combine teaching part-time in non-tenure track positions and other grant funds to remain in the University community; however, the primary focus of their activities will be on objectives other than those of HRPP.

III. An Assessment of the Results

Two of the three major goals of the program were achieved. Program staff were successful in focusing the formal education and work experience of a number of high quality graduate students who are currently employed in professional positions. Moreover, the quality of in-service training and technical assistance available to managers of employment and training programs was significantly enhanced. Little progress, however, was made toward the goal of institutionalization.

In the development and implementation of the on-campus portion of the program, HRPP realized a number of successes. An effective model for developing employment-specific, interdisciplinary programs in a major university setting was developed and tested. Using the electives in graduate degree programs, a student's education and training can be individually tailored to their needs and broadly focused on knowledge and skill requirements for employment. The course mix can be augmented by adding one or two specific courses and by providing a series of seminars and workshops to fill identified gaps in the existing offerings. This effort was based on practical approaches to analyzing job requirements and to determine the level of knowledge and skills developed in the individual courses. We are convinced that, when assessed in terms of practicality and efficiency, this approach for training human resource managers in a major university is clearly superior to the alternative of creating a specialized program within a given department or developing a separate institute.

The student internship model represented another success for the program. The critical elements of the program were a formal job description from the employer, personal interviews for the interns as prospective employees of the agency and a requirement that the employer pay the entire salary of the intern. The approach emphasized a normal employer-employee relationship with no special services beyond job matching assistance from HRPP. Before the federal budget cuts, nearly all interns were offered full-time positions with their host agency and the participating agencies were interested in continuing their relationship with the program.

A third major success was the use of other projects at the Center as avenues for HRPP students to move from the academic environment to the world of work. Under this approach, HRPP students were employed at the Center on "real world" projects related to the management of human resource programs. As staff on a given project they were able to make practical application of knowledges and skills learned in the classroom. They were given exposure to experienced managers working on difficult management problems, thereby significantly increasing their confidence, skills and employability. While this approach is not new, it has largely been used as an access route for Ph.D. candidates interested in research. We are now convinced that it will work exceptionally well for those interested in careers as managers.

Finally, with institutional grant support, we were successful in developing and offering interdisciplinary counseling and advising services in sharp contrast to the graduate advisor approach common in most large universities. Using the information from the curriculum analysis and assessment effort, we were able to tailor a human resources management concentration individually for each student and at the same time, satisfy the master's degree requirements of any one of the four departments participating in the program.

The on-campus program had two major failures: the number of students and the level of their participation were much below the original expectations and staff efforts to institutionalize the program were largely unsuccessful.

The low number of students taking advantage of HRPP's full range of services is attributable to several factors. Although staff developed a well-focused program leading to well-paying jobs, students are more attracted to enthusiastic faculty working on interesting problems than they are to programs. HRPP staff, although teaching some courses, were not integrated into the faculty of the participating departments. Offices were maintained at the Center, physically located on the campus, but several blocks removed from the various centers of activity. The program was well publicized, students were actively recruited; however,

overall visibility was low and personal interaction between the staff and graduate students was sporadic at best. A second factor affecting numbers is the overall attitude toward government, particularly human resource areas which, unfortunately, are often still viewed as hold-over poverty programs. Negative publicity about the CETA program in the late 1970s and the budget cuts of the 1980s have made it even more difficult to attract students. In the short-run, we had little to offer. Internship opportunities disappeared and job opportunities after graduation were not promising. Arguments of the long-term recovery and redirection of the policy area had little currency with prospective students.

The failure to institutionalize the program is the result of a number of interrelated factors. A part of the problem was one of unrealistic expectations. Program staff overestimated the influence of a \$130,000 grant to a small Center in a major university. Well-entrenched academic programs of the various colleges and departments are not modified in the short-run by well-intentioned outsiders without formal status. The primary barrier was the lack of tenured faculty involvement and commitment to the goals of HRPP. There were no tenured faculty from any of the participating departments on regular staff at the Center. Moreover, none of the HRPP staff were able to secure tenure track positions during the grant period. As a result, staff had no access to curriculum development or budget deliberation activities of any academic department. Staff work on curriculum development (i.e. revising degree programs, developing courses or building human resource concentrations) could not be considered for formal institutionalization by a given college or department without the support and advocacy of one or more key faculty members. While the program enjoyed the support and advice of a number of tenured faculty in the LBJ School of Public Affairs, and in the departments of management and of economics, no one was interested enough in curriculum revision issues to provide the requisite advocacy services. While this lack of access did not prevent HRPP staff from developing and teaching topical courses in these departments, it effectively stifled development of a formal human resources concentration within any of the departments or schools.

A second major barrier was the traditional autonomy of the academic disciplines. Although the merit of the interdisciplinary approach to educating and training managers was never seriously questioned, the commitment to maintaining enrollment in courses taught by graduate faculty of the participating departments was an overriding concern. Students are often counseled with a bias toward the interest of the graduate faculty rather than toward the development of their own knowledge and skills. There is little apparent interest among faculty in curriculum development beyond a periodic revision of the courses they teach. Curriculum revision which includes interdisciplinary approaches cutting across colleges and departments are difficult to institutionalize in this environment.

The focus of HRPP was another barrier to institutionalization. Developing curriculum for master degree candidates that emphasizes training for specific kinds of management jobs runs counter, in many ways, to graduate programs geared to assisting professors with their research and to educating doctoral candidates who are interested solely in careers of teaching and research. While this attitude was not prevalent in professional schools such as the LBJ School or in the College of Business Administration, unfortunately, it was present in some faculty in economics and government. In economics, in particular, there is little apparent interest in the masters' degree program. The program's focus on training professional managers, while entirely rational, was not practical in the University setting.

HRPP efforts related to the goal of improving the training and technical assistance available to practitioners was directed to enhancing the skills of directors and other top managers of CETA programs. There were two notable successes related to the off-campus portion of the program. First, as a result of work to develop an ongoing Management Development Institute attached to the University and funded by ETA, two management seminars were developed and presented for CETA managers in the region. Second, in preparation for these seminars a private sector decision making model was identified and adapted for use by managers of public sector programs. This model integrates the

process of developing goals, objectives and criteria for evaluating program alternatives with the development of options and alternative program strategies to rationalize decision making in complex, uncertain environments. A case study of an employment and training program was developed to facilitate the transfer and application of this particular approach to strategic or long-range planning. The model, although still in a rudimentary stage, has been revised and recently tested with a group of CETA managers in California in a training session sponsored by the Applied Institute of Manpower Management.

Failures of the off-campus efforts are similar to those cited earlier. We had difficulty attracting program managers to training. There are several reasons for this lack of interest even though the employment and training system suffers from a lack of good management decision making. In part, most CETA managers have their attention focused on current or past problems and have little time or apparent interest in planning and managing the future. They do not recognize the value of an overall strategic plan for more effectively and efficiently focusing the resources of their agency and for reducing the level of confusion in their current programs. In addition, many are not really interested in serious knowledge and skills development. They have become accustomed to equating training with conferences where they hear speeches and swap stories with each other or with one day sessions where they are given information on how to fill out various reporting forms. Training that requires them to think about developing inter-related goals and objectives and to evolving consistent program strategies that are likely to contribute most to the achievement of their goals is work most prefer to avoid. The environment since 1978 has not helped to change this attitude. The negative publicity regarding program management and the budget cuts have been used by many directors as an excuse to do no planning for their programs. For the most part, the system is dominated by reactive administrators, not managers, who are waiting to receive the next directive so they, in turn, can pass it down to a lower level in the system. Success is measured in terms of the efficiency of systems and processes and not on the basis of the effectiveness of program outcomes.

Program staff have failed in their efforts to institutionalize this approach to developing management skills. Proposals for further development and expansion of this model have been submitted to both regional and national offices of ETA. The verbal response from the national office has been supportive; however, in this period of severe budget cuts no funding has been made available to continue this activity. Portions of our strategic planning model likely will be incorporated in the curriculum of other institutes that are continuing to receive ETA funds. In the current environment where the question of any federal government involvement in this policy area is being effectively surfaced, the prospects of institutionalization with federal resources are slim indeed.

IV. Recommendations

This section is divided into two parts. The first concerns recommendations related to getting better results from institutional grants should ETA decide to renew this activity sometime in the future. The second part is a broader recommendation for better focusing the agency's training and technical assistance efforts.

For Consideration on Refunding Institutional Grants

1. The purpose and objectives of the program should be more focused. Under past efforts, colleges and universities have used this money to support and prepare researchers, to train managers, to train all sorts of technical staff associated with employment and training programs, to hold conferences and to provide different kinds of technical assistance. While each of these activities provided needed services, their relative contribution to achieving ETA's goals and objectives were not clear. A decision as to whether these grants were for training academic researchers or managers of operating programs would have provided some of the critical direction for more effective use of the \$10 million allocated for the Institutional Grants program during the past 4 years. The key questions are: What were the results? Did ETA get what it wanted from the grants? Was this program effective in resolving an identified need or a particular problem affecting the agency's performance?
2. Institutional grants should be sponsored directly by a college or department and include at least one tenured faculty member with fifty percent or more of his/her time supported by grant funds. Practitioner involvement, however, should not be sacrificed in this shift toward academia.

3. If ETA is serious in its interest in institutionalizing human resource development programs in academic settings--certainly a laudable goal for the program--the grants should not be shifted from place to place. Developing and institutionalizing capacity in an academic environment takes an enormous amount of time. A small number of quality programs should be developed at selected colleges or universities across the country. Over time, each of the institutions would develop recognized programs and the reputation for quality education and training in the field.

For Consideration in Better Focusing ETA's Training and Technical Assistance Efforts

If the federal government continues to provide funding for employment and training programs, some type of multi-organizational delivery system will be required to provide services. The major actors and their roles and responsibilities will shift from time to time, yet policy and program decisions of differing magnitudes are likely to be made at all levels in the system. In the interest of efficient and effective use of these scarce taxpayers' resources, the federal government cannot afford to abdicate its responsibility for attracting and developing competent staff to manage the programs regardless of the funding level.

The federal agency responsible for program implementation should consider itself and the organizations it funds as one major interrelated public enterprise and recognize the importance of a well-focused staff training and development function similar to that common to many private sector firms. Using a systems approach, a staff training and development plan for the entire delivery system should be developed and funded. This plan should be focused on identifying, training and bringing new people into the system; updating the skills of technicians and specialists already working in the field; and developing and renewing the skills of managers at all levels in the delivery system.

Using this approach, decisions regarding what is to be done are made first, then decisions as to the appropriate role for universities

or other organizations in providing training and staff development could more easily be made. The development of such a plan providing a framework for decision making should precede any decision regarding how such staff training and development should be delivered or who should be involved in providing the services.

Attachments

University Courses Taught by HRPP Staff

<u>Course Title</u>	<u>Dept.</u>	<u>Semester(s) Offered</u>	<u>Number Enrolled</u>	<u>Instructor</u>
Apprenticeship Project of the LBJ School of Public Affairs	LBJ	F 78/S 79	23	R. Glover K. Tolo
Improving the Effective- ness of the Federal Employment & Training System	LBJ	F 79/S 80	11	R. Glover R. McPherson
Employment-Training Policy Implementation in Local Labor Markets	LBJ	F 80/S 81	15	R. Glover D. Porter
Evaluating Training Programs in Texas	LBJ	F 81/S 82	9	R. Glover N. Grubb
Introduction to Labor Economics	ECO	F 80 S 81	41 52	C. King C. King
Topics in Labor Economics	ECO	S 81	6	C. King
Management of Human Resources (2 sections)	MAN MAN	F 81 F 81	38 44	R. McPherson & C. King

The Internship Program

The Human Resources Professionals Program Internship component consistently placed interested students in management-track internship positions with CETA prime sponsors, community-based organizations, various offices of the Department of Labor or research projects funded through The Center for the Study of Human Resources.

Program staff searched out appropriate internship opportunities and elicited a commitment from each agency for a specific internship slot, preferably with an assignment and job description laid out before students applied. Students' backgrounds in terms of academic achievement, work experience, knowledge of the field and personal interests were then matched to a select group of internship slots.

When an agency expressed interest in a student, an interview was set up, after which all negotiations were between the agency and the student. In each case, the intern's salary was paid by the host agency. This approach was designed to create a realistic employer-employee relationship for the intern.

The role of the Human Resources Professionals Program staff then became one of monitoring the internship. To this end, interns kept weekly logs and were contacted by program staff at various points during the internship period. In addition, the interns' supervisors were asked to complete evaluation forms regarding the interns' completion of the assigned responsibilities.

Specifics of the internships for each year follow:

1979 Belinda Guadarrama - Summer 1979

Agency: MDC, Inc., Chapel Hill, North Carolina. MDC, Inc. under contract to the Department of Labor, Office of Youth Programs.

Relationship to Degree Program: Ms. Guadarrama was a graduate student in Economics pursuing a master's degree. An internship is not a formal requirement for an M.A. in Economics; however, Belinda used this experience as a basis for her thesis which is a requirement for the degree.

Work Assignment: Ms. Guadarrama was responsible for monitoring and assessing the Department of Labor's Summer Youth Employment Program in Washington, D.C. Her duties included on-site review of program activities and report compilation at the Office of Youth Programs.

Salary Arrangements: The total salary was paid by MDC, Inc.

Ida Stewart - Summer 1979

Agency: Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training (BAT), U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Relationship to Degree Program: Ms. Stewart was a student at the LBJ School of Public Affairs. The internship is a four credit hour requirement toward a Master of Public Affairs degree.

Work Assignment: Ms. Stewart was a Program Analyst with the National Office of the Bureau of Apprenticeship. She did special studies and analysis related to expanding access to apprenticeship for women and minorities as well as other topics.

Salary Arrangements: The total salary was paid by the Bureau.

1980 Ruben Barrera - Summer 1980

Agency: Office of Management Assistance (OMA), Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Relationship to Degree Program: Mr. Barrera received four credit hours toward his Master of Public Affairs degree. An internship is required for graduation. His Professional Report, another degree requirement, was based on data collected during his internship.

Work Assignment: As a Federal Summer Intern, Mr. Barrera was assigned to the Division of Program and Management Review and Policy Development. He assisted in development of monitoring systems, instruments for Federal monitoring activities, and on-site management reviews and reports.

Salary Arrangements: The total salary was paid by OMA.

Della Blake - Summer 1980

Agency: Mayor's Office of Manpower Resources, Baltimore, Maryland.

Relationship to Degree Program: Ms. Blake's MBA program does not give internship credit, but she wanted the practical experience and exposure to the employment and training field that the internship offered her, to supplement her studies.

Work Assignment: As Administrative Assistant to the Coordinator of Special Projects, Ms. Blake assisted in the administration and monitoring of a number of youth employment and training programs.

Salary Arrangements: The total salary was paid by the CETA prime sponsor.

Jeffrey Carr - Summer 1980

Agency: Alameda County Training and Employment Board, Hayward, California.

Relationship to Degree Program: Mr. Carr received four credit hours toward his Master of Public Affairs degree; an internship is required for graduation in this program.

Work Assignment: Assigned to the Management Information Systems Unit, Mr. Carr compiled reports and carried out special projects for the CETA prime sponsor.

Salary Arrangements: The total salary was paid by the prime sponsor.

Dana DeBeauvoir - Summer 1980

Agency: Multnomah/Washington Consortium, Portland, Oregon.

Relationship to Degree Program: Ms. DeBeauvoir received four credit hours toward her Master of Public Affairs degree; an internship is required for graduation in this program.

Work Assignment: As a Planning Intern, Ms. DeBeauvoir conducted an independent evaluation of the existing planning process, its relationship to evaluation, MIS and Fiscal Department, and made recommendations for improvement.

Salary Arrangements: The total salary was paid by the CETA prime sponsor.

Laura Pittman - Summer 1980

Agency: Center for the Study of Human Resources, Austin, Texas.

Relationship to Degree Program: Ms. Pittman received four credit hours toward her Master of Public Affairs degree; an internship is required in this degree program. She wrote her Professional Report, another degree requirement, on the topic researched during her internship.

Work Assignment: Ms. Pittman was responsible for conducting a pilot study to test the feasibility of a research design to analyze the labor market for professional/top management level personnel working in DOL Region VI CETA prime sponsor organizations.

Salary Arrangements: The total salary was paid by the University of Texas at Austin under funding through the Institutional grant from the Office of Research and Development, U.S. Department of Labor.

Scott Tuggle - Spring through Summer 1980

Agency: Targeted Outreach Program Management System Project, Center for the Study of Human Resources, Austin, Texas.

Relationship to Degree Program: There was no course-credit relationship between this internship and the MBA program; however, Mr. Tuggle's eight months' part-time as a research associate expanded his knowledge of the field and gave him practical work experience, supplementing his course work.

Work Assignment: Mr. Tuggle was assigned as a Research Associate I, compiling background materials and data, organizing formats and writing report elements for a comprehensive management system involving both planning and MIS elements.

Salary Arrangements: The total salary was paid by the University of Texas at Austin with funding from a contract with the Office of National Programs, U.S. Department of Labor.

Robert Schwab - Summer 1980

Agency: Mid-Willamette Valley Consortium, Salem, Oregon.

Relationship to Degree Program: Mr. Schwab was a graduate student in the Economics Department, which does not offer course credit for internships. He felt that an internship

with a CETA prime sponsor would complement his academic program by offering exposure to the field and hands-on experience.

Work Assignment: As a Student Intern II, Mr. Schwab was assigned to the IMU to conduct analysis of major control systems within the organization and to develop conclusions and recommendations based upon research and analysis of his findings.

Salary Arrangements: The total salary was paid by the CETA prime sponsor.

1981 Patrick Bernal - Summer 1981

Agency: Alamo Consortium, Department of Economic and Employment Development, San Antonio, Texas.

Relationship to Degree Program: Mr. Bernal was a graduate student in the LBJ School of Public Affairs' combined law-public affairs program. The internship is a four credit hour requirement toward this degree.

Work Assignment: Assigned to the Planning Division, Mr. Bernal proposed, designed and implemented a study of job developers and private employers in order to enhance private sector employment of CETA clients.

Salary Arrangements: The total salary was paid by the CETA prime sponsor.

Laurie Born - Summer 1981

Agency: Employment-Training Implementation in Local Labor Markets Project, Center for the Study of Human Resources, Austin, Texas.

Relationship to Degree Program: Ms. Born was a student at the LBJ School of Public Affairs. The internship is a four credit hour requirement toward her master's degree. Ms. Born's Professional Report was also based on this research.

Work Assignment: Ms. Born conducted employer interviews and case studies as part of a detailed Austin labor market study examining the relationship between local training and jobs.

Salary Arrangements: The total salary was paid by the University of Texas at Austin with funding under contract with the Capital Area Manpower Consortium, the CETA prime sponsor for the Austin area.

Maxine Kramer - Summer 1981

Agency: Seattle Opportunities Industrialization Center, Seattle, Washington.

Relationship to Degree Program: Ms. Kramer had completed her required internship in 1980, but wished to gain greater experience and exposure to the field.

Work Assignment: Within the Planning Department of Seattle OIC, Ms. Kramer conducted an evaluation study of the relative effectiveness and benefits of OIC's classroom training and on-the-job training.

Salary Arrangements: The total salary was paid by Seattle OIC.

Susan Marshall - Summer 1981

Agency: Penobscot Consortium, New England Institute, Bangor, Maine.

Relationship to Degree Program: Ms. Marshall was entering the LBJ School of Public Affairs in Fall 1981, so could not receive course credit for her internship. However, she wished to gain practical experience in the employment and training field to supplement her academic work.

Work Assignment: Ms. Marshall carried out a computer analysis of the long-term employment patterns of CETA participants who have received "job search" training versus those who have not.

Salary Arrangements: The total salary was paid by the Consortium.

Jill McAlister (Kerr) - Summer 1981

Agency: Community-Based Job Corps Center, Penobscot Consortium, Bangor, Maine.

Relationship to Degree Program: Ms. McAlister was a student at the LBJ School of Public Affairs. The internship is a four credit hour requirement for the Master of Public Affairs degree.

Work Assignment: Ms. Kerr conducted a research project designed to identify common characteristics among Job Corps trainees.

Salary Arrangements: The total salary was paid by the Consortium.

Human Resources Professionals Program Students

I. Core Students - 20

<u>Student</u>	<u>Dept.</u>	<u>Internship</u>	<u>Graduated</u>
Ruben Barrera	LBJ	Summer 80	1981
Patrick Bernal	LBJ/LAW	Summer 81	
Della Blake	MAN	Summer 80	1981
Laurie Born	LBJ	Summer 81	1982
Jeff Carr	LBJ	Summer 80	
Brian Deaton	MAN		1981
Dana DeBeauvoir	LBJ	Summer 80	1981
Belinda Guadarrama	ECO	Summer 79	1980
Maxine Kramer	LBJ	Summer 81	1981
Annette Lovoi	LBJ		1980
Susan Marshall	LBJ	Summer 81	
Jill McAlister (Kerr)	LBJ	Summer 81	
Jennifer Pfeister	LBJ		1980
Laura Pittman	LBJ	Summer 80	1981
Judy Roberson	GOV		1981
Linda Schulman	LBJ		
Robert Schwab	ECO	Summer 80	
Ida Stewart	LBJ/LAW	Summer 79	
Scott Tuggle	MAN	Spr/Sum 80	1981
Rik Mackay	ECO		

II. Students Receiving Substantial Services: Counseling, Internship Assistance and Workshops - 31

<u>Student</u>	<u>Dept.</u>
Susan Angelo	MAN
Melda Benevidez	ECO
Marie Bittner	GOV
Ann Blumberg	MAN
Steve Chenoweth	GOV
Harold Cox	SW
Greg DeCoster	ECO
Karen Dockal	MAN
Esther Gonzales	LBJ
Burnis Hall	GOV
Ken Hodson	LBJ
Bob Hoff	GOV
Max Hosmanek	LAS
Mary Ann Kelly	LBJ
Mike Kueber	MAN
Alice Kuhn	LBJ
Bina Lefkovitz	LBJ
Debra Looper	ECO
James Mason	LBJ
Linda Millstone	LBJ
Charles Musta	GOV
Sandro Pio	CRP
Mark Richardson	LBJ
Steve Schatz	GOV
Brian Sperry	CRP

<u>Student</u>	<u>Dept.</u>
Eric Sprotte	ECO
Nelda Sturgeon	GOV
Jan Vardaman	ECO
Joan Viellette	LBJ
Phyllis Weaver	LBJ
Alan Wright	LBJ

III. Students Enrolled in University Courses Taught by HRPP Staff - 239

IV. Students Having Minimal Contact With the Program, Including Some Guidance or Counseling - 65

V. Students Making Information Requests - 70