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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. OVERVIEW

Rapidly expanding interest in problems associated with the effective dissemination and utilization of scientific knowledge reflects a growing concern on the part of social scientists with the need to promote wider use of the products of social science R & D and with the need to foster innovations that will strengthen the theoretical, methodological, and empirical foundations of the social sciences in ways that will stimulate knowledge utilization.

Substantial theoretical and empirical evidence increasingly supports the notion that knowledge utilization can be improved by adopting a clinical approach to research. Though guidelines outlining what needs to be done to promote knowledge utilization are available, clear guidelines have not been produced about how to meet the requirements that appear to be associated with successful knowledge utilization.

Accordingly, this dissertation attempts to narrow the gap that exists between what needs to be done to promote knowledge utilization and how to do it. In this regard, special attention is given to the role that research review procedures and mechanisms can play in
promoting the wider utilization of products from social science research and development (R & D) efforts.

Research review procedures and mechanisms have a long history in science. Review panels are used to establish R & D agendas in order to reduce redundancy and to promote cumulative learning. They are used to evaluate proposals that are solicited by funding agencies to help ensure that proposed research is responsive to the request for proposals (RFPs) and that it is likely to be executed in a timely and competent manner. Review panels are also used to assess the quality of research prior to its publication to ensure that it meets commonly accepted scientific standards and/or institutionally-specific standards for publication. In nearly all these cases, however, the review functions are performed by the researcher's scientific peers and the research is evaluated against scientific standards largely derived from professional norms and practices.

This research deals with an innovation in the use of review mechanisms — a review panel comprised by users of scientific research who are charged with assessing the research against standards derived from dissemination and utilization requirements. Specifically, this research deals with a research review innovation called the Report Review Committee (RRC).

The Report Review Committee was developed in a clinical research environment as a component of the BENCHMARK Program, a joint venture of The Ohio State University and Battelle Memorial Institute to promote the development and utilization of social science products,
processes, and methods in problem-solving at the metropolitan level. The Report Review Committee innovation -- one component of a prototype of a clinical approach to community research -- involved potential users from the public and civic sectors of the community in the analysis of data from a social indicator system developed by BENCHMARK and in the preparation and dissemination of research reports based upon it.

The principal result of this study is a set of prescriptive recommendations that social scientists can follow in convening small, ad hoc groups created to assist in the analysis, reporting, and dissemination of social science research findings in order to promote the utilization of social science research. These recommendations include attention to how the members of such a group can be recruited and to how such a convening can be operated. In addition, the analysis gives special emphasis to the social process surrounding a social science R & D effort, and provides specific elaboration of a clinical approach to problem-solving -- one that integrates training, research, and service in a single program and one that fosters close and continuous interaction between the users and performers of social science R & D.

B. THE PROBLEM OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH UTILIZATION

Research utilization is one of the most serious challenges presently confronting the social sciences R & D community. However modest one's expectations about the social sciences might be, the use
of social science R & D seems quite meager compared to the investment made in social science R & D. When the ledger sheet is filled in, the return does not seem commensurate with the investment. Why this is so has captured the interest of those who fund, practice, and use social science research. Efforts to understand this apparent shortfall have led to numerous explanations purporting to account for the social sciences' high investment-to-payoff ratio.

1. The Intractability Argument

Some have argued that the social sciences deal with phenomena that by their very nature are subject to more influences which are less stable and far more difficult to understand and control than are the phenomena dealt with by the physical sciences. Consequently, the payoffs from social science R & D can never be as great or in the same class — so it is argued — as the payoffs from R & D investments in the physical sciences. The result is that the use and usefulness of social science research are limited and that the limitations are inherent in the nature of the phenomena that such research explores.

2. The Maturity Argument

Another class of explanations focuses on the relative youthfulness of the social sciences. As this argument has it, the social sciences have only recently begun to develop the data bases, tools, and methodologies that are necessary prerequisites for producing discernible payoffs from R & D. The emphasis on acquiring data and improving methodology, so evident throughout the past decade in the
social sciences, represents the inevitable start-up costs that preceede any return on investment from social science R & D or any R & D investment. The resulting explanation from this perspective is that payoffs will be slow in coming because the use and usefulness of social science R & D increase only as the social sciences mature, and the social sciences mature only with time and continuing investment in their maturation.

Though other more esoteric explanations exist, these two classes of explanations are employed typically to account for the apparent incapacity of many of society's institutions to use the products from social science research -- one focusing on the nature of social phenomena and suggesting that the utility and impact of the social sciences may always be limited, and the other focusing on the data and methodologies available to social scientists and suggesting that the social sciences are approaching the take-off stage where a return on investment can reasonably be expected. However appealing they may be, from the perspective of the person who wishes to improve either the investment-to-payoff ratio or the level of payoff of social science R & D, these explanations are not particularly useful -- primarily because they suggest that the social scientist can do very little in the here and now to influence knowledge utilization.

3. The Social System of Research Argument

There is, however, another very important class of explanations -- one that is receiving the increasing attention and interest of a broad spectrum of social scientists. This class of explanations
focuses on the social system within which knowledge utilization takes place, and suggests -- unlike the others -- that social scientists can do a great deal to influence knowledge utilization. From this perspective, knowledge utilization is a social process that can be influenced as well as studied by social scientists. Social scientists can meet the twin challenges of making social science research both useful and used.

This class of explanations suggests that the social science utilization challenge is exacerbated by the following factors:

- the investment made in the conduct of social science R & D is not matched by corresponding investments to enhance the utility and promote the use of social science research products;
- the process of generating scientific knowledge is rarely linked to the process of applying this knowledge in planning and problem solving;
- researchers are usually un concerned with marketing; that is, incorporating utilization strategies into the research process itself;
- the knowledge utilization process is often conceptualized in a manner that hinders the dissemination and utilization of scientific knowledge. The domains of research, technology and utilization -- which parallel roughly the generation, refinement, and application of knowledge -- are often viewed as stages in a process of knowledge utilization in which innovations or advances arise most often in a "pure and basic" research setting and progress inevitably and irreversibly through the stage of technology and onto the stage of utilization. Such conceptualizations may actually hinder knowledge utilization because they promote the notion that vital and "natural" linkages exist among research, technology and utilization when, in fact, the weight of the evidence suggests they do not. Rather, these domains appear to be separate and distinct, and are related in complex and indeterminate, but nonetheless understandable ways.
• certain scientific norms that dominate the practice and professions of social science also contribute to underutilization. These norms often eschew the value of instrumental knowledge, and favor statistical explanation and prediction over action (manipulation) and control;  

• the larger social setting within which knowledge utilization takes place is afflicted by its own "two cultures" problem; the producers of social science knowledge and the potential users of that knowledge are worlds apart — separated by dissimilar institutions, languages, social backgrounds, professional socialization experiences, and behavioral norms;  

• only a few social scientists receive the training and acquire the practical experience required to facilitate their operating effectively in settings where the knowledge they generate could be applied.  

Though these factors constitute barriers limiting the extent to which social science research is used in policy and program management, social scientists can exert considerable influence over these barriers and can narrow the gap which separates the best social science knowledge available from its all too infrequent application in social planning and problem-solving. It is not, in other words, necessary to say that the knowledge application gap represents an intractable problem resulting from the nature of the phenomena under study, or that social scientists can do little beyond improving social science data, methodology, and theory.  

On the contrary, the utilization challenge is likely to persist as long as research is regarded as an isolated, self-contained activity — designed and executed in a vacuum with little attention devoted to linking either the process or products of that research to
users, to social purpose, or to public policy. Thus, attention to the institutional setting and the social process of knowledge utilization suggests that social scientists can do much to improve the utility and promote the utilization of social science research. One of the more promising strategies in this regard is to adopt a clinical approach to research — one that focuses attention precisely on the social context of research and on the interdependencies among research, training, and service and on the need to create opportunities for natural, task-oriented interaction between research performers and research users.

C. A CLINICAL APPROACH TO UTILIZATION

The adoption of a clinical approach to social science research constitutes one method for eliminating many of the barriers to knowledge utilization. Because the Report Review Committee constitutes an important component of a clinical strategy, it is important to describe the elements of a clinical orientation in some detail — including the characteristics which distinguish clinically oriented from non-clinically oriented research.13

1. Demand-Oriented Research

First, in clinically oriented research, research is demand generated or related. Research agendas are developed in response to needs and research questions are specified according to socially defined rather than scientifically defined objectives. Though clinical research may be very abstract or conceptual in nature, it originates
from and is directly rooted to a purpose which is defined not by the R & D performer but by the R & D user.14

2. User Involvement

Second, the clinical approach places great emphasis on establishing close linkages between the research performer and the research user. Consequently, clinically oriented research evidences a high degree of interaction between the R & D performer and R & D users and clients. Generally, users or clients are involved in all phases of the research, development, and utilization process. In addition, an effort is made to integrate the user or client as a participant in the R & D process, a participant who serves the functions of identifying needs for R & D, providing feedback on the utility of R & D, and marketing the products of the R & D effort in wider user communities.

3. Feedback

Third, the opportunity to receive continuous feedback on the R & D effort is essential to a clinical orientation. Since users or clients are so intimately involved in the R & D effort, they represent a source of feedback on its utility and applicability—especially if the research performer makes corresponding efforts to design routines that facilitate a constant flow of feedback. Thus, the clinically oriented research environment provides opportunities for evaluative feedback on the utility of the R & D effort, and the clinically oriented researcher constantly tries to stimulate evaluative
feedback and its integration in order to improve the research product and adapt it to changing conditions or demands.

4. An Integrated R & D Process

Fourth, in the clinical approach, all the phases of the research, development, and utilization process are closely linked. Thus, activities undertaken in one phase are connected to and conditioned by activities undertaken in the other phases of the overall process. This is done to ensure a closeness-of-fit between what goes into and what comes out of the R & D effort, and to promote congruence and continuity among all the phases of the process. 15

5. Research Management

Fifth, in the clinical approach, a great deal of attention is paid to the social context of research, including the context within which the research originates, the context within which the research is executed, and the context within which the research is applied or used. Accordingly, the research performer is encouraged to be more self-conscious of his own role and function, to be aware of the potential policy functions of research itself, to be sensitive to the role of the user and client, and to be cognizant of the factors that condition both the demand for and the use of R & D. 16

6. Promoting Utilization

Finally, since the clinical orientation places a high value on knowledge utilization, continuous efforts are made to promote knowledge utilization. This involves "testing" decisions about the
R & D effort against the requirements of establishing those conditions and exerting leverage over those factors that both theory and experience suggest influence the utilization of scientific knowledge in problem-solving.

Thus, the clinical approach emphasizes:

- research that is demand-generated or need-related;
- close linkages between the research performer and the research user;
- continuous feedback on the research effort;
- linkages among all the phases of the research, development, and utilization process;
- continuous attention to and management of the social context of research; and
- attention to the promotion of knowledge utilization and the marketing of the products of the research.

D. RESULTS OF A CLINICAL APPROACH

Social scientists who adopt a clinical approach to research are likely to become more familiar with the needs and practices of potential users or clients owing to the emphasis placed on both the social context of research and linkages with users. As a consequence, the R & D performer with a clinical orientation is in an advantageous position to design and execute research that is responsive to the needs of users. Hence, a clinical approach is more likely to result in the design and execution of research that has relative advantages for the user, addresses deficiencies in existing practices, and is compatible with the norms, practices, constraints and requirements of the system within which the user operates.
Other features of the clinical approach help to ensure that the R & D will be easier to understand and use. The attention that is paid to promoting knowledge utilization and linking all the phases of the research, development, and utilization process, the procedures and structures designed to elicit and incorporate feedback, and the high degree of interaction and involvement between the R & D performer and user all help ensure that user problems in understanding or using the R & D can be quickly discovered and more easily corrected.

Finally, the clinical approach promotes knowledge utilization because it encourages the careful monitoring and controlled application of research in problem-solving arenas that include technical assistance and other forms of utilization support for the prospective user. Consequently, the R & D effort is complimented by a corresponding effort to tailor R & D products to specific user needs and to support the application of R & D in the trial, assessment, adoption, and institutionalization phases of a utilization chain.

In summary, the clinical approach to social science R & D has a number of attributes which recommend its adoption by social scientists eager to increase the use and usefulness of the R & D they perform. Since social scientists can influence the setting within which and the process by which R & D is performed, they can use the clinical approach to overcome or reduce the impact of many social process barriers that are known to inhibit knowledge utilization.
As noted earlier, knowledge about what to do to promote knowledge utilization in the social sciences exceeds the knowledge about how to do it. Thus, the gap between the knowledge about what needs to be done to promote knowledge utilization in the social sciences and the knowledge about how to do it needs to be narrowed. For the most part, clearly explicated, well documented, instrumental (or engineering) strategies for promoting knowledge utilization are missing. It is because the absence of such strategies constitutes a serious barrier to the increased use of social science R & D that this study has been undertaken — an in-depth examination of the Report Review Committee focusing attention on the conduct of R & D according to a clinical approach and on the creation and operation of the institutional settings that facilitate clinically oriented research.

The barriers are not insurmountable. Individuals outside the social sciences have devised procedural innovations, institutional mechanisms, and "how to" guidelines for performing clinically oriented research. Moreover, many of these models and guidelines can be adapted by social scientists for use in the social sciences. However, though social scientists can look elsewhere — that is, "outside" of the social sciences -- for the know-how required to promote knowledge utilization, the main task of creating that know-how must be shouldered by social scientists themselves.
Though instrumental knowledge developed elsewhere for promoting the use and increasing the utility of R & D is undoubtedly an important source of the know-how required to increase the utility of social science R & D, at some point social scientists must discover and create for themselves that type of know-how which is ideally suited to the specific and unique requirements of the social sciences. Success here requires the ingenuity, creativity, resourcefulness, and perseverance of social scientists as they focus their talent and energies on inventing, testing, evaluating, and documenting this know-how. It is to this task that we now turn as the remaining pages concentrate on institutional innovations and related innovations in the social process that can reasonably be expected to affect the pattern of utilization of the products and methods of social science research in the process of community problem-solving.
CHAPTER II

THE RESEARCH DESIGN

A. THE RESEARCH SETTING: THE BENCHMARK PROGRAM

1. Introduction

In the summer of 1973, the BENCHMARK Program was established as a three year prototype of a clinical approach to urban research. The Program had two overriding objectives — one problem solving and the other scientific. The problem-solving (or service) objective was to conduct urban research that could be used in community planning and decision making by policy and program managers in both the civic and public sectors. The scientific objective was to invent the institutional innovations and strategies necessary to reduce the barriers inhibiting the broadest possible use of this research and to develop guidelines and instrumental knowledge based on the systematic evaluation of the operation of these innovations and strategies. The Report Review Committee (RRC) was a major component of this prototype, and it is the subject of this study. Before describing the Report Review Committee, the context within which it evolved is briefly discussed.

The BENCHMARK Program was the organizational nexus within which the development and testing of this clinical approach to social science research was embedded. The Program was a new organization.
in the community, semi-autonomous of the Ohio State University, and funded as a scientific prototype.

BENCHMARK had teaching, research, and service missions — all of which were carried out within the framework of this clinical approach. The core staff consisted primarily of advanced graduate students whose involvement in the Program was designed to augment their formal, university-based academic programs of study. Research of both a methodological and theoretical nature and dealing with a broad array of substantive issues was conducted by the Program. BENCHMARK also served a service function by performing demand-generated research, providing multiple forms of technical assistance, engaging in a variety of capacity building efforts, and transferring information and skills to individuals working in the community’s public and civic sector institutions.

2. Institutional Mechanisms

Designed to provide policy and program management for the Program, major components of the Program included the BENCHMARK Community Conference (BCC), the Special Interest Groups (SIGs), and the Scope Team.

Policy management components. The BENCHMARK Community Conference was designed as an organization serving both advisory and policy making functions for the Program. Membership in the BCC was open (that is, unrestricted), and resulted from voluntary interest and self-selection. Through the BCC, any person or group in the community
could collaborate with the staff in addressing the problems associated with making research responsive to community needs. The BCC helped to establish major program policies, priorities and procedures. The BCC also assumed important program development functions — especially with respect to the design and development of the first Columbus Area Social Profile (CASP). 18

Provision for Special Interest Groups (SIGs) was approved by the BCC less than half a year after its formation. Approval was granted "to permit smaller, more focused groups 1) to exchange knowledge and information, 2) to explore alternatives and develop strategic options, 3) to develop action plans, and 4) to develop and mobilize resources to facilitate the implementation of action plans." 19 SIGs were community initiated and membership in them was unrestricted. The SIGs provided policy guidance to BENCHMARK regarding the specialized areas of interest or concern around which they were organized.

The SCOPE Team was devised to serve executive committee functions for the BCC thereby providing direction and structure to its efforts and precluding the development of hierarchy and oligarchy within it. Membership in the SCOPE Team consisted of three BCC Coordinators elected by the Conference, a representative of each active SIG, and the Director of the Program.

These and other institutional components of the Program were designed to give substance to the elements of a clinical approach outlined earlier. The BCC, the SIGs, and the SCOPE Team all performed agenda-setting functions for the Program and helped ensure that
research undertaken was demand-generated and need-related. These mechanisms also facilitated the development of linkages with the user community and provided feedback on Program efforts.

Staff support to these entities charged with performing policy management functions for the program was provided by the Community Analysis-Assistance Group (CA-AG), the major staff arm of the Program. CA-AG was responsible for the research, development, and community training and assistance functions of the Program, and for major Program operations. In keeping with BENCHMARK's clinical orientation, CA-AG attempted to develop collaborative as opposed to purely staff or consultant relationships based on recognition of and respect for the prerogatives and interests of the social scientists operating BENCHMARK and the community members assisting in policy management.

Program management components. Other institutional innovations, designed principally for program management, evolved as required to meet the policy and program objectives established for the Program. Like the institutional components of the Program established to serve policy management functions, the institutional components established to serve program management functions were designed to give substance to the elements of BENCHMARK's clinical approach.

One of the major Program initiatives approved by the BCC and undertaken by BENCHMARK involved filling a gap in the community's information base by developing a social indicator system to provide an accurate profile of the attitudes, practices and levels of awareness of Columbus area residents. To form the foundation of this
social indicator system, BENCHMARK designed and executed the Columbus Area Social Profile (CASP), a survey conducted in the summer of 1974 with a probability sample of 2,401 Columbus, Ohio area residents.

The personal interviews conducted for CASP averaged one and three-quarter hours in length and dealt with a broad array of human concerns. The data base derived from the survey was designed so that it could be integrated with aggregate and institutional data collected from other sources. Consequently, BENCHMARK's social indicator system included data from surveys, the census and other sources.

BENCHMARK wanted to ensure that the social indicator system it designed was both useful and used—that is, employed widely throughout the public and civic sectors of the community in planning, policy making, education, training, and evaluation. Publicly it was said that CASP had been undertaken for the following purposes: 1) to assess people's needs, aspirations, and priorities; 2) to stimulate discussion about important issues facing the metropolitan area; 3) to develop alternative approaches to social problem-solving; 4) to improve people's understanding of the community; and 5) to establish some "benchmarks" against which it would be possible to assess where the community was, where it had been, where it was headed, and where it would like to go.

BENCHMARK was confronted with the challenge of promoting the dissemination and utilization of the information contained in the CASP social indicator system. The Program's clinical approach and corresponding innovations were designed to meet this challenge by reducing the social, psychological, organizational, and institutional
barriers that typically impede the use of social intelligence and the adoption of new social technologies.  

BENCHMARK turned to the substantial body of theory and research on knowledge utilization to identify specific barriers that needed to be overcome and specific conditions that needed to be established to promote CASP's use. Not only was much of the theory and research on knowledge utilization compatible with the Program's clinical approach, it was also easily converted into design specifications for and objectives to be met by the policy and program management components of the Program.

This theory and research indicated the importance of creating among potential users conditions of awareness, interest, trust and credibility in the research performer, the research method, and the research products. Thus, the theory-based approach to program operations adopted by BENCHMARK to promote CASP's use employed the clinical approach to establish these conditions. These conditions emerge time and again as potent explanatory variables in the study of knowledge utilization; and, because they are susceptible to manipulation, they are of great importance to those who have more than an academic interest in the phenomenon of knowledge utilization; that is, to those who wish to devise strategies and tactics to increase the use of scientific knowledge.  

Consequently, the institutional innovations were designed to involve potential users intimately in the design, development, and dissemination phases of the CASP social reporting process based on
research findings indicating the importance of user involvement in establishing the conditions of awareness, interest, trust and credibility that, in turn, are essential to knowledge utilization. The social process of user involvement in each stage of the CASP R & D process is displayed in Figure 2.1. User involvement was sought to ensure that the information collected in CASP was responsive to the needs of potential users, to stimulate interest in and awareness of CASP, to foster an appreciation of the strengths and limitations of survey research, to increase community identification with CASP, and to build trust and credibility in BENCHMARK's R & D effort.

Several important institutional innovations were developed by the Program to promote the utilization of the CASP social indicator system. One such innovation, the Report Review Committee, is the subject of this study and is described in the following sections. Other major innovations included the Community-Originated Studies Program, the USERS GUIDE, the Program's newsletter, BenchMarkings, BENCHMARK Background Reports, User's Workshops, and the Social Reports.

The Community-Originated Studies (COS) Program made it possible for any person or group in the community to request a special study based on information available in the CASP data base or accessible by the BENCHMARK Data Center. Generally, COSs were performed free of charge or for a nominal fee on a first-come, first-serve basis. The USERS GUIDE was designed to introduce people to the purposes of BENCHMARK, the processes by which it was governed, the contents of CASP, the process by which CASP was designed, how CASP data could be
FIGURE 2.1: THE COLUMBUS AREA SOCIAL REPORTS:
stages of development and utilization
used, and how to formulate a COS request. The Program's newsletter, BenchMarkings, was sent monthly to over 500 people in the community and included information about CASP related reports that had been written and CASP related special studies that had been performed. Background Reports provided brief explanations written for users about such things as how to read and interpret computer print-out, the concept of sampling error, and how to use CASP data. Users Workshops were provided both at regular intervals and on demand to accompany the USERS GUIDE and to introduce people to CASP and the COS Program. Finally, Social Reports were written to disseminate the major findings from CASP widely throughout the community.  

B. THE SUBJECT OF THE RESEARCH: THE REPORT REVIEW COMMITTEE

Two mandates had been extended to BENCHMARK by the BENCHMARK Community Conference regarding CASP. One was to disseminate the results of CASP quickly and widely throughout the community. The other was to make the data from CASP available to individuals and groups in the community for specialized purposes or uses.

To meet the first mandate, BENCHMARK began issuing a series of Social Reports about the Columbus metropolitan area a month after the field work for CASP was completed. The BENCHMARK Social Reports—16 were issued at the rate of one approximately every three weeks—were relatively short (13 to 19 pages), non-technical summaries breaking out quality of life indicators from CASP for major demographic groups and areal divisions within the metropolitan area. The Social
Reports dealt with major substantive topics covered in the survey including housing, crime and the criminal justice system, transportation, social services, capital improvements, health, employment, child care, food, recreation, and education.

One of the principal institutional innovations created by the Program was the Report Review Committee (RRC). The RRC was designed to involve potential users in the analysis of CASP data and in the preparation and dissemination of the Social Reports. BENCHMARK established a Report Review Committee (RRC) for each Social Report.

It was apparent that the goal of broad dissemination of the results of CASP could be facilitated greatly by media coverage of the release of the Social Reports. News editors and news directors from the print and electronic media were convened to brief them on BENCHMARK's missions and to seek their suggestions about how to design and release the Social Reports so as to maximize media coverage.

The media panel agreed on the requirements that broad, public dissemination demanded. Most importantly, the panel urged that the contents of the Social Reports reflect a concern for relevance, timeliness, newsworthiness, and readability. Thus, a decision was made to convene a Report Review Committee for each Social Report, an ad hoc review panel of interested persons and potential users created to assist in the analysis, reporting and dissemination of the findings from CASP. Thus the RRC assisted BENCHMARK in preparing Social Reports suitable for broad distribution and whose content would meet the relevance, timeliness, newsworthiness and readability
requirements identified by the panel of news leadership from the local media.

The RRC review panel was an important component of the BENCHMARK prototype of a clinical approach to urban research. In keeping with the demand-generated research characteristic of the clinical approach, the RRC articulated user defined needs for information from CASP. RRC members provided the staff analysts responsible for conducting the research on which Social Report drafts were based with advice about the content and form of the Social Reports.

The RRC also helped to establish close linkages between the Program's professional staff and users from the community by facilitating community input into the reporting process itself, stimulating task-oriented interaction between staff and users, and enabling potential users to become more aware of the scope, nature, and uses of CASP data.

RRC members, as participants in the Social Report writing process, were able to provide feedback both on the research and analysis undertaken for the Social Reports and on the design of CASP. In addition, the RRC review panel helped provide continuity among the different phases of the research development and utilization process. RRC members identified the CASP data to be analyzed, specified additional research to be conducted, assisted in writing the Social Reports, and participated in the utilization process by using the research themselves, by diffusing the research to others, and by identifying groups, agencies, and individuals who should receive copies of Social Reports.
Finally, the RRC also focused attention on the social context within which the research would be used and helped ensure that Social Reports met user defined dissemination and utilization requirements.

The membership of a Report Review Committee was recruited from the BENCHMARK Community Conference\(^2\) and from agencies and groups representing important potential users having an interest or expertise in the subject area of a given Social Report. In addition, all persons who expressed an interest in serving on a Report Review Committee were invited to participate, as were individuals nominated by others.

People could become aware of the opportunity to serve on an RRC in a variety of ways: through the members and meetings of the Special Interest Groups that were an integral part of the Program; through the members and meetings of the BENCHMARK Community Conference; through the Program's newsletter--distributed to over 500 people in the community and containing announcements of upcoming RRCs and invitations to serve on an RRC; through the networks of associations and contacts developed by staff members; through presentations made by or meetings attended by staff members; through media accounts of the Program; and through the Social Reports themselves (which contained names of all RRC members).

RRCs were relatively small (4 to 12 people) but heterogeneous groups of experts, professionals, practitioners, government officials, and interested persons who met in three or four intensive work sessions over approximately a month to prepare a Social Report. Most of the
people serving on the twelve RRCs convened by the BENCHMARK Program had not been on an RRC before, but approximately half had been aware of and involved to varying degrees in the design of CASP.

In addition, public sector and civic sector institutions were represented almost evenly on the RRCs. From a job function perspective, it is noteworthy that nearly two-thirds of the RRC members performed planning functions in the institutions with which they were affiliated.

Though the RRC constituted only one component of BENCHMARK's overall dissemination and utilization strategy, its intensive investigation is warranted on several counts. First and perhaps most important, the RRC represents a prototype of a user review mechanism that social scientists can use to improve the dissemination and utilization of social science research outside the social science community. The channels for reporting and disseminating social science research findings are fairly well developed within the social science community. Conferences, symposia, professional associations and organizations, journals and other forms of professional publication have evolved as relatively effective professional dissemination mechanisms. However, the mechanisms available for promoting the dissemination and utilization of social science research outside the rather small and specialized community of social scientists are rudimentary and primitive in comparison to those within the social science community.

Second, most of the existing channels available to social scientists for communicating to those outside the social science community—including lectures and other forms of public speaking engagements,
interviews in the print and electronic media, and stories in popular journals— are haphazard, unreliable, unsystematic and passive in nature. Indeed, these adjectives are good descriptors even for many academic advisory services and public service programs. For the most part, social scientists have few guidelines or models that can be easily adopted to promote the dissemination and utilization of the products of their research among planners, policy makers and the general public.  

Third, the Report Review Committee represents an innovation in the design, adaptation, and operation of which are well within the intellectual, management, and administrative capabilities of most social scientists. In short, the RRC has a number of attributes and functions—in addition to those just mentioned—that recommend it for consideration by social scientists; for example, it:

- provides a way to enhance the competence of individuals outside the social science community;
- has constituency building value for the social scientist;
- provides a functional way to link the R & D performer with the potential R & D user;
- provides a way to socialize the social scientist and layman alike, promoting a basis for cooperative action;
- is a transient or temporary as opposed to either a continuing or intermittent organization, and thus belongs to a class of organizations with identifiable and researchable characteristics.
• involves relatively little risk for the participant yet substantial promise of benefit;
• is relatively inexpensive to operate and easy to administer;
• has from a scientific viewpoint much potential heuristic value;
• is from a technical viewpoint simple, efficient, and effective;
• is from an ethical viewpoint perfectly consistent with the creeds of both educators and scientists; and
• is from a pragmatic viewpoint feasible to create and operate, and adaptable for specialized purposes.

C. THE PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

The purpose of this research is to describe and evaluate the Report Review Committee—a research review innovation designed by BENCHMARK—and to generate a set of prescriptive recommendations that social scientists can follow in convening small, ad hoc groups created to assist in the analysis and reporting of social science research findings in order to promote the utilization of social science research.

It should be emphasized that the primary purpose of the research is to generate instrumental knowledge that can be used for control or engineering purposes, rather than explanatory knowledge that may not be susceptible to manipulation or applicable in any practical sense. The dissertation represents a case study undertaken for the purpose of generating instrumental knowledge derived from the evaluation of an innovation developed in a clinical setting and designed to
promote knowledge utilization. The following evaluation does not attempt to refute or corroborate some hypothesis or theory dealing with knowledge utilization but rather to generate guidelines for implementing the type of innovation which the RRC represents, and to identify factors that need to be considered in the design and use of such an innovation.

Consequently, the criteria applied to the evaluation are different from those that might be employed were the purpose of the dissertation to test hypotheses about the efficacy of some manipulation or treatment in producing some effect. Accordingly, the knowledge to be generated by this research can be regarded as a bridge between the empirical and theoretical research on knowledge utilization rooted in the study of small groups, social psychology, attitude formation and change, and communications and the "how to" but often undocumented knowledge about knowledge utilization derived from advertising, marketing, and extensive applied experience.

The purpose of the research is best understood perhaps in light of the following three objectives. First, the research seeks to understand the role of the Report Review Committee innovation within the context of the overall challenge posed by the problem of the underutilization of social science R & D. Second, and as a consequence of meeting this first objective, it seeks to define an appropriate set of purposes for the RRC. And finally, the research seeks to address the design questions associated with creating and operating a Report Re­view Committee—including who should participate and how should
participants be recruited, how should RRC meetings be run, what should be done after an RRC has been disbanded, and so on.

D. THE CONDUCT OF THE RESEARCH

1. Sources of Data

Four sources of data about the RRCs are used in this research: 1) structured mail questionnaires sent in May, 1975, to members of the RRCs; 2) semi-structured personal interviews conducted with BENCHMARK staff analysts responsible for chairing RRCs and for drafting Social Reports; 3) written records and materials related to the RRCs and BENCHMARK's overall dissemination and utilization strategy; and 4) data from the author's experiences as a participant-observer in the design, development, and operational phases of the BENCHMARK Program. A brief discussion of these data sources follows.

Survey of RRC Members. In May of 1975, structured mail questionnaires were sent to all members of Report Review Committees convened by that date. This population included RRCs for the first 13 of the 16 Social Reports issued as part of CASP. The questionnaires measured the effectiveness of the Program's dissemination and utilization strategy in promoting conditions of awareness, interest, trust and credibility; the degree to which respondents talked about the Program, the products it generated, and the services it provided; the extent to which respondents referred people to the Program for information or assistance; the degree to which BENCHMARK products and services had been used; and the opinion of respondents about BENCHMARK's
organization, operation, and staff. A total of 49 questionnaires were sent out to members of RRCs, of which 36 (73%) were returned. A copy of the questionnaire is included as Appendix A.

**Interviews with BENCHMARK Staff Analysts.** Between September of 1974 and October of 1975, 16 separate Report Review Committees were convened for the 16 Social Reports that were issued. Because a number of the Social Reports dealt with the same general subject matter (for example, there were two general overview reports, three on crime and justice, and two on transportation), only 12 distinctly different RRCs were convened or viewed in light of membership composition. Eight different BENCHMARK staff members chaired the meetings of these 12 distinctly different RRCs.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with these staff members. The interviews dealt with the purpose, content, and the process of RRCs; and referenced how RRC members were recruited, operational norms followed by staff members, social interaction patterns that emerged during RRC meetings, policies and procedures that guided the work of the committees, and challenges and opportunities in the RRC process perceived by staff analysts. Since each staff analyst can be expected to have a more intimate understanding than anyone else has of what transpired in the Report Review Committee meetings convened for the Social Report for which he was responsible, these interviews constitute a valuable source of information. An outline of the questions used in these interviews is included in Appendix E.
Written Records and Materials. Over the course of the 13 months during which RRC meetings were held, numerous written materials were prepared for and about the RRCs. Some of these materials concerned policies and guidelines to be followed by RRC members, and some concerned policies and guidelines to be followed by BENCHMARK staff analysts. These and other written materials concerning the RRCs' and BENCHMARK's overall dissemination and utilization strategy were reviewed. Examples of these materials are provided in Appendix F.

Participant-Observer Data. From BENCHMARK's inception, the author was intimately involved in the design, development, and implementation of the BENCHMARK Program, including its Report Review Committees. In addition, he helped codify the experiences of some of the earliest RRCs and convert these into revised guidelines for the other staff analysts to follow. Though personal experience cannot meet the criterion of "intersubjectivity," participant observation is a well-established methodology with some unique advantages. It provides a "feel" for what is going on and an insider's perspective — both of which are essential for the researcher interested in generating instrumental knowledge. Because participant observation is a field research methodology, it often fosters a class of serendipitous discoveries, stimulating research questions that would not arise in a more formal research setting or which a formal research setting might suppress, distort, or stimulate artificially because of the contrived and constrained research atmosphere. Participant observation also "helps one
to interpret data gathered by other means," "increases opportunities for observation," and "yields information about the current situation as it unfolds rather than the situation as reconstructed by interviews or questionnaire." Finally, the limitations inherent in an analysis based solely on participant-observation data are reduced considerably by the fact that other sources of data are being employed in the research.

2. Organization

The dissertation requires three major research tasks which also constitute its organization. These tasks include describing the RRCs, evaluating the RRCs, and producing recommendations about convening small, ad hoc groups to assist in the analysis and reporting of social science research findings in order to promote the utilization of social science research.

Describing the RRC. The description of the RRC is designed to provide an understanding of the process by which the RRC actually worked as well as information about the context within which it was employed. These two types of knowledge — process knowledge and contextual knowledge — are both important. Process knowledge is particularly important for those who wish to implement an RRC (or an institutional innovation which is its functional equivalent), and contextual knowledge is particularly important for those who wish to evaluate it. For the surgeon who is obliged to remove an appendix, process knowledge (how to carry out the surgical procedures required to complete
successfully the operation) is of primary importance; for the diagnostician who is obliged to determine whether the appendix needs to be removed, contextual knowledge (what is the full range of conditions operating in this situation which has a bearing on the diagnosis) is of primary importance.

The description includes a discussion of the setting within which BENCHMARK's RRCs evolved and of the factors which make BENCHMARK's RRCs unique. For example, it is important to consider that the RRCs evolved in an institutional setting that was semi-autonomous of the university, that the RRC mechanism was part of a larger programmatic undertaking, and that the Program in which the RRC was imbedded had a well-established public image and purpose as well as a relatively substantial resource base.

The description of the RRC also includes a discussion of the purposes it was designed to serve vis-a-vis knowledge dissemination and utilization, the BENCHMARK staff, the BENCHMARK Program, the RRC members, and the Social Reports.

The membership of the RRCs is also examined. This examination focuses on the composition of the RRCs, the institutional affiliations of RRC members, and the characteristics of the different RRCs.

Most RRCs seemed to progress through several distinct phases: a recruitment phase, a socialization phase, a phase of substantive deliberation, and a post-RRC contact phase. These phases are discussed in considerable detail. In particular, attention is devoted to who was recruited; how recruitment was handled; the mechanics of operating an
RRC; the policies, procedures and guidelines followed in an RRC; the styles adopted by staff analysts; the types of problems that arose and how these problems were handled; the behavioral patterns exhibited by RRC members and the norms that appeared to underlie their participation in the RRC process; and the tasks that had to be performed by the RRC in order to produce a Social Report.

Evaluating the RRC. Because the dissertation seeks to generate instrumental rather than explanatory knowledge, the criteria used to evaluate the RRC differ from those that would be used to test a theory or a set of hypotheses. This does not mean, however, that evaluative criteria cannot be explicated.

In the first place, BENCHMARK's overall dissemination and utilization strategy was derived from a body of theoretical and empirical research emphasizing the importance of the conditions of awareness, interest, trust and credibility in the adoption of an innovation — in this instance a social indicator system and the methods used to create it. Accordingly, BENCHMARK's dissemination and utilization strategy — of which the RRC constituted an important part — was designed to meet these requirements. Thus no attempt is made to corroborate or refute the theoretical premises upon which the strategy was based. Rather, the research is designed to ascertain the extent to which the RRC was successful in achieving the essential criteria postulated in the theory.

Because the RRC is being recommended for use by social scientists, an important consideration relates to how easily social scientists are able to use the RRC as a mechanism for promoting the use
of social research. Consequently, "managerial feasibility," and "economy of operation" are criteria against which the RRC mechanism can be assessed.

The robustness of the RRC as a technique is also an important consideration. If the RRC mechanism is to be employed in other settings, then it needs to be sufficiently robust to accommodate different situational and contextual conditions without suffering any critical losses in its efficacy and integrity. In addition, if the design of the RRC is to be changed or if the RRC is to be adapted for use elsewhere, then it must have components that are adaptable. Whether components of the RRC are susceptible to modification is another important criterion that must be considered.

Though it is important to make a provisional assessment about the efficacy of the RRC and its amenability to modification, it should be kept in mind that the primary objective of the evaluation is to generate actionable information that can facilitate the wider use of an institutional innovation like the RRC to promote the dissemination and utilization of social science R & D. In this respect, the evaluation is an exploratory, developmental (or process) evaluation; and neither a summative evaluation nor a test of some theory.

Producing recommendations about the RRC. Based on the assessment that is made of BENCHMARK's Report Review Committees, recommendations are formulated which pertain to how the RRC innovation is conceptualized and implemented. Specifically, these recommendations concern
the purposes which the Report Review Committee innovation serves in the overall knowledge utilization process, and the mechanics of implement ing the major phases of the RRC process.
CHAPTER III

AN OVERVIEW OF THE REPORT REVIEW COMMITTEE

A. INTRODUCTION

Five subjects are discussed in this chapter. They include: 1) the purposes served by the RRC, 2) the composition of the RRCs and the characteristics of the members, 3) the staff and resources required to run an RRC, 4) the institutional and organizational setting within which BENCHMARK's RRCs evolved, and 5) distinctive features of each of the twelve RRCs convened by BENCHMARK. In the next chapter, a more process oriented discussion of the RRCs will be provided. That discussion will focus on the major phases each RRC went through, including phases of recruitment, socialization, substantive deliberation, and post-RRC contact.

B. PURPOSES

The Report Review Committee had as one of its major purposes -- as did all of the other institutional innovations created as part of BENCHMARK's overall dissemination and utilization strategy -- the promotion of conditions of awareness, interest, trust, and credibility among potential users. The RRC, however, served a variety of other
purposes as well. These purposes can be distinguished in terms of the four major targets to which they were related: 1) the Social Reports, 2) the RRC members and the community, 3) the BENCHMARK staff, and 4) the BENCHMARK Program. Not all of the purposes which the RRCs served were anticipated when the idea of the RRC first emerged. As the RRCs evolved, however, the full richness of purposes served by this innovation gradually was discovered; and the Program's commitment to the prototypic nature of the undertaking made it possible to build on, learn from, and take advantage of these serendipitous discoveries.

The RRC was originally conceived as a means to enhance the quality and add to the legitimacy of the Social Reports. RRC members were to provide advice about the development of issues and themes contained in a Social Report; and were to critique Social Report drafts prepared by the staff analyst to ensure that they were timely, newsworthy, readable, fair and balanced in their treatment of sensitive issues, and relevant to current or forthcoming policy issues. Though it was never stated as a purpose publicly, the RRC process — in which community members were given the opportunity to provide input into the writing of the Social Reports — was also designed to enhance the legitimacy and credibility of the product.

A natural extension of the Program's commitment to involving potential users in the design of CASP was to involve them in the writing of the Social Reports and the dissemination of the CASP results as well. This the RRC did, and in a very visible way. Not only was the RRC recruitment process an open and visible one, RRC members were extended the mandate of approving a Social Report for release and in so
doing were obliged to include their names on the Social Report and acknowledge their participation on the RRC. Though both the Program Director and the members of an RRC could veto the release of a Social Report, only the RRC was empowered to authorize a Social Report's release. These three things -- the openness of the recruitment process, the visibility of community participation, and the release power extended to the RRC -- were all designed with the purpose of adding to the legitimacy and credibility of the Social Reports in mind.

At first, these were the clear and dominant purposes of the RRCs. It became apparent almost immediately, however, that these purposes could be further refined and more completely developed and articulated. The deliberations of the earliest RRCs made it apparent that in order to exercise fully their duties, RRC members needed to learn about the Program, how CASP had been designed, what CASP contained, what the limitations of the data derived from CASP were, what could be done with the data, and how it could be used. In addition, RRC members, as volunteer community participants, represented highly credible spokesmen who could attest to quality of the Program's social reporting effort.

Consequently, after the first RRC had been convened the public and explicit purposes of the RRC were expanded to include the following: to enable community input to the reporting process itself, to provide opportunities for users and potential users to become more aware of the scope of each CASP I module, to increase awareness of the variety of analytical options that could be brought to bear on the CASP I data base, and to provide opportunities for individuals to become more
knowledgeable about each report and its background so they could serve as contacts for the media seeking "community spokesmen" to supplement comments solicited from the BENCHMARK staff and members of the BENCHMARK Community Conference.

Other purposes of the RRC surfaced more slowly, and some quite as the result of serendipity. For example, RRC members served the invaluable function of supplying lists of names of people to whom Social Reports should be sent and of suggesting names of people to whom embargoed copies of Social Reports might be sent prior to their official release.30 Given the breadth and depth of the networks of associations of RRC members, staff analysts thus had easy access to information they would have been hard pressed to generate themselves.

In addition, it was discovered that the RRC meetings fostered discussions among RRC members that frequently extended beyond the Social Reports. In this manner, RRCs promoted the development of lateral linkages in the community, and facilitated interaction among potential users who shared similar interests.

The RRC also served the purpose of enabling RRC members to build contacts with the research community. Since RRC members frequently raised questions which could only be answered by subjecting the data to fairly sophisticated analysis or which could not be answered without going beyond the data, many RRC meetings were converted to informal seminars on evidence, inference, and the nature of social science research. Consequently, the RRCs afforded the opportunity to sensitize members to the capacity of the social science research enterprise.
A number of purposes relating to the Program and to the staff also were largely unanticipated. Some RRC members made a conscientious effort to diffuse the results of CASP and of their Social Report in the community. RRC members frequently took copies of Social Reports to redistribute among colleagues and professional acquaintances. In so doing, RRC members became vocal proponents of the Program, disseminating the results of CASP, promoting CASP's use, and lauding the Program in situations where it would have been inappropriate or impossible for a staff member or a person more closely associated with the Program to. The RRC thus served the purpose of fostering support for BENCHMARK among people in the community. The interaction between RRC participants and BENCHMARK analysts contributed to the development of linkages between users and the Program. The RRC process also helped generate potential clients for BENCHMARK's Community-Originated Studies Program and its Technical Assistance Program.

For the BENCHMARK staff members who assumed lead and support roles in the preparation of the Social Reports, the Report Review Committee served a number of different purposes. The RRC experience contributed to the professional socialization of BENCHMARK staff members; heightened their sensitivity to the needs of users and to the social, psychological, institutional, and organizational context within which users operate; and made it possible for staff members to extend their networks of contacts into the user community. Like many of the other purposes of the RRC, these purposes, for the most part, had been unanticipated.
In Figure 3.1 the purposes of the RRC are summarized. They are distinguished according to whether or not they were fully anticipated prior to the convening of any RRCs, and according to the major target to which they were related: the Social Reports, the RRC members and the community, the BENCHMARK staff, and the BENCHMARK Program. The distinction between purposes that were fully anticipated prior to the convening of any RRCs and those that were not should not be overdrawn. These purposes were a natural outgrowth of BENCHMARK's clinical orientation, and became evident very quickly. Thus each purpose was consciously addressed in the design and operation of the RRCs.

C. COMPOSITION AND MEMBERSHIP

Between September 1974 and October 1975, sixteen Social Reports -- listed in Figure 3.3 -- were issued by the BENCHMARK Program. Because a number of the Social Reports dealt with the same general subject matter (there were two overview Social Reports, three on crime and justice, and two on transportation), only 12 distinctly different RRCs were convened. An analysis of the membership of these 12 RRCs reveals a great deal about their size and composition.

The RRCs were relatively small. They averaged 7.6 members and ranged in size from 4 to 13 people. In addition, there was very little overlap in membership across RRCs. For the most part, each RRC consisted of a fresh group of people. Of the 91 people who served on the 12 RRCs, 83 (91%) were new RRC members; that is, they had not served
FIGURE 3.1: PURPOSES SERVED BY THE REPORT REVIEW COMMITTEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATED TO</th>
<th>ANTICIPATED</th>
<th>UNANTICIPATED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BENCHMARK SOCIAL REPORTS</strong></td>
<td>• To ensure that the Social Reports reflect the issues and themes of users &lt;br&gt; • To ensure that the Social Reports are relevant, fair and balanced, timely, newsworthy, readable, and sensitive to delicate issues &lt;br&gt; • To enhance the legitimacy and credibility of the Social Reports</td>
<td>• To recruit community spokesmen for the Social Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REC MEMBERS AND THE COMMUNITY</strong></td>
<td>• To provide an opportunity for community members to provide input into the writing of the Social Reports</td>
<td>• To develop networks of contacts in the user community &lt;br&gt; • To heighten the sensitivity of staff members to the needs of users and to the social, psychological, institutional and organizational context within which users operate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BENCHMARK STAFF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• To generate names of people to receive Social Reports &lt;br&gt; • To generate names of people to receive embargoed release copies of Social Reports &lt;br&gt; • To promote linkages between users and the Program &lt;br&gt; • To generate clients for the Community-Originated Studies Program &lt;br&gt; • To generate clients for the Technical Assistance Program &lt;br&gt; • To reduce barriers separating the user and research communities &lt;br&gt; • To promote the dissemination and utilization of scientific methods and knowledge, and of BENCHMARK's social reporting system &lt;br&gt; • To recruit community spokesmen for the Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BENCHMARK PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on another RRC. Nine of the 12 Report Review Committees consisted entirely of new RRC members.

An examination of the institutional affiliations of RRC members reveals that both public sector and civic sector institutions were represented on the RRCs. Each RRC member was classified according to whether his primary institutional affiliation was with a public sector, civic sector, or university sector institution. RRC membership was divided fairly evenly between people with public sector, institutional affiliations (47%) and those with civic sector, institutional affiliations (40%). Individuals whose primary institutional affiliation was with the university accounted for 13% of the RRC membership. The balance between public sector and civic sector representation was maintained on most but not all RRCs. Imbalance in representation was greatest on the Recreation RRC where 10 members came from public sector institutions, 2 from civic sector institutions, and 1 from the university.

The 91 RRC members represented 58 different organizations, agencies, departments or institutions. The 58 different institutions represented included 26 public sector institutions, 22 civic sector institutions, and 10 different departments or units of The Ohio State University. Since only one institutional affiliation was attributed to each RRC member, and since at least some of the RRC members had more than one institutional affiliation, more than 58 institutions were actually represented by the 91 RRC members. A complete list of the public, civic, and university sector institutions represented is included in Figure 3.2.
FIGURE 3.2: PRIMARY INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATIONS OF REPORT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC SECTOR/STATE</th>
<th>CIVIC SECTOR</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY SECTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Energy Task Force</td>
<td>Ohio Historical Society</td>
<td>Hershon Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Department of Economic and Community Development</td>
<td>Academy for Contemporary Problems</td>
<td>Department of Civil Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunger Task Force</td>
<td>League of Women Voters</td>
<td>Nisonger Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td>Columbus Metropolitan Area</td>
<td>Department of Preventive Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Department of Natural Resources</td>
<td>Community Action Organization</td>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Department of Public Welfare</td>
<td>Housing Opportunity Center</td>
<td>Center for Human Resource Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Rights Amendment Task Force</td>
<td>Columbus Area Leadership Program</td>
<td>Child Care Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laborers International Union of North America (local 423-AFL-CIO)</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goodwill Industries of Central Ohio, Inc.</td>
<td>Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Franklin County Committee on Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Office of the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus Urban League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Coordinated Child Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Play and Learn Pre-School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood House Day Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Broadway Day Care Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lutheran Social Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operation Feed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus Audubon Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salesian Inner City Boys' Club</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus Education Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL CIVIC SECTOR = 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL PUBLIC SECTOR = 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL UNIVERSITY SECTOR = 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The institutional status of RRC members within their respective organizations varied widely. Though many members held middle level management or planning positions, the Directors, Presidents, or Executive Directors of 13 organizations or agencies (five from the public sector and eight from the civic sector) sat on RRCs. An examination of the positions of RRC members indicates that experts, practitioners, interested persons, and government bureaucrats served on RRCs. Notably absent on the RRCs however were any elected public officials.  

An examination of the primary functions performed by RRC members within the institutions with which they were affiliated reveals that the majority performed a planning function. Each RRC member was classified according to whether the primary function he performed was in the area of planning, policy making, operations (service delivery), or university-based teaching, research, or service. Of the 91 RRC members, 63% were considered to perform primarily a planning function, 13% a policy-making (or advocacy) function, 16% a service delivery or operations function, and 8% a university-based, teaching, research or service function. The mean number of individuals on each RRC who performed a planning function was 4.8, and the range was 1 to 10. On six of the 12 RRCs, there were no members whose primary function was policy-making; and on four of the RRCs, there were no members whose primary function was operations or service delivery.

RRC members were also categorized according to whether or not they had been involved in the design of CASP. Involvement was considered to mean anything from actually generating questions that were included in the survey and reviewing drafts of modules to reviewing
questions that were being proposed for inclusion or talking about question areas that might be included. The major distinction is between those who had contact with the Program during the design phase of CASP, and those who had no contact with the Program. RRC members were divided fairly evenly between those who did and those who did not participate in the design process. Of the 91 RRC members, 45% had participated in the design process of CASP and 55% had not. Though approximately three-fourths of the RRCs manifested a general balance between members who had participated in the design of CASP and members who had not, several of the RRCs were severely skewed in this regard. The ratio of members who had participated in the design of CASP to those who had not was 4:0 on the "overview" RRC, 1:8 on the "child care" RRC, and 1:6 on the "education" RRC.

In conclusion, the 12 RRCs convened by the BENCHMARK Program can best be described as small groups consisting almost entirely of people who had not previously served on an RRC but approximately half of whom had been aware of and involved to varying degrees in the design of CASP. Public sector and civic sector institutions were represented almost evenly on the RRCs, and nearly two-thirds of the RRC members performed planning functions in the institutions with which they were affiliated. These relationships are detailed in Figure 3.3.

D. STAFFING AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

The staff and resources required to produce a Social Report and convene a Report Review Committee were substantial. The Social Report/RRC process was an intensive one which involved a high degree of
### FIGURE 3.3: MEMBERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS OF THE REPORT REVIEW COMMITTEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Review Committee</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
<th>Primary Institutional Affiliation</th>
<th>Primary Function</th>
<th>Participated in Formulating Questions for CASF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Report Number</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public Civic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Quality of Life Overview</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Housing</td>
<td>003</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Crime and Justice</td>
<td>004 005 006</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Transportation</td>
<td>007 008</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Social Services</td>
<td>009</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Capital Improvements</td>
<td>010</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Health</td>
<td>011</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Employment</td>
<td>012</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Child Care</td>
<td>013</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Food</td>
<td>014</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Recreation</td>
<td>015</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Education</td>
<td>016</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRTAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODE</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,7,8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANGE</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-13</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>4-13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ representing 26 different institutions
^ representing 22 different institutions
^ representing 10 different units of Ohio State University
involvement and interaction over a relatively short time span of three to four weeks. Though an extension of the time period allotted for this process undoubtedly would have relieved some of the pressure associated with it, compelling reasons existed for compressing as much as possible the time within which a Social Report was written.

In the first place, BENCHMARK had an express commitment to releasing CASP data through the Social Reports with an absolute minimum of delay. The twin tensions of getting the data out and subjecting it to the most exhaustive analysis possible were ever present. Second, the Program made an effort to surround each Social Report and the deliberations of each RRC with a sense of urgency, timeliness, and importance — something that would have been difficult to accomplish if no deadlines were imposed on the Social Report/RRC process or if those deadlines were treated cavalierly. Third, BENCHMARK did not want to impose unduly on the RRC members, and the fear existed that it might be difficult to sustain the active involvement and interest of RRC members for a longer or unbounded period of time. Fourth, the Program wanted to maintain its visibility in the community — something that could be accomplished only by creating deadlines and meeting them. As often as was practical, for example, public announcements were made about the date a Social Report was scheduled for release, and each Social Report contained at its end a notice saying that, "The next Social Report deals with . . . and is scheduled for release on . . ." Fifth, given the number of subject areas covered in CASP, Social Reports had to be released frequently if all these subject areas were going to be covered before another CASP was undertaken.
For all these reasons, Social Reports had to be written quickly and many of the tasks associated with the Social Report/RRC process performed simultaneously. Consequently, the staff and resources needed to complete these tasks were considerable.

The most extensive preparation notwithstanding, the Program staff had to be prepared for the unexpected — both because there was no turning back once a Social Report/RRC had been set into motion and because each Social Report/RRC posed unique problems. Staff had to operate along several fronts simultaneously and a variety of tasks had to be performed. CASP data had to be analyzed; RRC members had to be recruited; RRC meetings had to be held; Social Reports had to be drafted, typed, reviewed, proofed and prepared for printing; graphics had to be prepared; release procedures had to be arranged; and so on.

In order to coordinate and perform these tasks, the BENCHMARK Program employed a "lead" and "support" system for the assignment of responsibilities. Each Social Report/RRC was assigned to a lead person ultimately responsible for that Social Report. The lead was always one of the Program's professional staff, and lead responsibilities were rotated. A support person — also a member of the professional staff — was assigned to assist the lead.

Ordinarily, the lead would make final decisions concerning the Social Report/RRC process, prepare drafts of Social Reports and press releases, and chair all meetings of the RRC. The support would provide whatever logistical support was requested by the lead, and take advantage of the opportunity to acquire first-hand knowledge of the Social
Report/RRC process. The support role thus had several purposes: to provide expert assistance to the lead, to provide exposure and experience to a staff member who at some juncture would assume a lead role, and to encourage continuity of treatment among Social Reports and RRCs.

In addition to the lead and support, a number of other staff members were involved during the course of any Social Report/RRC. The BENCHMARK data center was called on to execute all of the data analysis requests submitted by the lead and the RRC. A typist and a graphic artist were involved in preparing typed drafts of and graphic material for a Social Report and an RRC. Either the support or personnel from the Office of Community Services would assist in — and on occasion, oversee — the recruitment of RRC members, proofing of the final draft of a Social Report and checking all figures against the original data, and arranging for the reproduction of Social Reports and their distribution to the media and others. Finally, other professional staff members would be called upon to subject each Social Report draft to an intensive review (each Social Report was reviewed internally by staff members as well as by RRC members). Thus at least seven and frequently more staff members were involved in each Social Report/RRC.

The resource requirements for each RRC were also considerable. Data analysis was facilitated greatly, and the ability to be responsive to requests from RRC members aided almost immeasurably, by the Program's having the CASP data on-line and accessible through a remote computer terminal. With a robust hardware and software computer configuration supporting remote access and time sharing, each RRC enjoyed almost
Immediate turn-around on data analysis requests. In addition to these computer resources for data storage, retrieval, and analysis, equipment and supplies for typing and producing graphics was also required. So too were meeting rooms for RRC meetings and press conferences, and a location — accessible 24 hours a day — where drafts of Social Reports could be picked up easily by RRC members. Environmental graphics for the media, and previously prepared materials on survey research and social science methodology were also employed in the Social Report/RRC process. Finally, boilerplate materials dealing with CASP, the RRC, the Social Reports, and BENCHMARK were also required.

E. INSTITUTIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL SETTING

Any innovation designed to promote knowledge dissemination and utilization must ultimately be tested in the field and exposed to all of the conditions and forces that the stringent controls of the laboratory are intended to keep at bay. Accordingly, to understand and evaluate BENCHMARK's RRCs, some knowledge about the setting within which the RRC innovation was implemented is required. Important characteristics of this setting can be described along institutional and organizational dimensions.

1. Linkages with the Knowledge Producing Sector

The knowledge producing sector of Columbus is dominated by two institutions, The Ohio State University (a large public institution of higher education) and Battelle Memorial Institute (a large, private
research corporation), neither of which has a particularly localistic orientation. In 1971, these two institutions joined to create The Academy for Contemporary Problems, which though formally and financially tied to its creators was nonetheless largely independent of them.

For a period of two and a half years and commencing in July of 1973, the BENCHMARK Program was one of five major programs supported by the Academy.\textsuperscript{36} In addition, substantial support for BENCHMARK was provided by Ohio State University's Mershon Center. In part because of its physical location within the Academy,\textsuperscript{37} BENCHMARK -- at least locally -- was more closely identified with the Academy than with the Mershon Center.

The Academy enjoyed a considerable amount of autonomy and independence. Battelle and Ohio State University guaranteed its financial support, and also extended a broad mandate to the Academy's administration. This independence cut two ways, however. Though it freed the Academy of constraints that frequently inhibit creativity and innovation, it also freed it of restraints that frequently operate to ensure accountability and responsiveness.

The Academy also had a very distinct public image due to the fact no doubt that it occupied a brand new and very impressive building of its own used by numerous local groups and organizations. For some who viewed the Academy's quarters as a symbol of commitment to the community, this image was a positive one. For some who viewed the Academy as a settlement house for the rich and the Academy's quarters as a symbol of ostentation, waste and hypocrisy, this image was negative.
In addition, the Academy was identified locally with both Battelle and Ohio State, in part because it was located midway between and not more than a stone's throw from either of them. The major knowledge producing sector of Columbus is concentrated into one single, large and identifiable area of the city. Once again, this association was considered an asset by some, and a liability by others.

Because of these institutional and symbolic linkages, BENCHMARK had a mixed image in the community. For some people, the Program had the image of an academic think tank. For others, however, this image was counterbalanced by the Program's close association with the BENCHMARK Community Conference, the open, voluntary and self-selected group of citizens created to help establish goals, policies, and procedures for the Program. Furthermore, BENCHMARK had made a conscientious effort to establish an image independent of the Academy's -- something difficult to accomplish because of the Program's physical location in the Academy -- and based on a record of performance and responsiveness. Nonetheless, many people chose to see in BENCHMARK what they wanted or expected to see: a captive of Battelle, a captive of the liberals, a captive of minorities, and so on.

At least publicly, BENCHMARK had the appearance of support from the establishment of the community. Nonetheless, because of its newness, its uniqueness, its independence, and the source and nature of its support, the institutional niche filled by BENCHMARK in the community was welcomed by some, questioned by others, and opposed by still others. In addition, the institutional legitimacy of BENCHMARK within the
community was accepted by some and not by others. Certain planners, power brokers, professionals, community spokesmen and experts made a genuine effort to support and assist BENCHMARK from the outset. Some, however, took a wait and see approach, and still others tried to sabotage the program.

However much ambiguity existed about the institutional location and legitimacy of the Program, far less ambiguity surrounded the Program's purposes and functions. In fact, BENCHMARK had a fairly well established public image as it pertained to its purposes and functions. In many different arenas throughout the community, BENCHMARK was regarded as an apolitical and reliable source of social information about the community, and a source of assistance for policy and program management. BENCHMARK was not formally aligned with any group or organization in the community; consequently its constituencies and clientele remained broad and diffuse.

Though BENCHMARK's image was associated with the University, as an organization BENCHMARK operated virtually totally independent of the University. BENCHMARK was subject to public scrutiny far more than it was subject to scrutiny by any University department or the University administration.

2. Linkages with the Media

Because of the impact the media was capable of having on the Program's public image, the relationship between BENCHMARK and the media was a very important one. A number of efforts were made to encourage the media to view the Social Reports and the Program as a resource, and
as an accurate and reliable source of information about public opinion that could be used to enhance the overall quality of reporting and not to treat the release of Social Reports merely as an event.\textsuperscript{39}

In short, it was hoped that the media would use BENCHMARK and the information contained in each Social Report and not just report it. For the most part, however, the media tended to view the Social Reports as an event and not as a resource. Reporters -- especially from the electronic media -- frequently tried to extract from the Reports that which was controversial, and pressured staff analysts and community spokesmen to go beyond the data in the process of reporting findings.

Though BENCHMARK received a great deal of media coverage, the quality and nature of that coverage failed to meet staff aspirations and perceptions, and the relationship between the Program and the media never quite developed as the staff had hoped it would.\textsuperscript{40}

3. Organizational Factors

The RRC innovation was part of a much larger programmatic undertaking. The elements of this large programmatic undertaking, the BENCHMARK Program, are described elsewhere.\textsuperscript{41} The BENCHMARK Program enjoyed -- at least in relative terms -- a substantial resource base. It should be pointed out, however, that the resources available to the Program were not expended evenly on all phases of the Program. The resources available after CASP came out of the field and for promoting the dissemination and utilization of CASP -- and thus for developing and implementing the RRCs -- were limited. In fact, resource constraints were so severe after CASP came out of the field that BENCHMARK
was forced to take a very restrictive, selective, and low-profile approach to the extremely sensitive and critical dissemination and utilization phase of the Program; and for a time serious consideration was given to suspending temporarily the effort to generate a continuing series of Social Reports about the community. In addition, resource constraints forced the postponement of serious planning for the execution of another CASP, and during the last six months of the Program there was little public expectation that another CASP would be mounted in the near future.

The professional staff members of the BENCHMARK Program, with the exception of the first Director, were all in the earliest stages of their professional careers. In fact, the core staff consisted of six graduate students, all of whom had received their graduate training in political science, none of whom had finished their dissertations, and all but two of whom had completed their general examinations. At the time the first Director of the Program resigned, the mean age of these staff members was 26. Most of these staff members had acquired a great deal of experience in applied and programmatic research, and much of this experience had been acquired together.

The quality and dedication of the staff is noteworthy. The following is not atypical of comments made about the staff.

All staff members are unusually energetic and hardworking, tolerant of ambiguous and turbulent environments, genuinely excited by the challenges and opportunities represented by the Program, deeply committed to the philosophy inherent in the Program and to its objectives, very talented, loyal to one another, and satisfied with the social aspects of the work environment.42
CASP-I field operations were completed prior to the time that the RRC was conceived. Nonetheless, the successful completion of field operations required a time and resource allocation that was unanticipated and the magnitude of which was grossly underestimated. As a consequence, the entire staff was exhausted when CASP came out of the field, and resources that otherwise would have been directed toward the dissemination and utilization phase of the program had to be diverted. The entire resources of the program had to be marshalled to complete the field operations phase of CASP, and as a result the sequencing of phases within the Program itself was disrupted. The front-end work that had been planned to precede the dissemination and utilization phases of the Program was not carried out completely.

A number of conclusions can be drawn about the setting within which the RRC evolved. In the first place, the setting was substantially different from most academic settings. Though BENCHMARK enjoyed substantial resources, it was nonetheless a high profile venture undertaken in an environment of high demands, high expectations, and high public accountability. Second, BENCHMARK and thus the RRCs evolved in a very uncertain and indeterminate environment in which the staff had limited control over many factors that affected the Program and the RRCs in major ways. Third, because of the intervening events — such as unanticipated problems with the field operations for CASP, and support problems with the Program's primary sponsor — that drained time, energy and other resources away from the dissemination and utilization phase of the Program, BENCHMARK became a seriously "undercapitalized venture," both literally and figuratively. Fourth, many environmental factors
operated for and many against — such as the extent to which BENCHMARK was viewed as a threat by some and an ally by others — the success of the Program and the RRCs.

F. THE TWELVE BENCHMARK RRCs

Though they were all cut out of the same mold and fashioned for much the same purpose, BENCHMARK's 12 RRCs were nonetheless unique in many respects. In the first place, 8 BENCHMARK staff members were assigned lead responsibilities for drafting Social Reports and administering RRCs. Second, the mix of members on each RRC was different. Third, the modules in CASP on which the Social Reports were based varied considerably with respect to the number and type of questions that were asked. Fourth, the situation in the community with respect to the material that was covered in a Social Report changed from one report to the next. And fifth, the styles adopted and the roles played by BENCHMARK staff members differed frequently as did the styles and roles of the RRC members. Though numerous other differences existed, these are some of the most important. In order to facilitate an appreciation of these differences as well as to provide a sense for the general character and some of the notable features of each RRC, a brief description of the 12 BENCHMARK RRCs follows.

1. RRC 01: The Overview Social Reports

The character of the first RRC was influenced more by severe constraints on time than by any other factor. Though CASP did not come out of the field until August 30, a prior public commitment had been
made to release the first Social Report on September 30, 1974. In the scant 30 days between August 30 and September 30, numerous tasks had to be completed. Included among these were the following: the data collected in the 2401 personal interviews had to be punched, verified, and cleaned; control card sets had to be written; the data had to be put up on the computer and analyzed; a strategy governing the release of the Social Reports and information from CASP had to be designed; a Users Guide had to be written; and the first Social Report had to be prepared for release. The idea of pushing back the September 30 deadline was not tenable, for it doubtless would have caused BENCHMARK to lose a considerable amount of credibility—especially since so many people in the community and in the BENCHMARK Community Conference were waiting eagerly to see the results from CASP, since earlier time schedules for completing CASP had been revised on several occasions, and since the plans for the release of the first Social Report had aroused so much anticipation and had been accompanied by so much fanfare.

For the first Social Report, the idea of the RRC was still largely in an embryonic form. Time constraints did not permit the extensive recruitment of RRC members, and the review of and deliberations concerning the Social Report were less formal and thorough than for subsequent Social Reports. In fact, several people from the BENCHMARK Community Conference, all of whom were closely associated with the Program and quite familiar with the contents of CASP, were hastily convened to review the first two Social Reports. Their input was minimal compared to the input made by members of other RRCs. The time
within which the first two overview Social Reports were written was drastically compressed, and the first RRC had no clear guidelines to follow because they had not been formulated at that time.

Even though the first RRC was an RRC in name more than in deed, it was nonetheless extremely important because it clearly set the precedent for user involvement in the dissemination of CASP results and because it provided the formative basis for developing and refining the RRC innovation. However, for the two Overview Social Reports, all eyes and energies were focused on the Social Reports and an irrevocable September 30th deadline and not on the RRC.

2. RRC 02: The Housing Social Report

The Housing RRC was the first, full-fledged RRC convened by BENCHMARK. Sufficient lead time was available for recruitment and for holding substantive deliberations about the content of the Social Report. The individuals who served on the RRC represented institutions deeply involved in housing planning for the mid-Ohio region, as well as some articulate and powerful advocates concerned about housing conditions and opportunities for the poor. In short, the Housing RRC included activists very much concerned with service delivery and people's day-to-day housing needs as well as planners both influential with respect to and informed about local housing.

The material in the housing module elicited the interest of and was subjected to close scrutiny by the RRC members, and this for several reasons. In the first place, the City of Columbus was in the midst of the preparation of plans for the allocation of $8 million in
funds to be received under the Housing and Community Development Act. The planning process had aroused a great deal of public interest and debate, largely because of the "citizen participation" that had been mandated by the Federal government as an integral part of entitlement. Consequently, the data from CASP on housing was particularly relevant to the often highly-charged community wide debate concerning the allocation of CDA monies; and in fact, the data from CASP was used in the final plan prepared by the City and submitted as part of its CDA application.

In the second place, CASP contained data rarely seen by and previously unavailable to housing planners -- namely attitudinal data dealing with people's perceived housing needs and conditions. The RRC encouraged the staff analyst to incorporate this attitudinal data with other indicators of housing needs and conditions. Substantial analytic effort was required to create an index of relative housing conditions based on data from the 1970 U.S. Census. Once created, this index was integrated into the CASP data base and included in the Housing Social Report. During the course of RRC deliberations about the Social Report, a great deal of discussion took place about the differences between and the meaning of "objective" and "subjective" social indicators.

The Housing RRC and Social Report stimulated a number of workshops and presentations about the housing related findings from CASP. In addition, several special studies (Community-Originated Studies, COSs) drawing on the CASP data were requested by RRC members, and the BENCHMARK staff analyst with lead responsibility for the Housing Social
Report was appointed to the City's Technical Advisory Committee on the Housing and Community Development Act. Subsequently, close relationships developed between the BENCHMARK staff analyst and the individuals who had served on the Housing RRC.

On the mechanical side, the Housing RRC was conducted with no other staff member assigned the specific responsibility of performing a support role for the lead analyst. In addition, the lead analyst had attempted to conform to a 17-day schedule that had been devised as a guideline for RRCs. The extra data collection and analysis required by the RRC for this Social Report placed inordinately heavy demands on the staff analyst. The experiences of this and the next few RRCs suggested that the 17-day schedule was the absolute minimum period within which all of the tasks normally performed as part of the RRC process could be completed.

3. RRC 03: The Crime and Justice Social Reports

The Crime and Justice module in CASP was the largest module in the survey and covered a fairly broad range of subjects related to crime and justice. The resulting wealth of data coupled with the natural diversity inherent in the criminal justice system led to a large RRC with a very heterogeneous composition. Heterogeneity was reflected both in the primary area of interest and in the political ideology of RRC members. The Crime and Justice RRC was a very lively group consisting of outspoken people who held very intense and often diametrically opposed views. In fact, viewpoints on the Crime and Justice RRC ranged from the ultra-liberal to the ultra-conservative.
Because of the amount of crime and justice related data obtained in CASP, the RRC decided to issue three Crime and Justice Social Reports dealing with substantially different subject areas. Because of this decision, the RRC convened over a much longer period of time than it would have had only one Social Report been issued.

RRC meetings evidenced a great deal of participation on the part of the members as well as a considerable amount of heated debate. In addition, RRC members went over Social Report drafts with a fine tooth comb, often arguing at length about sentence structure, phrasing, and language. RRC members were adamant about ensuring that the Social Reports were as purely descriptive as possible. Consequently, the Crime and Justice RRC targeted for Social Reports that presented the findings from CASP clearly, completely and precisely — and nothing more. Though RRC members argued and speculated about what gave rise to the conditions, behaviors and perceptions uncovered by CASP and about how to interpret them and what to do about them, they were vigilant about preventing any interpretive analysis from finding its way into the Reports themselves. On occasion, the inclusion or exclusion of a word or figure triggered a debate lasting 20 minutes or more. In short, this RRC was concerned far less with how to interpret the findings — they negotiated an agreement not to interpret them — than with how to present them.

The situation existing in the community at the time the Crime and Justice Social Reports were released helps account for the frequently adversary nature of these RRC proceedings. At the same time, the Crime
and Justice Social Reports were being released a community wide debate was raging over the issue of a police review board. CASP contained information about public attitudes regarding this issue as well as information about citizen images of the police and citizen reactions to the accusations of police brutality that had surfaced on several occasions during the previous year. Consequently, a number of topics discussed in these Social Reports concerned very volatile issues. At the same time, the level of community concern about the criminal justice system was extremely high owing to a number of other events, activities and phenomena that were taking place, the most important of which was the rising crime rates in the city.

The release of the Crime and Justice Social Reports generated more media coverage and stimulated more requests for public presentations than perhaps any other Social Report. A press conference in which two members of the RRC participated was called to accompany the first of the three Crime and Justice Social Reports that was released. In addition, several RRC members requested COSs dealing with the crime-related CASP data and a great deal of contact between BENCHMARK staff and RRC members ensued. One RRC member took 50 copies of each of the Social Reports to distribute among his colleagues. And finally, the unrelenting pressure associated with producing three Social Reports on the same subject back-to-back underscored the role of the support person assigned to assist the lead.
4. **RRC 04: The Transportation Social Report**

Two Transportation Social Reports were released by the Transportation RRC. The RRC was conducted in a fairly straightforward and business-like manner, and the BENCHMARK staff member assigned lead responsibility for this RRC executed most of the required tasks without the assistance of a staff member specifically assigned to a support role.

The members of the Transportation RRC found the attitudinal data on transportation needs and conditions an interesting and previously unavailable type of information. Notable is the fact that the transportation related findings from CASP -- both in the Social Reports and in COS requests initiated by RRC members -- were funelled through the members of this RRC and led both to major modifications in the operation of the area's mass transit system and to major research and planning efforts dealing with the requirements and configuration of the region's transportation system.

5. **RRC 05: The Social Services Social Report**

The Social Services RRC was large. Eleven individuals participated of whom 9 were planners. The Social Services module of CASP, like the Crime and Justice module, engendered a great deal of discussion and debate among RRC members. Unlike the Crime and Justice RRC, however, the Social Services RRC was far more concerned with the analysis of the data and how the findings might be interpreted than with the language of the Social Report.
This concern manifested itself in some interesting ways. RRC members argued about the etiology of needs uncovered by CASP, and in the process had the opportunity to discuss deficiencies in and the fragmentation of the social service planning and delivery system. In addition, Social Service RRC members pressed for the extensive analysis of the social service related, CASP data, including the creation of an index of multiple needs (which was not actually used in the Social Report) and the exploration of statistical relationships among different types of needs and controlling for different demographic characteristics. For example, a great deal of time was spent exploring whether the perception of need for job-related assistance was associated more with race than with income.

This intensive exploration necessitated providing for RRC members explanations of analytic concepts such as association, intervening variables, statistical controls, and so on. More so perhaps than any other RRC, the Social Services RRC found it difficult to report the findings from CASP for public consumption and debate without engaging in a corresponding research and analysis project of major proportions. Once the RRC members had been sensitized to issues related to the nature of evidence and inference, it became extremely difficult for them simply to report the findings from CASP. On several occasions, the purpose of the Social Reports and the RRC became obscured or of seemingly secondary importance, and was supplanted by a desire to try to get to the bottom of the social services quagmire.
6. RRC 06: The Capital Improvements Social Report

Capital Improvements was the shortest module in CASP. Consequently, the BENCHMARK staff analyst responsible for this Social Report had very little data to work with and very little data to share with his RRC. Because of the relative paucity of Capital Improvements related information in CASP, RRC members tended to be more critical of CASP than did members of other RRCs.

At the same time that this RRC met, the City was holding public hearings on the Capital Improvements Budget and Program. Fights in the community that had been caused by the City's handling of these matters and that had received community-wide attention spilled over into the proceedings of the Capital Improvements RRC. Some major disagreements regarding the findings erupted in the RRC, disagreements which were difficult to contain or resolve. The atmosphere was often quite tense, and the hostility some members felt for other members was thinly veiled.

7. RRC 07: The Health Social Report

The Health RRC consisted of a fairly small but relatively expert group of people. The RRC members were very stringent in the interpretations they would allow on the basis of the data, and indicated that the inferences that justifiably could be drawn about people's health needs on the basis of data pertaining to people's preventative health care was necessarily limited.
8. RRC 08: The Employment Social Report

The Employment Social Report took far longer to produce than any other Social Report; in fact, the RRC met over a period of approximately two months. This was due, for the most part, to the fact that the RRC had requested substantial additional analysis of the employment related CASP data. The staff member had to tool up for and then execute some complex factor analyses which were ultimately incorporated into the Social Report.

9. RRC 09: The Child Care Social Report

The Child Care RRC was quite large; and it consisted of people a large proportion of whom were either involved in or intimately familiar with child care service delivery. The RRC members, only one of whom participated in the formulation of questions for CASP, were all very excited about their participation on the Child Care RRC. In general, the Child Care RRC meetings were pleasant and enjoyable, and the atmosphere very light and friendly. Whatever expertise the participants may have lacked in data analysis and research, they made up for in enthusiasm, interest and sincerity.

The Social Report produced by the RRC made use of census data and data from the Ohio Department of Public Welfare which when combined with the findings from CASP made it possible to project the number of young children in the area requiring daily child care. This projection of need was compared to other estimates of the ability to meet that need and included in the Social Report.
The RRC was eager to diffuse the findings from CASP to others in the community involved in child care, and consequently pursued a fairly aggressive strategy for marketing the Social Report. Copies of the Social Report were sent to all child care providers and planners in the county. The report produced by the Child Care RRC was very timely, especially because of the threatened closing and consolidation of certain city-supported child care facilities, and because of cutbacks in city funded social services.

10. RRC 10: The Food Shopping and Spending Social Report

The Food Shopping and Spending RRC was a very small RRC (4 people). Though very few questions which dealt with food shopping and spending were asked in CASP, results were combined with demographic data that had been collected in the survey to generate some very interesting indicators of food spending patterns.

As was the case with the Employment Social Report, the Food Shopping and Spending Social Report was important because of emergency food needs of citizens caused by the high unemployment that accompanied the deep economic downturn and recession and the spiraling inflation of 1974 and 1975. Several members of this RRC were involved in the operation of emergency food pantries and programs. In addition, one of the members of the RRC subsequently requested technical assistance from BENCHMARK on a project related to providing emergency food services for area residents.
11. RRC 11: The Recreation Social Report

The Recreation RRC was the largest, 13 people, of any convened by BENCHMARK. Because CASP had been conducted in the summer and because of the seasonal nature of recreational activities, the Recreation Social Report -- which was released in the autumn -- was less "timely" than most of the other Social Reports.

Of all of the Social Reports issued by BENCHMARK, the Recreation Social Report posed the most severe analytic problems. Because of the length of the series of questions that had been asked as well as the number of coding options, the mere presentation of the findings constituted a complex and problematic undertaking. Data could be recoded and combined in innumerable ways, and some RRC members had reservations about the recoding decisions that were employed. The person assigned the support role did a great deal of work on this Social Report, and because of the number of people involved, the mechanical tasks of convening meetings and making the necessary logistical arrangements were quite involved.

RRC 12: The Education Social Report

The Education Social Report was the last Social Report issued by the BENCHMARK Program. The deliberations of this RRC were spirited, and several constructive discussions arose which focused on the utility and reliability of survey research as a methodology for assessing educational needs and planning educational programs.

The Education Social Report was released with very little fanfare, and no major effort was made to aggressively market the report.
The staff member assigned lead responsibility for this Social Report adopted a style somewhat more authoritative than that adopted by other staff members. In addition, this Social Report was subjected to less internal staff review than any of the other Social Reports except the Overview Social Reports.
A. INTRODUCTION

Each staff analyst responsible for running an RRC was faced with a formidable challenge: how to involve a heterogeneous group of people basically unfamiliar with CASP in the report writing and dissemination stages of that research effort. To respond to this challenge, issues related to the design and operation of the RRC -- such as who should be recruited, what type of setting should be created, through what stages should the process progress, what style should staff members adopt, and what ground rules should be established -- were formally addressed. In this chapter, many of these issues are discussed in the process of describing the stages through which the RRC progressed.

The RRC process can be divided into four distinct phases. The first phase, recruitment, involved the identification and recruitment of prospective members to serve on the RRC. The second phase, socialization, involved the establishment of ground rules and the familiarization of RRC members with the purposes of the RRC, each other, the staff, and the research upon which the report was to be based. The third phase, substantive deliberation, involved the drafting, review,
and release of the report. The fourth phase, post-RRC contact, involved the continuation of relationships between RRC members and the staff after the Social Report had been released and disseminated. In this chapter each of these phases is described in detail. A summary of major features of the RRC process is then provided.

B. RECRUITMENT

In keeping with the Program's avowed principle of open access, no effort was made to establish any type of quotas for the RRCs. Nevertheless, participation in the RRCs was actively solicited, and RRC members were recruited through a variety of channels and from a variety of sources including the BENCHMARK Program and agencies and groups representing important potential users having an interest or expertise in the subject area of a given Social Report. In addition, all persons who expressed an interest in serving on a Report Review Committee were invited to participate as were individuals nominated by others.

First, the BENCHMARK Community Conference was used both as a channel of recruitment and as a source of members. RRC sign-up lists were circulated at BCC meetings, and Conference participants were asked to volunteer the names of and/or nominate people who could be contacted about serving on an RRC. BCC participants were also asked to refer people to the Program. Referrals, nominations, and volunteers were also solicited through the Program's Special Interest Groups (SIGs) — such as the Public Affairs SIG and the Crime and Justice SIG. The
Program's newsletter, *BenchMarkings*, which was sent monthly to over 500 individuals and agencies throughout the community, was also used as a channel of recruitment. Announcements were placed in *BenchMarkings* inviting individuals interested in serving on an RRC to contact the Program.

Second, the people who had participated in the design of CASP constituted a major source of potential RRC members. The Program maintained lists of people who had participated in the design of CASP and of the subject areas in which those people were interested. An attempt was made by staff members to contact these people and invite them to serve on an RRC.

Third, many BENCHMARK staff analysts systematically solicited the participation of specific individuals or agencies in the community. This was done to ensure the representation of a particular viewpoint or interest on an RRC when the presence of that viewpoint was regarded as particularly germane. Staff members also used their own professional networks of contacts, meetings they attended, and presentations they made about the Program to recruit RRC members.

In summary, channels of recruitment and sources of members for the RRCs included: the members and meetings of the Special Interest Groups, the members and meetings of the Columbus Community Conference, the Program's newsletter, lists of individuals who had participated in the design of CASP, networks of associations and contacts developed by staff members, and presentations made by or meetings attended by staff members. Some individuals contacted BENCHMARK about serving on an RRC;
others were contacted by BENCHMARK. RRC members were either referred to the Program, contacted the Program without having been referred, nominated by someone and then contacted by the Program, or contacted by the Program without having been nominated. Contacts were made in a variety of ways including over the phone, by mail, in person, and through written materials. Some individuals were asked if they would be interested in serving on an RRC, and still others were asked if they would be willing to serve on an RRC.

RRCs were convened between September 1974 and October 1975 over a period of approximately 14 months. During this time recruitment patterns differed widely. The recruitment process was treated very seriously, and substantial attention was paid to the actual composition of an RRC. A conscientious effort was made to ensure that certain objectives or characteristics of the recruitment process were preserved; namely that the recruitment process was genuinely open and that those individuals interested in serving on an RRC had an opportunity to serve as a result of self-selection, that people who had participated in the design were contacted about serving on an RRC, and that the participation of potential users in the community who had not participated in the design and were not formally involved in the Program was actively solicited.

Once these procedural concerns had been satisfied, the RRCs were left to evolve according to ad hoc or situational criteria. With only rare exceptions, and beyond meeting the criteria already mentioned, no effort was made to compose an RRC in any particular way. In short, three things were important about the recruitment process: was it open,
had it generated members who represented important potential users, and
had it generated enough participants according to the standards of the
staff member responsible for running the RRC. It should be pointed out
that no one who ever asked to serve on an RRC was denied the opportunity.

The writing of the Social Reports (and thus the convening of
RRCs) was separated from the design of CASP by the field operations
phase required to administer CASP and build the CASP data base. In other
words, people who had participated in the design of CASP had to wait for
a period of time before the RRC on which they might have been interested
in serving was convened. At the very minimum, this waiting period was
five months. As the waiting period increased, the ratio of potential
RRC members who had participated in the CASP design process to those
who had not decreased. If the 14 month period during which RRCs were
convened is divided into two equal periods, 7 of the 12 RRCs (covering
Social Reports 001 through 011) were convened during the first 7 months,
and the remaining 5 RRCs (covering Social Reports 012 through 016)
during the final 7 months. On these first 7 RRCs, 53% (28 people) of
the RRC members had participated in the design of CASP and 47% (25
people) had not. On the final 5 RRCs, 34% (13 people) of the RRC mem-
bers had participated in the design of CASP and 66% (25 people) had not.

Despite the pressures that surrounded the issuance of approx-
imately the first eight Social Reports, model recruitment practices
and procedures developed early on and were refined over time. They
operated in much the following manner. A list of names of candidate
RRC members was assembled according to the procedures already described.
People on this list were then contacted by phone, sometimes by a secretary or staff assistant and sometimes by the staff analyst responsible for the Social Report for which the RRC was being convened, and arrangements made about a convenient time to hold the first RRC meeting.

In the event that the person contacted was familiar with the Program, CASP, and the basic purposes and operation of an RRC, the only matter that needed to be discussed was a meeting time and place. In the event that the person contacted was not familiar with the Program, then he was told a) what BENCHMARK was and who it was affiliated with; b) what CASP was and how it had been designed -- emphasizing user involvement; c) what the Social Reports were; d) what an RRC was, what its objectives were, and what the obligations of an RRC member were; and e) why he had been asked if he would be interested in or willing to serve on an RRC.

Generally, some allowance for attrition was made in the number of people who were recruited. Just as many of the RRC members were unfamiliar both with the BENCHMARK Program and with the staff analyst with whom they were working, so too were some of the staff analysts unfamiliar both with the people who had been recruited and with the institutions with which they were affiliated. In addition, some of the staff analysts who drafted Social Reports had not been involved in the design of the CASP module on which their Social Report focused. Consequently, these staff analysts could not play as forceful and knowledgeable a role in recruiting RRC members as they otherwise might have -- at least with respect to building on a personal relationship that had been established during the design phase of CASP.
C. INITIAL MEETINGS OF THE RRC: THE SOCIALIZATION PHASE

The initial meeting of each RRC was held at the Academy for Contemporary Problems, the location of the BENCHMARK Program, in a meeting room that could comfortably accommodate groups ranging from four to twenty people. Parking at the Academy was available, proximate and free. The meeting rooms contained blackboards and audio-visual hookups, but the surroundings were intimate, comfortable, private, and unobtrusive. In this respect, the Academy facility suggested a versatile conferencing center rather than a cold academic setting. Though the Academy is a relatively large facility with numerous meeting rooms, it had a receptionist and reception area that made it easy for people unfamiliar with the building to find the location of the RRC meeting.

The BENCHMARK staff analyst responsible for a given Social Report would usually introduce himself and the support staff member (if one was present) to the RRC participants assembled. On no occasion were more than two staff members present at any meeting, a decision that was followed to try to keep to a minimum any inhibitions that RRC members might have experienced were more staff members present. Since one objective was to elicit the input of users, every precaution was taken to avoid the staff domination of the proceedings. Staff members almost always wore jackets to RRC meetings, in direct contrast to the extremely casual dress in which they were normally attired, and an indication both of the respect they had for the RRC process and of the effort that was made to treat the proceedings seriously and to avoid
offending any of the participants — many of whom the staff members had never met.

After the staff member introduced himself to the RRC members, he normally would request that each participant introduce himself to the others. Frequently, many of the participants had never met either the BENCHMARK staff analyst or the other RRC members. Since the groups were usually quite small, no effort was made to induce familiarity by having all those present wear name tags. The door of the meeting room was kept closed at all times to maintain the privacy of the proceedings.

The RRC, as an innovation, had a number of purposes and objectives. The first meeting of each RRC also had some very specific, tactical purposes and objectives, the most important of which was to enlist the support and cooperation of the participants and to allay any reservations — about BENCHMARK, CASP, the RRC, or related program activities — which might have caused them to be unresponsive to the information and methodologies to which they were being exposed. This meant that the staff analysts had to be agile, sensitive to the reactions of the RRC members, and able to deal deftly with any problems that arose — an ability that often required well-developed social interaction skills, especially small group leadership skills.

One of the first tasks of the staff analyst was to explain to the RRC members what each of the following was: BENCHMARK, CASP, BENCHMARK Social Reports, and RRC, and the COS Program. This was done to familiarize the members with the Program and to provide a context within which they could understand their involvement and the rationale
behind the procedures followed by the RRC and the rights and responsibilities of RRC members. In addition this background discussion was designed to increase RRC members' awareness of and interest in CASP and the RRC, and to increase RRC members' trust and confidence in the staff and the research effort.

Each staff analyst was free to provide this context in whatever manner he saw fit. Some staff members discussed these things quite briefly and orally; others engaged in more extended discussions supplemented by the use of written and graphic materials. These materials included such things as: Program brochures; the Program's newsletter; copies of Social Reports that had already been issued; the USERS GUIDE; the Program's Code of Ethics; examples of newspaper stories written about the Social Reports; and pictographic representations of the design of CASP, CASP field operations, the CASP data base, and the dissemination and utilization of CASP data. Examples of these materials are reproduced in Appendix B.

Most staff members focused on a number of things in trying to provide a context that would facilitate an understanding of and involvement in the RRC. Since many RRC members had not been involved in the design of CASP, an explanation of the design process was provided. Emphasis was placed on the fact that scores of potential users had been intimately involved in the design of CASP and in the instrumentation, prioritization, and review and comment of questions proposed for inclusion in the survey.
To convey a sense for the rigor and systematicity with which the field operations were handled, the components of the field operations phase were outlined to members. In addition, RRC members were told that the data base had been designed to make it maximally flexible and useful, that it could be expanded, and that it could be integrated with data from other sources including future CASPs.

To explain why the RRC was being convened and to underscore the Program's user orientation, it was pointed out that the BENCHMARK Community Conference had mandated BENCHMARK to do two things with the data from CASP. BENCHMARK was to issue a continuing series of Social Reports about the community suitable for broad dissemination and dealing with the areas of concern covered in the survey. The role of the RRC in accomplishing this task was emphasized to increase RRC members' regard for the importance of the function they served.

The second thing BENCHMARK had been mandated to do was to make the data accessible to anyone in the community who wished to use it for more specialized purposes. In this regard, it was emphasized that any member of the RRC could request a Community-Originated Study. RRC members were also told that to familiarize people with BENCHMARK and CASP a USERS GUIDE had been written to introduce people to the Program and its objectives, how it was governed and operated, how CASP was designed and what it contained, how to make use of the data in the CASP data archive, and how to request a special CASP-related study through the COS Program. The Program would also conduct "Users Workshops" for anyone who requested them.
Once the background material had been covered, the purpose of the RRC and the rights and responsibilities of RRC members were discussed in detail. This discussion usually followed closely the guidelines that had been prepared for and that were circulated to the participants. These guidelines, a copy of which is included as Figure 4.1 referenced the purpose of the RRC, how members were recruited, the mandate and scope of the RRC, how RRC meetings were organized, how the approval process for Social Reports operated, and the constraints under which RRC members operated.

A timetable and set of tasks was outlined for RRC members. The RRC process was portrayed as an iterative process in which a staff analyst prepared drafts for committee members to review. When a Social Report had been prepared which all the members of the RRC approved and which complied with the stated purpose and philosophy of the Social Reports and BENCHMARK's Code of Ethics, it was released. Generally, RRCs met in three or four intensive, 2-hour work sessions which met over a period of approximately three weeks. RRC members were responsible for reviewing the drafts that had been prepared, for attending RRC meetings, for helping to design a release strategy for the Social Report, and for maintaining confidentiality of the RRC proceedings.

It was felt that the first meeting of the RRC should familiarize the participants not only with the Program and the purposes and responsibilities of the RRC, but also with the data upon which their Social Report would be based. The participants should then be
FIGURE 4.1: GUIDELINES FOR MEMBERS OF RRCS

By contrast, it is the task of the analyst of the Community Analysis-Assistance Group to ensure that interpretations and other implications written into each report do not go beyond the available evidence and that each report is in all other ways consistent with BENCHMARK’s Code of Ethics to which he is obligated.

Organizing. Each Reports Review Committee will be organized and its members notified through the Office of Community Services of the BENCHMARK Community Conference.

Each meeting will be chaired by the Community Analysis-Assistance Group’s Analyst who is responsible for drafting each report. Each meeting will include an “open chair” segment where any member may introduce new items — or serve in the agenda and lead the discussion of these items or issues.

The “Approach” process. A Reports Review Committee will normally approve a report for release by a consensus or “some of the hands” process. Formal voting will be used only when all other methods of arriving at differences have failed to yield a decision. If a formal vote is required a simple majority of those present and voting will rule. Voting will transfer by a show of hands.

Constraints. Each member of a Reports Review Committee is expected to honor the following constraints:

1) All approved Social Reports must be consistent with the conditions stipulated in BENCHMARK’s Code of Ethics.
2) Each member of a Reports Review Committee is expected to maintain the confidentiality of the proceedings until the public release date and time.
3) Every effort should be made to limit the report to 1,000 words of text (i.e., six typewritten pages double spaced) or on more than four tables or other graphic displays.
4) Each member of a Reports Review Committee will be named in the body text of the report.
5) Each member of a Reports Review Committee who is willing to serve on a press contact for the report will be listed as a “contact” and will need to include his name, organizational affiliation, telephone number where he can be reached for comments, and the times he can be reached by representatives of the media.
6) Individuals who are unable to accept these constraints should withdraw as members of a Reports Review Committee.

Members of the Reports Review Committee (RRCS)

Guidelines for members of RRCS

At its monthly meeting on September 11, 1974, the Columbus Community Conference approved the establishment of a Reports Review Committee to guide the development of each of the scheduled Social Reports.

Purpose. A Reports Review Committee is established for each Social Report (1) to advise on the development of issues and themes, (2) to enable community input to the reporting process itself, (3) to provide opportunities for more and potential users to become more aware of the scope of each CASC I module, (4) to decrease awareness of the variety of analytical options that are being used on the CASC I data base, and (5) to provide opportunities for individuals to become more knowledgeable about such reports and its background so that they can serve as contacts for the bodies calling “Community Equipped” to supplement concrete solicited from the BENCHMARK staff and members of the Columbus Community Conference.

Structure. Members of a Reports Review Committee are recruited from the membership of the Columbus Community Conference and its leadership and from the membership of the Public Affairs Special Interest Group. In addition, members are recruited from community groups and agencies that may have a direct interest and/or expertise in the subject of a given Social Report. In addition, all individuals who volunteer services on a Reports Review Committee are invited to serve as are all individuals nominated by others.

Rights and Scope. Each Reports Review Committee is charged with approving the final draft of each Social Report released to the Press. In addition a Reports Review Committee may advise on the desirability of releasing a series of reports on other supplementary materials to back up or to provide additional context for each approved release.

Generally speaking, it is the function of the Reports Review Committee to guide the development of each report and at each stage in the developmental process — to assess what is prepared by the Analyst against the following criteria:

1) Relevance to current or forthcoming policy issues.
2) Timeliness.
3) Novelties.
4) Readability — with respect to both the verbal and graphic-visual dimensions of the report.
5) Sensitivity to delicate issues to ensure fair and balanced treatment.
given the opportunity to specify to the staff analyst those things he
should focus on in preparing the first Social Report draft.

Consequently, at the first meeting of the RRC, the staff analyst
circulated copies of the questions with which that Social Report was
concerned. These questions -- an example of which is included in
Appendix C -- were copied from the CASP USERS GUIDE along with the
prose introduction concerning the module to which they referred, and
discussed with the RRC members. In addition, any special methodologies
or question formats employed in the design of the questions were ex­
plained to committee members. These explanations concerned things such
as Likert and self-anchoring scales, semantic differentials, and a
coin allocation technique that had been created for use in CASP, as
well as closed and open ended questions and branches or skips in the
survey schedule.

It was at this point -- and before any results to CASP were
presented -- that some staff members asked the participants if they
wished to serve on the RRC. At some point early in the meeting --
either at this juncture or even earlier -- those who had come to the
first meeting were given the opportunity to depart gracefully. This
intermission or "coffee break" was structured to take place at the
time when the participants were asked to decide whether or not they
intended to serve on the RRC for its entire duration and comply with
regulations governing its operation and their behavior. Those who
decided to continue were asked to sign a form indicating that they
agreed to maintain the confidentiality of the discussions and
materials addressed in the RRC meetings until the information had been publicly released.

The form, a copy of which is included as Figure 4.2, also elicited information about each member's organizational affiliation, position, address, and phone number. After a few RRCs, it became apparent that it was essential to acquire this information. It was used to generate a list of participants that could be shared with other RRC members. In addition, it forced each participant to sign off on the rules and regulations of the RRC. And finally, the lists made it easy to contact members in the event that they had to be notified about something such as a change in meeting time or a change in the time when a draft would be ready to pick up, or contacted to discuss or take a phone vote about some matter affecting the Social Report.

Since such a large segment of the initial meeting of each RRC was devoted to procedural matters and the task of familiarizing members with the Program, the RRC and the staff, only a small amount of time was available for reviewing and discussing the findings from CASP. Nonetheless, it was considered very important to allow the members to get their hands on the data during the first meeting. At the same time, care was taken not to overwhelm the RRC members. Consequently, the marginal results were distributed to RRC members during the first meeting. Staff analysts would frequently prepare tables that would graphically portray the marginal distributions of findings to important questions.
FIGURE 4.2: AGREEMENT FORM TO SERVE ON AN RRC

CCC Memorandum
October 1974

SUBJECT: Agreement to serve on a Reports Review Committee

I agree to serve on the Reports Review Committee on _______________________

I understand my commitment to maintain the confidentiality of the discussions and materials addressed in the RRC meetings until the public release of the information.

________________________________________  (signature)
________________________________________  (print name)

________________________________________  (organization or affiliation)

________________________________________  (position)

________________________________________  (number)  (street)  (city)  (ZIP)

________________________________________  (day telephone)  (night telephone)

______________________________  (date)
On some occasions, members were asked to write down their predictions of the findings, and then given the actual responses from CASP. This device helped to stimulate discussion about the findings. It also helped to prevent some participants from saying that the results came as no surprise or that they already knew what public opinion about some matter was.

The overall findings would be discussed; members would be asked to identify any unanticipated findings and to comment upon them. Frequently, the members were encouraged to discuss the policy relevance of the findings and the applicability of the data. In addition, members were asked to make provisional decisions about those questions and findings that were most important to address in the Social Report, and thus to give staff analysts guidance about the direction to follow in their preparation of Social Report drafts.

Because of the length of some modules in CASP, this early delineation of boundaries for the Social Report was quite important. It was at this first meeting that several RRCs recommended that more than one Social Report be issued for a single area of concern -- and, in fact, three Social Reports dealing with crime and justice and two dealing with transportation were released at the recommendation of the RRC.

Once the findings had been reviewed and discussed, a time and place was set for the next meeting of the RRC. The staff analyst would tell the participants when the first draft of the Social Report would be ready to be picked up. Though Social Report drafts were occasionally
mailed or hand delivered to members, the most frequently followed method for getting the drafts into the hands of the RRC was to have the committee members pick up the drafts at the Academy. Drafts were placed in manila envelopes bearing the names of the RRC members and left at the receptionist's desk where they could be picked up any time of the day or night. The major reasons why this method was adopted by most of the staff analysts were to save the time that would have been involved in mailing drafts and the inconvenience caused by delivering them. Mail delivery was uncertain and slow, especially when drafts were mailed over a weekend; and personal delivery of drafts to all the members of a large RRC seemed untenable.

The success and ease of operation of the pick-up method hinged on the staff analyst having the draft ready at the agreed-upon time. If the draft was not ready on time, members had to be informed of that fact and the meeting time for the second convening of the RRC probably had to be changed. An effort was made to have a draft prepared as soon after the first meeting as possible — usually in three to five days — and to schedule the next RRC meeting as soon after that as possible, but not less than 24 hours after the draft was ready to be picked up. Frequently, the first meeting would be held on a Monday, a draft readied by Friday, and the second meeting set for the following Monday.

This schedule was a tight one which placed a great deal of pressure on staff analysts; occasionally it had to be extended. Though it would have been possible to extend the period of time allotted to an
RRC -- and on occasion it was absolutely necessary to extend it -- an effort was made not to allow the RRC process and the writing of a Social Report to become a long-drawn-out, and attenuated affair. The Program had a commitment to releasing the data as quickly as it could; and wanted to preserve the identity of the RRC as a short-term, intensive, ad-hoc, and functionally-oriented proceeding.

Meeting times were arranged by the members themselves. Though not everyone's meeting time preferences could be accommodated, meetings were usually arranged according to the principle of the least inconvenience for the fewest. This principle was not always adhered to however, because some members in effect exercised a veto by claiming that there were certain times at which they absolutely could not meet.

Certain recurring problems had to be addressed by staff analysts in the process of running an RRC. Most of these problems surfaced during the first meeting. One problem was that of the "no-show," the person who indicated an interest in attending the RRC and failed to show up at a meeting. "No-shows" were of two types; those who were really not very interested in serving on an RRC, and those who were very interested but for one reason or another were obliged to miss a meeting. It was the latter type of absentee member with whom the staff analyst was most concerned. Though some staff analysts chose to take a very hard line with no-shows, others did not. Some staff analysts regarded the first meeting of the RRC as a critical one. If a prospective member failed to attend that meeting then he was not permitted to serve on the RRC. Other staff members were far more lenient, and often
allowed people to serve on an RRC despite the fact that they missed a meeting.

Sometimes "no-shows" would contact the Program to account for their absence and to ask if it was still possible to sit on the RRC. In these instances, the staff analyst would usually arrange a time to provide a private briefing — provided by either the lead or the support — for the person or persons who had missed the first meeting. At no time were private briefings held for more than three prospective members of an RRC. Though it happened rarely, several individuals were recontacted by Program personnel even though they had not taken the initiative to call once they had missed the first meeting. The effort that was required to involve a person who had missed the first meeting was substantial, and often entailed interrupting an already busy schedule.

There was another potential cost associated with allowing a person to join an RRC late: that person was denied exposure to the group interaction that took place during the first meeting as well as whatever feelings of group cohesion or trust that resulted. When these people finally attended a meeting, they did so as strangers. To decrease the likelihood of this happening, some staff analysts would inform the RRC that someone had been obliged to miss a meeting, and be sure to introduce them at a subsequent meeting. In BENCHMARK's RRC, this "alienation" phenomenon never became a serious problem.

Some of the people who were contacted about serving on an RRC — and it was most prevalent among those contacted by the Program
as the result of a referral -- failed to attend the first meeting. This "no-show" phenomenon came to be expected. Consequently, staff members frequently would over-recruit for their RRCs on the assumption that some of the people who had been recruited would not show up or continue to participate after the first meeting. Attrition in membership after the first meeting of the RRC was not very great, and never caused a problem. Since no quotas were ever imposed on an RRC, it was left to the discretion of each analyst about how aggressively, how actively, and how many people should be recruited.

A second type of problem with which the staff analyst was obliged to deal concerned the member who was outspokenly critical of the Program, the CASP design process, the methodology used to conduct CASP, the Social Reports, and so on. It was inevitable that some of the RRC members would have questions or reservations about BENCHMARK's social reporting system. Though some participants were enthusiastic from the outset, others were not. Consequently, most every RRC initially had to go through a phase during which members had the opportunity to air their questions and reservations -- or in the parlance of the staff, to "pitch a bitch."

Questions that frequently arose concerned the reliability and validity of the survey research methodology that had been employed, the "uninformed" nature of the sample that had been questioned, the predictability of the findings, and so on. In order to respond to these questions, staff analysts often had to provide clear, succinct and convincing explanations of things such as randomness, probability
sampling, sampling error, questionnaire construction, and so on. Thus, materials for responding to these types of questions frequently were prepared or assembled in advance of a meeting.

The style in which a staff analyst responded to question depended almost entirely on the context in which a question was raised. At times, staff analysts would try to pre-empt certain questions by doing things such as having RRC members predict the results before they got to see them. Sometimes, staff analysts would respond directly, immediately, and forcefully to questions that were raised. Other times, the staff analyst would encourage a discussion of these questions and allow other RRC members to respond to the person who was intent on raising or pressing an issue.

In the last analysis, the discussions that arose in response to these questions often resulted in transforming some of the most skeptical people into strong advocates of the social reporting process that had been undertaken. Though the problems that arose in this regard were not terribly severe, each staff analyst had to be prepared to respond to some very difficult questions -- of both a political and scientific nature -- about CASP and the Social Reports, and about the institutions with which the Program was identified or affiliated including Battelle Memorial Institute, Ohio State University, the Mershon Center and the Academy for Contemporary Problems. The staff analyst could usually count on the support of the rest of the RRC in preventing a person who refused to accept a reasonable response to an unreasonable question from disrupting the proceedings.
Other problems with which staff analysts had to contend concerned a) the image which some RRC members had of the staff as young, academic and inexperienced; b) the reluctance of some RRC members to accept some of the ground rules governing the operation of the RRC — such as the length, scope, and impartial presentation of the Social Reports; and c) the difficulties associated with doing so much work in so little time. These problems, like the others, were handled according to the discretion of the staff members involved. In general, RRC members were treated with great respect. Staff members made a concerted effort to demonstrate that they were sensitive to the needs and concerns of users, and to behave such that they reflected the considerable applied experience they had acquired.

The initial meeting of each RRC seemed to have several distinct components or phases. The first phase was the introduction phase during which all participants were introduced to one another. The second major component involved the establishment of ground rules. It was at this time that preliminary material dealing with the history and purpose of BENCHMARK, CASP and the RRC was covered. At some point during the first meeting, the staff analysts attentions were drawn almost totally to the task of question and complaint resolution, when participants explored the limits of the Program and the staff. This phase was then followed by a preliminary review of findings from CASP, and the specification of guidelines for the analyst to follow in preparing the first draft. And finally, arrangements were formulated for picking up the first draft of the Social Report and convening the RRC
for a second time. On no occasion was a draft of a Social Report ever distributed at a first meeting. The staff was careful to draft Social Reports after the RRC had convened and not before so that the concerns and suggestions of the RRC could be incorporated into the first draft.

D. SUBSEQUENT MEETINGS OF THE RRC: THE SUBSTANTIVE DELIBERATION PHASE

The primary, explicit purpose of an RRC was to produce a Social Report; a Social Report was also the most tangible product of an RRC. Consequently, after the first meeting of each RRC (though the socialization of RRC members was a continuous process, the first meeting was targeted at bringing the participants on board), discussions focused on the task of producing a Social Report. It was after the initial meeting then that substantive deliberations about the Social Reports began. The completion of these deliberations normally required that each RRC meet two and sometimes three times after the first meeting.

In addition to hammering out a draft acceptable to the members of the RRC, a number of other tasks had to be accomplished. These tasks included: 1) identifying individuals or agencies to receive embargoed copies of the Social Report, 2) identifying individuals or agencies to receive complimentary copies of the Social Report, 3) identifying RRC participants to act as contact people for the media, 4) designing a release strategy for the Social Report, and 5) discussing the possible contents of a module for subsequent CASPs dealing with the same area of concern. Not all of these tasks were addressed by all the RRCs.
1. Producing a Social Report

Clearly, the first and foremost challenge presented to the RRC was that of helping to produce a draft of the Social Report acceptable for release. This challenge was met by going through the iterative process of providing feedback on the drafts that had been prepared by staff analysts. The feedback on one draft would become input for the next. All Social Reports went through at least two full drafts and more often than not an additional two partial drafts before they were ready to be final typed.

The draft and review process, a model of which is portrayed in Figure 4.3, operated as follows. At the first meeting of the RRC, general guidelines for the Social Report would be constructed. The discussions that transpired during the first meeting and the guidelines that were established were incorporated into the first Social Report draft prepared by the analyst. Copies of this draft would then be given simultaneously to members of the RRC (who would pick them up prior to their second meeting) and to other staff members. Once feedback on the draft had been obtained from both the RRC and the staff, the analyst would then prepare a second draft usually containing major revisions incorporating the two sets of comments he had received.

The changes between the first and second drafts ordinarily were the most substantial ones made during the course of preparing a Social Report. Before this second draft was circulated to RRC members, it was first returned to the staff for review on the assumption that any additional changes suggested by the RRC would be minor and that
FIGURE 4.3: THE SOCIAL REPORT DRAFT AND REVIEW PROCESS

- First RRC Meeting
- Draft of Social Report Prepared
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- Third RRC Meeting
- Final Modifications Made to Social Report
consequently any additional staff-suggested changes should be incorporated in what was hoped would be the last draft seen by the RRC. Staff comments were then incorporated into yet another draft, copies of which were circulated to the RRC. This draft was a fairly polished draft; figures and graphics that in previous drafts might have been hand written were usually typed along with titles and any explanatory footnotes that were required.

An attempt was made to reach final agreement on the Social Report at the third meeting of the RRC, and changes suggested by the RRC in response to the draft they had received frequently could be made right at the meeting. When this was not possible an attempt was made to produce a draft acceptable for release without convening the RRC again. On some occasions, however, this was not possible, and another round of draft and review — including another meeting of the RRC — was required.

Though there was some overlap between the review function performed by the staff and that performed by the members of the RRC, each provided a unique type of feedback. The internal staff review focused on analytic issues and questions related to evidence and inference. RRC members, on the other hand, made comments related to substantive and political considerations: comments on phrasing, language, emphasis, order, themes, etc. Over time, the type of comments provided by the two groups converged somewhat: staff members became more sensitive to political issues and RRC members became more sensitive to analytical issues. This convergence, however, never totally eliminated
the comparative strengths (and weaknesses) and distinctive qualities of each group's feedback.

The feedback response rate for both staff and RRC members was high. Since most RRC members picked up Social Report drafts at the Academy in manila envelopes bearing their names, it was quite simple to determine — and in a very unobtrusive manner — who had and who had not picked up drafts prior to a meeting. Though the act of picking up a draft prior to a meeting was no guarantee that the draft had been carefully reviewed, it was one indicator of interest in the Social Report and the RRC process.

In general, almost every RRC member was an active participant in the RRC meetings, and almost every RRC member provided specific feedback on the drafts that had been prepared. It should be pointed out that the internal staff review of Social Reports was, for all intents and purposes, invisible to the members of the RRC. Though not all staff members provided feedback on Social Report drafts, a high percentage usually did, especially on the first draft. A staff norm arose to accord Social Report drafts the highest priority and to subject them immediately to a careful, thoughtful and complete review. On the few occasions that staff members were tardy in providing comments, the lead analyst responsible for the Social Report would solicit it from some people. No staff member ever felt the slightest hesitation to say exactly what he thought; consequently staff comments were direct and to the point. Social Report drafts always benefited from the most rigorous review of at least two, and frequently more, staff members.
In general, it was not very difficult to elicit feedback from the RRC participants. On the contrary, most RRC members took their roles very seriously and provided comments willingly, enthusiastically, and abundantly. Nonetheless, staff analysts on occasion were required to elicit feedback from the RRC members. There was considerable variance in how staff analysts did this -- ranging from gently prodding for general comments to directly asking an individual member for his reaction to a very specific question.

Not only were drafts subjected to different types of reviews by virtue of the differences between the two groups who were reviewing them, they were also subjected to different reviews by virtue of what stage in the Social Report writing process they reflected. Early drafts tended to be subjected to more intensive reviews focused on substantive and analytic concerns and by a larger percentage of potential reviewers than did later drafts. As the Social Report writing process progressed, reviews changed emphasis and became more and more concerned with the final appearance and typographical and technical accuracy and consistency of the Report. In fact, the very last review, which was conducted by BENCHMARK staff members was a check on the accuracy and consistency of the Report.

Despite the severe time constraints under which each Social Report was produced, no error was ever detected in any of the 16 Social Reports that was released. Though one error in a table made it through the printing stage, it was caught and corrected before the Report was distributed. This accuracy was attributable to a strict adherence to
certain guidelines: the final copy of a Social Report was proofed by at least two people in addition to the lead; tables and figures were proofed against the computer print-out of the findings and not against earlier drafts; the printed copies were proofed to ensure that everything had been printed and assembled in proper order according to printing instructions; Social Reports were proofed against other Social Reports to ensure consistency among Social Reports with respect to reporting conventions that had been devised and with respect to typographical format; and one typist had the responsibility for producing the master copy of all the Social Reports.

2. Designing and Implementing a Release Strategy

In addition to assisting in the preparation of the Social Report, the RRC also assisted in designing a strategy for the Reports' release. Generally, this involved the following tasks: 1) designating an official release date for the Social Report; 2) identifying individuals or agencies to receive copies of the Social Reports prior to the Social Reports' official release; 3) identifying individuals or agencies to receive complimentary, unsolicited copies of Social Reports after the Social Report had been officially released; and 4) designating certain RRC members to act as community spokesmen for the Social Reports. These tasks usually were accomplished at the last meeting of each RRC.

Each RRC worked with two release dates: a target release date and an official release date. The target release date was suggested by the staff analyst during the first meeting of an RRC. The establishment of a target release date was important for two reasons.
First, it symbolized the priority attached to producing a Social Report with a minimum of delay as well as the fact that the convening of an RRC was not conceived as an open-ended endeavor. The target release date thus helped to establish the ground rules and set the tone for each RRC. Second, the target release date constituted a point of reference toward which each RRC could aim its efforts.

The actual or official release date was determined normally during the final meeting of an RRC. Though the decision as to when a Social Report should be officially released was under the purview of the RRC, the decision was made in accordance with any suggestions provided by members of the Program's Public Affairs Special Interest Group. Generally, the official release date was chosen to maximize the potential media coverage a Social Report might receive (consequently, an attempt was made not to release a Social Report so that its coverage would fall on a Saturday or a holiday, or so that it would be competing with other major, predictable events for media coverage), to ensure that the Reports would be printed and available for distribution on the official release date, and to correspond with a time when RRC spokesmen would be available for comments.

The target date for the release of a Social Report served both internal and external functions. Internally, the date influenced how staff, resources and tasks were scheduled. Externally, the date served as a reminder as to when another Social Report would be released, both for the media and for others in the community interested in a particular Social Report. When people made inquiries about a Social
Report, staff were able to provide them with a specific date as to when they could expect that Social Report to be ready for release. Every effort was made to make the target release date and the official release date coincide.

Embargoed copies of Social Reports — that is, copies of Social Reports released prior to the official release date — were sent to the media and to certain individuals in the community. These embargoed copies were sent to the media under a "hold for release" proviso — that is under the understanding that they would not be reported in the media until the official release date. Only once did a newspaper fail to honor this understanding and report findings from an embargoed copy of a Social Report prior to the official release date — and this was done by mistake.

Approximately half-way through the series of Social Reports, it became apparent that only rarely were media members soliciting comments about Social Report findings from people who had been sent embargoed copies. Consequently, the practice of sending embargoed copies to people outside the media was abandoned. In a locale with a more enterprising, aggressive, or better endowed media, an embargoed release strategy might have been more successful.

Just as the practice of distributing pre-release copies withered, the practice of distributing unsolicited copies of Social Reports grew. When the first Social Reports were ready for release, the Program was at the end of a budget cycle and the number of copies of Social Reports that could be printed and distributed was quite
limited. Consequently, the Program initially assumed a very low profile with respect to the availability and distribution of Social Reports. The availability of Social Reports was not advertised and few unsolicited copies were distributed. When these budget constraints were relaxed, the Social Reports were marketed much more aggressively.

About this time, the practice evolved of having RRC participants identify people in the community whom they felt reasonably sure would be interested in and able to use a Social Report. The people so identified were sent, without charge, unsolicited copies of a Social Report. On occasion, the Social Report was sent out under the signature of the BENCHMARK analyst or Director and accompanied by a cover letter. An example of such a cover letter is contained in Appendix D. Though it never happened, the Social Report could have been accompanied by a cover letter signed either by the RRC or the Program's Public Affairs Special Interest Group. Multiple copies of Social Reports were provided to RRC members so that they could diffuse them as they saw fit.

Whenever possible, and in order to promote their identification with the Social Reports, RRC members were encouraged to act as spokesmen for the Social Reports. This was also done to enhance the credibility of the Social Reports in the community. The notion was that if the media — and through the media, the public — knew that diverse groups and interests in the community were "buying on" the Social Reports, affiliating themselves with BENCHMARK (both with the institution and the staff), and going so far as to act as spokesmen for the Social Reports then citizens would be more likely to pay attention to the Social Reports and regard them as credible.
The practice of identifying and selecting spokesmen operated in the following manner. From the outset, the RRC members were apprised that they would have to select spokesmen and that anyone so serving would be listed along with his institutional affiliation on the Social Report produced by his RRC. On the Social Reports' official release date, spokesmen were to make themselves available for comments and interviews. In practice spokesmen either emerged or were recruited by the staff analyst. In some RRCs, a consensus seemed to emerge naturally about who should serve as spokesmen. In other RRCs, the staff analyst took more initiative in recruiting spokesmen. In either case, the selection was made with the knowledge and consent of other RRC members.

For the most part, the RRC spokesmen for BENCHMARK Social Reports were not used as spokesmen to any great extent. Occasionally they would be interviewed by the media, and occasionally they would participate in press conferences. Most of the time, however, the primary contact for the media was the BENCHMARK staff analyst responsible for drafting the report. Once again, had the community setting been any different, RRC spokesmen might have been utilized far more than they actually were. And though it happened only rarely, some spokesmen served not just as contact people for the media but also as resource people who could also assume partial or total responsibility for speaking at public or private engagements where the Social Report or CASP was the topic of discussion.

Once the RRC process became more routinized, the selection of community spokesmen became somewhat a pro forma exercise, and the
function of spokesmen somewhat ambiguous. It should be pointed out, however, that the fact that RRC spokesmen were contacted infrequently to discuss the social reports does not detract from the fact that the very act of selecting spokesmen and the institutional legitimacy attached to this position by the staff constituted a symbolic representation of the open process surrounding the design of CASP and the analysis and reporting of CASP findings.

It is also important to distinguish the formal process of selecting official spokesmen for the Social Reports from the informal function each RRC member served as a spokesman for the Social Reports. While the officially designated spokesmen's contact qua official spokesmen with the media and in the community might have been limited, the contact of RRC members with the media and in the community was not. In fact, RRC members diffused the Social Reports widely and in many different settings. In addition, the name of every RRC member was listed on the report to underscore broad community participation in and the openness of the report writing process.

The practice or strategy of selecting community spokesmen was not without risks. In the first place, people in the community (and people in the media as well) might confuse the image or identity of BENCHMARK with the institutional affiliation attributed to the spokesmen selected by the RRC. In other words, whatever gains might be realized by having the Social Reports identified with people and institutions in the community might be offset if the people and institutions with whom the reports became identified produced a negative affect
amongst people unfamiliar with the Program, CASP, or the Social Reports. Since it was not possible to ensure fair and competent media coverage, this possibility could not be discounted.

In the second place, community spokesmen were more prone to distorting, misinterpreting, or going beyond the findings than were staff analysts. In one press conference, for example, attended by two RRC spokesmen and the staff analyst, contradictory statements were made in response to questions from the media. Though this apparent contradiction was resolved quickly and without incident, it might very well have served to discredit BENCHMARK and the findings from CASP. It should be pointed out that the community spokesman strategy was capable of working well. Several times articulate, well-respected, influential and able RRC members were selected as spokesmen. These people were known and interviewed by the media. On these occasions, the coverage received by the Social Reports benefited tremendously as a result of officially designating RRC spokesmen and involving these spokesmen in the report's public release.

The RRC served two other very important functions. It constituted a seed-bed for new ideas and a new demand for subsequent Columbus Area Social Profiles. In fact, one of the express purposes of the RRC was to begin to stimulate the demand and build a base of support for CASP II and to begin to structure the input into the design of CASP II. In some of the RRCs, the production of the Social Report was little more than a prelude to the design of a module or section for CASP II. In other RRCs, prospects for CASP II were discussed and members invited
to indicate their interest in participating in the process of designing parts of another CASP.

The RRC also served as a forum in which clients for the Community-Originated Studies Program could be recruited. RRC members were informed that if they wanted specialized analyses conducted on the CASP data or special reports written on subjects not included in the Social Report they had helped prepare, they could receive such analyses or reports through the Community-Originated Studies Program.

One final practice related to the release of the Social Reports deserves some discussion. After approximately two-thirds of the Social Reports had been released, the Program adopted the practice of including a copy of a press release with every Social Report that was circulated to a member of the media. The press release, which closely followed the Social Report, was prepared by Program staff without the assistance of the RRC -- though there was no express reason for not involving RRC members in the task. The result of this practice -- which was instituted to determine how it would affect the media coverage the Social Reports received -- was that many media would reproduce verbatim all or part of the press releases in stories reporting the findings from CASP. This was especially true of radio stations that frequently had neither the time nor the resources to extract good news copy from the full Social Reports.
E. AFTER THE RRC: THE POST-RRC CONTACT PHASE

Once a Social Report was officially released, the RRC disbanded. Since its mandate was very specific, the structure was dissolved immediately after the mandate was fulfilled. Nonetheless, contact continued between RRC members and staff analysts. Consequently, it seems useful to distinguish a "post-RRC" contact phase as a separate phase of the overall RRC process.

It is important to emphasize that this post-RRC contact phase was not structured nearly to the degree that other phases in the RRC process had been. Whereas careful consideration had been given as to how to handle the RRC process up until the time the Social Report was released, virtually no attention was focused on how to handle post-RRC contact with committee members after the Social Report was released.

Almost every staff analyst sent thank you letters to the members of his RRC. In addition, all RRC members were to have been placed on the Program's mailing list and automatically sent copies of the monthly newsletter, BenchMarkings. This would have ensured that at least some post-RRC contact would have been routinized and that RRC members would have been kept apprised of what the Program was doing even after the RRC on which they had been a member disbanded. In actuality, however, this never happened. Not all RRC members were placed on the Program's mailing list. Aside from these two practices -- one of which was not followed consistently -- contact that continued
was quite idiosyncratic from one RRC to the next. For the most part, both staff members and RRC members were free to choose either to continue to nurture the relationships that had taken root during the RRCs or to allow those relationships to wither.

The post-RRC contact that took place can be differentiated according to several criteria. In the first place, it can be differentiated according to who initiated it — a BENCHMARK staff member or an RRC member. As the following discussion reveals, most post-RRC contact was initiated by RRC members. And in the second place, it can be differentiated according to how formal the occasion or purpose for the contact was — formal and with an identifiable purpose or informal (casual) and with no identifiable purpose. Most post-RRC contact was formal and had an identifiable purpose.

One forum for post-RRC contact was in BENCHMARK's Special Interest Groups (SIGs), a device adopted by the Program "to permit smaller, more focused groups 1) to exchange knowledge and information, 2) to explore alternatives and develop strategic options, 3) to develop action plans, and 4) to develop and mobilize resources to facilitate the implementation of action plans." Post-RRC contact in at least one of the SIGs was substantial.

After the RRC for the Crime and Justice Social Reports disbanded, much of the energy and many of the people involved in that RRC spilled over into the Crime and Justice SIG which already existed. This infusion of energy and people helped breathe new life and direction into the SIG. Meetings were held regularly, and a new crime and justice
module for CASP II was drafted. Relationships that had just begun to
develop in the RRC itself had the chance to evolve even more fully in
the forum of the SIG. Furthermore, just as the SIG facilitated post-
RRC contact between staff and RRC members, so too did it facilitate
continuing post-RRC contact among RRC members themselves. For the most
part, this form of continuing contact was initiated by staff members
who invited or arranged to have invitations sent to RRC members who
were not already members of the SIG. Though the SIG was a formal en-
tity, most of the contact was nonetheless very casual and relaxed.

Though it happened infrequently, some RRC members participated
on task forces formed to discuss issues such as the governance and
funding of the Program. Unlike most other forms of post-RRC contact,
this form was unrelated to the subject matter that had been the occasion
for contact in the RRC. This was also true of post-RRC contact that
resulted from some RRC members becoming active members or continuing
active membership on the BENCHMARK Community Conference.

RRC members themselves initiated a great deal of the post-
RRC contact that took place. Staff members were invited by RRC members
to make presentations about the Social Report or about the Program.
On occasion, RRC members also involved staff members on committees and
task forces in the community. For example, one staff member was in-
vited to serve on the City's Housing and Community Development Technical
Advisory Committee. Another served on the planning subcommittee of the
Franklin County Committee on Criminal Justice. On these committees,
staff members continued to have contact with members of RRCs.
On some occasions, RRC members would contact staff members informally to run ideas by them, to get expert advice or information about some matter, or to have them review plans or evaluate proposals. In short, some RRC members viewed staff members as resources whom they could call upon for help or advice. Once these RRC members had established relationships with staff, they felt free to call upon them. It was in this manner that the networks of professional associations of BENCHMARK staff members and RRC members became intertwined.

Post-RRC contact also took place when RRC members came to BENCHMARK for Community-Originated Studies or for Technical Assistance. At one time, the RRC was viewed in part as an advance marketing mechanism for Community-Originated Studies. And in fact, a number of COSs were requested by people who had served on RRCs. But the opposite was true as well; the COS program was an advance marketing mechanism for the RRCs. Some RRC members were people who earlier had received COSs.

Not as many COSs were requested by RRC members as had been anticipated. This may have been because RRC members -- as a result of their participation in the Social Report writing process -- were so familiar with the findings from CASP of interest to them that they had less rather than more need for a COS than they otherwise might have had. A great deal of detailed analysis was undertaken during the course of an RRC that was not included in a Social Report, and RRC members had access to most of this analysis. This also may have been because RRC members had established personal relationships with staff members, and could circumvent the formal process of requesting a COS when all they
needed was a particular piece of CASP-related information. This, in fact, happened. Since CASP was on-line, answers to simple questions could be obtained almost immediately.

Technical assistance requests also came from RRC members and occasionally as a result of RRC membership. But like COSs, RRC membership occasionally resulted from prior contact that people had had with the Program because of a request for technical assistance. Some of the technical assistance was minor in terms of the scope and amount of assistance provided, but other technical assistance was quite substantial and officially funnelled through BENCHMARK's Technical Assistance Program.

And of course informal contact between BENCHMARK staff and RRC members took place in a variety of settings and in a variety of ways — socially, professionally, serendipitously and so on. Several points should be emphasized. Though it was not really structured or planned, post-RRC contact continued, and this contact served to broaden and strengthen the linkages that had been formed between BENCHMARK and both users and potential users in the community. More often than not, the contact had content; that is, there was a purpose for the contact. And more often than not the purpose of the contact sprang from a need which RRC members had for information, advice, or assistance.

F. SUMMARY

On the basis of the preceding discussion, it is possible to isolate characteristics of the RRCs as they pertain to particular
subjects or topics such as the mechanics of operating an RRC, the problems that typically emerged during the course of an RRC, and so on. The remaining pages of this chapter briefly describe the more important of these characteristics.

1. Policies

Each RRC was operated in accordance with certain policies. These policies were rigidly adhered to and formed a set of unambiguous ground rules that both the staff and members could follow during the course of an RRC convening.

Open recruitment. RRC members were selected in accordance with an open recruitment process. Though some people were referred to the RRCs and still others invited to serve, the principle of self-selection was honored. Any person wanting to serve on an RRC was welcome to do so and self selection was encouraged.

Confidentiality of proceedings. Each RRC member was pledged to maintaining the confidentiality of the proceedings until the Social Report had been officially released. Though there was no certain way to determine whether this pledge had been violated and no specific and mandatory sanctions meted out against violators, the policy of confidentiality was clearly communicated to all participants.

Impartial presentation of findings. The Social Reports produced by the RRCs were to present the findings from CASP impartially. The Social Reports were not to be treated as a forum or medium for advocacy. It was not the purpose of a Social Report to take a
position on some issue, but rather to clarify and report public opinion about that issue.

Review and approval of Social Report by the RRC. Each Social Report released to the community had to be reviewed and approved by the RRC. Normally, approval would emerge by a process of consensus and by a more formal voting process only when all other methods for resolving differences about the Social Report had failed to achieve consensus. Responsibility for drafting Social Reports was that of the staff analyst (see below); responsibility for reviewing and approving the Social Report was that of the RRC.

Identification of RRC members. All members of an RRC were to be named on the Social Report they had helped prepare, and those members serving as contact people for the media were further identified by their institutional affiliations.

Social Reports consistent with the Program's Code of Ethics. Social Reports had to be consistent with the BENCHMARK Program's Code of Ethics regarding professional norms relating to the conduct of research and professional responsibilities relating to dealing with people.

Meetings managed by BENCHMARK staff analysts. RRC meetings were to be chaired by the BENCHMARK staff analyst assigned the lead responsibility for a Social Report. Provisions were to be made ensuring that any member had the opportunity to introduce new items onto the meeting agenda and to control the discussion of those items.
Drafts prepared by staff analysts. Social Report drafts were to be prepared by BENCHMARK staff analysts, and these drafts were to incorporate the recommendations made by members of the RRC.

2. Guidelines

In addition to the policies that formed the hard and fast ground rules for operating an RRC, a number of guidelines — some formal and explicit, some informal and tacit — helped provide direction to the RRCs.

RRCs a temporary structure. Each RRC was convened for the express purpose of producing a Social Report. The mandate of the RRC was limited to this purpose, and consequently each RRC was an ad hoc, temporary organization.

Social Reports produced quickly. Each Social Report was to be produced within three or four weeks after an RRC was first convened. Though contextual differences surrounding the Social Reports necessitated flexibility in the production schedule, the Social Reports were to be produced with an absolute minimum of delay and as quickly as possible.

Social Reports limited in length. Social Reports were to be as brief as possible, non-technical, and easy to read and understand so as to maximize the breadth of their penetration in the community.

Social Reports relevant, timely and newsworthy. The Social Reports were to emphasize those findings from CASP that were relevant to current or forthcoming policy issues, timely, and newsworthy.
3. Mechanics

A variety of tasks had to be performed in order to convene an RRC and facilitate its deliberations. Though most of the tasks were performed by the staff, some -- such as picking up and reviewing drafts -- were the responsibility of the RRC members. In addition, standard operating procedures were developed and followed to expedite the completion of important tasks and to prevent contingencies and problems that arose from becoming crises. The RRC process was a staged process that operated pretty much according to the following sequence:

- RRC members recruited
- Materials for RRC meetings prepared
- RRC convened
- Draft of Social Report prepared
- Draft of Social Report reviewed
- Reviews incorporated into new drafts
- Approved draft of Social Report typed and reproduced
- Release strategy for the Social Report prepared
- Social Report released

The mechanics of this process were handled as follows:

- BENCHMARK staff handled the recruitment of RRC members
- Meetings held at the Academy for Contemporary Problems
- Data analysis performed by the BENCHMARK Data Center and Social Report draft prepared by the BENCHMARK staff analyst
- Drafts picked up by RRC members and reviewed both by RRC members and other staff
- Staff and RRC members formulate a release strategy including determination of a date for release of the Social Report, selection of RRC spokes­men, and selection of people to receive copies of the Social Reports
- Report preparation -- including typing, graphics, and reproduction handled by staff
- Report dissemination handled by staff
4. Styles of Staff Analysts

In BENCHMARK's RRCs, there was substantial uniformity in the styles adopted by staff analysts. These styles can be described in terms of the multiple roles each staff analyst played in his RRC. With respect to their roles as nominal leaders or chairman of the RRC, most staff analysts adopted a democratic decision-making style as opposed to an autocratic or laissez-faire style. It should be pointed out however that the staff analysts were strong leaders and directive in the approach they took. With respect to their roles as technical experts and resources for the RRC and staff to the RRC, most staff analysts were professional in the technical expertise they provided and prompt and efficient in the staff work they performed. And finally, with respect to their roles as clinicians, most staff analysts were responsive and sensitive to the needs of the group and group members — even those that were not expressed explicitly — and ever conscious of the multiple objectives and purposes of the RRC including those of enhancing the capabilities of individual RRC members and personalizing the content, materials and methods of the proceedings for the individual members.

5. Characteristics of the Group Process and Group Interaction

Though the overall group process and group interaction that characterized the RRCs evidenced considerable similarity, it is important to acknowledge that variation did exist. RRCs were not carbon copies of one another. Though the basic or fundamental group processes operating in each RRC were much the same, individual variations
existed. In other words, the RRCs were all members of the same species, but like the members of the same species they differed considerably when compared one with another.

Most RRCs evidenced sufficient cohesion that differences among members in ideologies, values, perceptions, and styles never became so divisive as to threaten the existence of the group. Though some role differentiation took place among RRC members — some became informal group spokesmen within the meetings, for example — the RRC did not meet so frequently or have so many separate and specific tasks for members to perform as to encourage great role differentiation. Some role expectations emerged, but these were more completely specified for staff analysts than for RRC members. It was expected that RRC members would perform review and comment, and it was expected that staff analysts would prepare drafts, incorporate comments, handle all logistical and support functions, and provide technical expertise where needed and appropriate.

Status differentials among RRC members were minimized within the RRC, perhaps because the meetings took place on neutral territory where no RRC member had a "territorial" or "locational" advantage over another, perhaps because the ground rules for the RRC were so clear, and perhaps because staff members were impartial arbiters when conflicts or differences did arise. In the RRC meetings, a great deal of interaction took place, both among RRC members and between members and the staff analysts. For the most part, this interaction was task-oriented, and the atmosphere cordial and friendly.
6. Norms

Certain norms governing the behavior of RRC members can be identified. One norm involved trying to resolve differences so that decisions could be reached by consensus rather than by a formal vote. Another norm involved meeting deadlines and attending meetings on time. Still another norm was that people would be candid and straightforward about their feelings and opinions. And finally, the norm of civility prevailed in most meetings. Whatever their differences, RRC members were civil to one another.

7. Problems

Each analyst was obliged to contend with a set of very predictable problems. Though several of these problems have already been discussed, they will be mentioned briefly here again.

Each staff analyst was confronted with the problem of "no-shows," people who indicated that they would participate in an RRC and then did not participate, or people who having joined an RRC missed one of the meetings. Since the work of the RRC was compressed into such a short period of time, "no-shows" constituted a real problem.

In addition, each staff analyst had to be prepared for the RRC member who "pitched a bitch," that is took the occasion of an RRC meeting to question the utility or accuracy of survey research, CASP, and what have you. Closely related to this problem was the problem that some RRC members had a general distrust of survey data and some had the tendency to say of the findings, "I knew this already."
Though it rarely happened, a problem arose when an RRC member was reluctant to accept the ground rules of the RRC, or having indicated his acceptance of them failed to comply with them. The ground rules that were most often questioned were those that had to do with keeping the Social Reports as objective as possible or with restricting the scope and length of the Social Reports. Finally, the work load and the deadlines associated with producing a Social Report frequently posed problems both for the RRC and the staff analyst.
CHAPTER V

MEMBER PERCEPTIONS OF THE REPORT REVIEW COMMITTEE

A. INTRODUCTION: SURVEY OF RRC MEMBERS

In May of 1975 — approximately eight months after the first Social Reports had been released — structured mail questionnaires were sent to all members of Report Review Committees that had been convened up until that time (this included RRCs for the first 13 of the 16 Social Reports issued as part of CASP). These questionnaires were prepared as part of BENCHMARK's ongoing evaluation effort and for the purpose of generating diagnostic information that could be used to refine and further develop the Program. The questionnaires measured the effectiveness of the Program's dissemination and utilization strategy in promoting conditions of awareness, interest, trust and credibility; the degree to which respondents talked about the Program, the products it generated and the services it provided; the extent to which respondents referred people to the Program for information or assistance; the degree to which BENCHMARK products and services had been used; and the opinion of respondents about the products, services, organization, operation and staff of the Program.

Of the 49 questionnaires sent to RRC members, 36 (or 73%) were returned. Each questionnaire was sent along with a stamped,
pre-addressed return envelope and a cover letter explaining the purpose of the questionnaire and guaranteeing the anonymity of the responses. A copy of the questionnaire and the cover letter which accompanied it are contained in Appendix A. A second wave of questionnaires was sent to respondents who had not returned the first questionnaire they received, and this second wave was followed up by a phone request to return the questionnaire.

The information collected in this survey represents the only information that was systematically collected from the RRC members themselves regarding their attitudes and behavior concerning, and their knowledge of different components of the BENCHMARK Program. Thus this information facilitates an evaluation of the Report Review Committee innovation from the perspective of the RRC member. Consequently, the results to this survey will be discussed in considerable detail.

The following fact should be kept in mind during the process of evaluating these results. Since the RRC innovation was designed and implemented as a prototype and exposed to the multitude of contaminating factors that exist in any natural, field research setting, great care must be exercised in interpreting these findings. It must be acknowledged, for example, that factors other than membership in the RRC could influence the knowledge, attitudes, and behavior of RRC members; just as it must be remembered that the RRC innovation was but one innovation -- albeit a very important one -- in a comprehensive strategy to promote knowledge utilization.
Thirty-nine percent (39%) of the RRC members responding to this questionnaire had been affiliated with the BENCHMARK Community Conference (BCC), another important mechanism in the Program's knowledge utilization strategy. Because of this and wherever appropriate, the responses of RRC members who also belonged to the BCC have been distinguished from the responses of RRC members who were not affiliated with the Program through any formal programs or structures other than the RRC. This is done to help isolate the influence of the BCC on RRC members. This control can be imposed analytically since the nature of each respondent's affiliation with BENCHMARK is known.

B. FAMILIARITY WITH THE BENCHMARK PROGRAM

Respondents were asked questions about their familiarity with different components of the BENCHMARK Program including the information from CASP covered in their Social Report, the topics covered in other parts of CASP, the Community-Originated Studies Program, the BENCHMARK Community Conference, and the types of service and information provided by the Program. When responses to these questions are evaluated, several facts should be kept in mind. First, almost half (45%) of the RRC participants had been involved to one degree or another in the design of CASP I. Though this involvement could be of many types -- some RRC members suggested questions to be included in CASP and were intimately involved in the review of drafts of modules, some members were involved in the design of CASP at the level of setting some of the basic parameters guiding the CASP effort, and some had been only
casually aware of design efforts that were going on -- close to half of the RRC members were at least aware of CASP before they actually served on an RRC.

Second, some RRC members interacted with the Program along other dimensions; that is, the contact they had with BENCHMARK was not restricted to contact resulting from their participation on an RRC. For example, as was mentioned earlier, 39% of the RRC members responding to this questionnaire at one time or another had attended meetings of the BENCHMARK Community Conference. In addition, respondents were asked if they had had previous contact with the BENCHMARK Program prior to their serving on an RRC. Two of three respondents (67%) indicated that they had. When the open ended responses to this question are examined, it is possible to get an idea of the range of forms this contact took. Forty-two percent (42%) of the RRC respondents reporting prior contact with BENCHMARK had been involved in one of the Program's continuing formal mechanisms such as the Community Conference or a Special Interest Group. In other words, approximately three of ten (28%) of the RRC membership had been recruited from one of the Program's continuing formal mechanisms. Other RRC members reporting prior contact with BENCHMARK indicated that they had participated in the design of CASP, had discussions or personal contacts with BENCHMARK staff, had read material dealing with the Program, or had attended a convening where BENCHMARK had been explained or that had been organized or administered by the Program.
Several conclusions can be drawn from this information about RRC members' prior contact with the Program. First, Program mechanisms and activities outside of the RRC constituted recruitment channels into the RRC for less than a third of the RRC members. Second, one would expect that approximately half of the RRC members should have had some degree of familiarity about BENCHMARK before they joined an RRC, especially when one considers that 67% of the RRC members report prior contact with the Program (though some of this contact was quite superficial and casual) and that Program records indicate that 45% of the RRC members had been at least aware of if not involved in the design of CASP. Furthermore, staff analysts were supposed to brief people about BENCHMARK in the RRC and there had been some coverage of the Program in the local media. RRC members' familiarity with BENCHMARK should be evaluated in light of these facts.

Figure 5.1 displays the results to questions measuring the respondent's familiarity with different aspects of the BENCHMARK Program. One question asked how familiar respondents were with the information from the survey that was dealt with in their RRC. The results indicate that the RRC innovation was successful in familiarizing people with the information from CASP covered in the Social Report they helped produce. Ninety-seven percent (97%) of the RRC respondents said they felt familiar with this information; compared to only 3% who responded "not very familiar" to this question.

It should be pointed out however, that although most every RRC member felt familiar with the CASP information covered in his RRC,
FIGURE 5.1: FAMILIARITY WITH CASP AND THE BENCHMARK PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>All RC Respondents</th>
<th>Members In</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How familiar do you feel you are with the information from the survey that was dealt with in your Report Review Committee?</td>
<td>Very familiar</td>
<td>53X</td>
<td>35X</td>
<td>50X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat familiar</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very familiar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all familiar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N - 36</td>
<td>N - 22</td>
<td>N - 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixteen subject areas or modules were included in the CASP I survey. Sr. a people are aware of a few of the subject areas, while others know what most of the subject areas are. Do you feel you know what most, some, a few or none of the subject areas are in the survey?</td>
<td>Most (11 to 16 areas)</td>
<td>36X</td>
<td>34X</td>
<td>71X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some (5 to 10 areas)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A few (1 to 4 areas)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N - 36</td>
<td>N - 22</td>
<td>N - 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you heard of the Community-Originated Studies (COS) Program in BENCHMARK?</td>
<td>Yes, and I'm familiar with its overall purpose</td>
<td>53X</td>
<td>36X</td>
<td>72X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, but I'm not too sure what its purpose is</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N - 36</td>
<td>N - 22</td>
<td>N - 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever heard of the BENCHMARK Community Conference?</td>
<td>Yes, and I'm familiar with its purpose</td>
<td>27X</td>
<td>27X</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, but I'm unfamiliar about what its purpose is</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N - 22</td>
<td>N - 22</td>
<td>N - 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK provides a variety of services and information. How familiar do you feel you are with the services and information BENCHMARK can provide?</td>
<td>Very familiar</td>
<td>17X</td>
<td>0X</td>
<td>43X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat familiar</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very familiar</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all familiar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N - 36</td>
<td>N - 22</td>
<td>N - 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes one respondent who also was the recipient of a COS.

†Respondents who had been members of the BENCHMARK Community Conference were not asked this question.

‡In this and all subsequent tables, percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding error.
not all RRC members felt equally familiar with that information. Fifty-three percent (53%) said they felt "very" familiar with the information; 44% said they felt "somewhat" familiar with it. When controlled for membership in the BCC, the results are almost identical. In other words, with respect to familiarity with the information from CASP covered in an RRC, the influence of membership in another formal structure of BENCHMARK, the BCC, washes out. It seems reasonable to conclude that the RRC innovation did indeed familiarize RRC members with the contents of CASP covered in their RRC. This is not equally true, however, for the contents of other parts of CASP as the following results reveal.

Respondents were also asked if they felt they knew what most, some, a few, or none of the 16 subject areas covered in the survey were. As the results in Figure 5.1 indicate, slightly more than one RRC member in five (22%) felt that he knew what a quarter or fewer of the subject areas covered in CASP were. The question, it should be emphasized, asked only if the respondent knew what the subject areas were and not if the respondent was familiar with those subject areas. Four of five respondents (78%) said they knew what more than a quarter of the 16 subject areas were, and 36% said they knew what more than 11 of the 16 subject areas were.

When controls for membership in the BCC are imposed, it can be seen quite readily that the familiarity that RRC members had about other areas of CASP as a result of participating on the RRC was increased by participating on the BCC. In other words, though RRC members who did not belong to the BCC were fairly well informed about other
areas of CASP, RRC members who were also members of the BCC were even better informed.

The RRC was only one of a number of institutional innovations that together formed BENCHMARK. To determine how familiar RRC members were with these other components of the Program, respondents were asked if they had ever heard of the Community-Originated Studies (COS) Program and the BENCHMARK Community Conference (BCC). Fift-three percent (53%) of the RRC members said that they had heard of the COS Program and were familiar with its overall purpose, and 27% said that they had heard of the BCC and were familiar with its purpose. Almost half of the respondents (47%) were not familiar with the COS Program, that is indicated either than they had not heard of it or that they had heard of it but were unfamiliar with its purpose. The percentage responding this way about the BCC was 73%. The respondents were also asked how familiar they were with the variety of services and information provided by BENCHMARK. Seventeen percent (17%) said they felt very familiar with the services and information BENCHMARK could provide, 58% said somewhat familiar, 19% said not very familiar and 6% not at all familiar.

When the results for RRC members who were also members of the BCC are compared to the results for RRC members who were not, some interesting differences emerge. Those RRC members who also belonged to the BCC were more familiar with other components of the Program than those RRC members who did not belong to the BCC. Seventy-one percent (71%) of the RRC members who belonged to the BCC knew what most of the
subject areas in CASP were compared to 14% of the RRC members who did not belong to the BCC; 79% of the RRC members who belonged to the BCC were familiar with the COS Program compared to 36% of the RRC members who did not belong to the BCC; and 100% of the RRC members who belonged to the BCC were either very or somewhat familiar with the services and information provided by BENCHMARK compared to 59% of the RRC members who did not belong to the BCC; and 100% of the RRC members who belonged to the BCC were either very or somewhat familiar with the services and information provided by BENCHMARK compared to 59% of the RRC members who did not belong to the BCC.

A number of conclusions can be drawn about the RRCs on the basis of these findings. First, the RRC appears to have been successful in accomplishing one of its primary purposes, namely, familiarizing members with the information from CASP that was dealt with in their Social Report. Second, the RRC does not appear to have been as successful in familiarizing members either with other components of the Program, such as the COS Program and the BCC, or with the variety of services and information the Program provided. Third, there was a definite lack of understanding which sizeable numbers of RRC members had of the Program as a whole. Fourth, those RRC members most likely to have a complete understanding of BENCHMARK were the members who also belonged to the BCC. In other words, familiarity with the Program and parts of CASP not dealt with by an RRC was greatest among those who had extra-RRC contact with BENCHMARK and appears to some extent to have been caused or mediated by it. Fifth, room for improvement
existed in RRC members' knowledge and level of understanding about BENCHMARK. Sixth, and despite this last fact, RRC members with respect to a ground zero base were nonetheless quite well informed about some aspects and relatively well informed about other aspects of the BENCHMARK Program.

C. INTEREST IN THE BENCHMARK PROGRAM

To some extent, participation in the RRC is itself evidence of both awareness of and interest in BENCHMARK. A number of questions were asked of RRC members about other manifestations of interest in the Program, namely whether they had seen a USERS GUIDE, read other Social Reports, requested information or assistance from the Program, and whether they were interested in participating in the design of another CASP. The responses to these questions are displayed in Figure 5.2.

Nearly two of three RRC members (64%) responded that they "had" a copy of the USERS GUIDE in the sense that they either owned, had access to or had looked through one. Nineteen percent (19%) responded that they did not have a copy but had heard about the USERS GUIDE and 17% (one of six RRC members) responded that they did not know that the USERS GUIDE was available.

USERS GUIDES generally were not available free to people; some degree of interest was required of any person who owned or had looked through one. By this measure, over half of the RRC members were sufficiently interested either to acquire or look through a
USERS GUIDE. As can be seen in Figure 5.2, over twice as many RRC members who belonged to the BCC owned USERS GUIDES as RRC members who did not. To some extent, this differential can be accounted for by the fact that the USERS GUIDE was released about the same time as the first Social Report, and at that time a major effort was made to distribute copies to the BCC. Though most people paid for USERS GUIDES, some BCC members received them free. USERS GUIDES were available at BCC meetings; they generally were not available at RRC meetings. In addition, the Program's stock became depleted rather quickly and consequently USERS GUIDES were not as readily available during a period when many of the RRCs were still being convened as they were earlier on.

One other observation seems worth making, namely, that a sizeable number of RRC respondents who did not belong to the BCC were unaware that the CASP I USERS GUIDE was available. Slightly over one in four (27%) of the RRC members not belonging to the BCC said that they did not know the USERS GUIDE was available.

RRC members were asked if they had actually read any of the Social Reports other than the one(s) produced by their RRC. Sixty-nine percent (69%) said that they had, and 32% said that they had not. The responses to a related open ended question indicate that those people who had read other Social Reports usually had read more than one other Social Report. RRC members who belonged to the BCC were twice as likely to have read other Social Reports as RRC members who did not. One hundred percent (100%) of the former group had read other
FIGURE 5.2: INDICATORS OF INTEREST IN BENCHMARK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>All RRC Respondents</th>
<th>BCC Only</th>
<th>RRC + BCC *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you have a copy of the User's Guide for the first Columbus Area Social Profile (CASP 1)?</strong></td>
<td>Yes, I own one</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, I have access to one but don' t own it</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, I don't own one, but I've looked through it</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, but I've heard about the User's Guide</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, I didn't know it was available</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Have you ever read any of the Social Reports, other than the one(s) produced by your RRC?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, I have copies of Social Reports, but I haven't had a chance to read them</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, I haven't read any Social Reports</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would you be interested in participating in selecting the kinds of questions to be included in the next Columbus Area Social Profile?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Have you ever made any requests for assistance or information from the Program?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes one respondent who was also the recipient of a COS.*
Social Reports compared to 50% of the latter group. In short, people whose involvement with BENCHMARK was limited to RRC membership alone appear to have been less interested in the other parts of CASP not dealt with by their RRC than those people whose involvement in the Program was broader and not limited to the RRC alone but rather extended to participation in other formal components of BENCHMARK.

Almost all of the RRC members indicated that they would be interested in participating in selecting the kinds of questions to be included in the next CASP. Eighty-one percent (81%) said they would be interested, 8% said they might be and 11% said that they would not be. This pattern of response is much the same for all RRC respondents whether or not they belonged to the BCC.

And finally, at the time the questionnaire was administered, one RRC member in three (32%) had made requests for assistance or information from the Program. These requests for assistance or information were more prevalent from RRC members who belonged to the BCC than from RRC members who did not. Once again, these differences may be accounted for by the fact that as a forum the BCC was oriented toward generating requests for information or assistance much more than the RRC which tended to be very task oriented in nature.

These results indicate that the interest RRC members had in BENCHMARK was not restricted to the RRC alone. Eight of ten RRC members were definitely interested in participating in the design of CASP II, seven of ten had actually read Social Reports other than the one(s) produced by their RRCs, six of ten owned or had seen the USERS.
GUIDE, three of ten had requested assistance or information from the Program, and almost four in ten (39%) belonged to the BCC (though this percentage would be somewhat less if RRC members from later RRCs had responded to this questionnaire). RRC members who belonged to the BCC evidenced higher "interest" scores than RRC members who did not have this BCC affiliation. Finally, it must be emphasized that participation on an RRC was itself a substantial manifestation of interest — especially since such participation required a corresponding commitment of work.

D. TRUST IN THE BENCHMARK PROGRAM AND STAFF

The condition of trust is very important in the knowledge utilization process, a fact that was discussed in the first chapter. Accordingly, RRC members were asked a series of questions designed to explore different dimensions of trust and certain attitudes that reasonably could be expected to influence RRC members' trust in the BENCHMARK staff and Program. Respondents were asked if they were satisfied with the performance of the staff on their RRC, if they had ever hesitated to request something from the Program, how responsive they found BENCHMARK, how likely they would be to go to BENCHMARK for assistance, and how positively they felt about the Program. In some questions respondents were asked to elaborate on their responses. The results to these questions are contained in Figure 5.3.
FIGURE 5.3: INDICATORS OF TRUST IN THE BENCHMARK PROGRAM AND STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>All RRC Respondents</th>
<th>RRC Only</th>
<th>RRC + ECC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general, what is your opinion about the performance of the staff from BENCHMARK that participated in your RRC?</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided/Neutral</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N = 36</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 22</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 14</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever hesitated to make a request to the Program for information or assistance?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N = 35</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 22</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 13</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How responsive do you think BENCHMARK is to requests for services or information?</td>
<td>Very responsive</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat responsive</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very responsive</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all responsive</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N = 36</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 22</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 14</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the future, if the need arises, how likely do you think it is that you would ask BENCHMARK to provide assistance or information for you?</td>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not very likely</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all likely</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N = 34</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 22</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 12</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, how do you feel about the BENCHMARK Program?</td>
<td>Very positive</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat positive</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat negative</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very negative</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided/Neutral</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N = 34</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 22</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 12</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes one respondent who was also the recipient of a COS.

*b These are recoded response categories.
In one sense, staff analysts represented change agents one of whose jobs it was to promote and facilitate the use of social science methodologies and products. Consequently, the opinion which RRC members held of staff members was an important indicator of the relative success of the knowledge utilization strategy adopted by BENCHMARK. RRC members were asked how satisfied they were with the performance of the staff from BENCHMARK that participated in their RRC. Almost 9 of 10 RRC members said they were satisfied with staff performance -- 69% said they were very satisfied and 17% said they were somewhat satisfied. Six percent (6%) of the respondents were somewhat dissatisfied and 8% were undecided or neutral about their opinions.

When the results are controlled for membership in the BCC it can be seen that a slightly higher percentage of RRC members whose only formal affiliation with BENCHMARK was through the RRC were satisfied with the performance of the staff than RRC members who were also affiliated with the Program through the BCC. In other words, satisfactory assessments of staff performance do not appear to have been influenced by formal contact with BENCHMARK outside of the RRC.

Respondents were asked to elaborate as to why they were satisfied or dissatisfied with the performance of the staff on their RRC. These answers, which are listed in Figure 5.4, provide a great deal of insight into the characteristics or dimensions of staff performance that are of importance to users. This type of feedback provides important diagnostic information because it sheds light on what
factors influenced users' affect toward BENCHMARK and the RRC, and thus can be used prescriptively in the design and administration of the RRC innovation. The content of each comment has been analyzed according to the function and quality of staff performance which it references.

Some interesting observations can be made about the written comments RRC members gave to this question. In the first place, 29 of 36 RRC members (81%) volunteered written comments about how satisfied they were with the performance of BENCHMARK staff in their RRC, a response rate suggesting that most RRC members had a clear and strong image of BENCHMARK staff members -- in sharp contrast to the image they had of BENCHMARK in general.

In addition, the content of that image is fairly well elaborated and differentiated. RRC members referenced many different functions that staff analysts served and many different qualities that they exhibited. Staff members were perceived -- and almost always with great favor -- in the roles they played as translators, mediators, managers, problem-solvers, listeners, editors, workers, administrators, practitioners, professionals and experts. And among the many qualities mentioned by RRC members, those qualities of staff most frequently mentioned included their responsiveness to the RRC members, and the knowledge, competence and skill they exhibited in running the RRC. In short, RRC members held a multi-dimensional image of the staff, and an image with a strong positive valence.

When asked if they had ever hesitated to make a request to the Program for information or assistance, 77% of the RRC respondents
FIGURE 5.4: REASONS FOR SATISFACTION WITH THE PERFORMANCE OF BENCHMARK STAFF IN THE RRC

Question: In general what is your opinion about the performance of the staff from BENCHMARK that participated in your RRC? Were you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with the BENCHMARK staff?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Written Comment of RRC Member</th>
<th>Function of Staff</th>
<th>Quality of Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>To the point in meetings, clarified questions, accepted and utilised</td>
<td>translator, editor</td>
<td>directness, responsiveness, clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>Eager to accommodate RRC's informational needs relative to reviewing the report, and very helpful with problem solving in this area</td>
<td>problem solver, reviewer</td>
<td>eagerness, responsiveness, helpulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>Because of the concern shown to present a factual and adequate document - and too because of their understanding of area of survey</td>
<td>expert</td>
<td>concern, objectivity, expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>Staff very enthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>Because of staff concern that results be accurate and meaningful; also acceptance of recommendations</td>
<td>editor</td>
<td>concern, accuracy, responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>Dedicated professionals</td>
<td>professional</td>
<td>dedication, professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>He exhibited care in putting the report together based on careful listening to the RRC in a tight time frame</td>
<td>assembler, listener, manager (quality controller)</td>
<td>carefulness, responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>Participated as mediator rather than advocate</td>
<td>mediator</td>
<td>impartiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>Good leadership from BENCHMARK staff</td>
<td>leader</td>
<td>leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>They were competent and knowledgeable of the subject area</td>
<td>expert</td>
<td>competence, knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>Impressed with their mental capacity - always willing to make themselves available and answer questions</td>
<td>expert</td>
<td>mental capacity, availability, responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>Very industrious - also very open to RRC input</td>
<td>worker</td>
<td>industriousness, openness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>Very knowledgeable, intelligent, and concerned</td>
<td>expert</td>
<td>knowledge, intelligence, concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>Professional, responsible, dedicated, and skilled in shepherding a project through to completion</td>
<td>professional, manager</td>
<td>professionalism, responsibility, dedication, skillfulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>Listened well, incorporated all reasonable suggestions, worked very hard</td>
<td>listener, editor, worker</td>
<td>responsiveness, industriousness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 5.4: REASONS FOR SATISFACTION WITH THE PERFORMANCE OF BENCHMARK STAFF IN THE RRC (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Written Comment of RRC Member</th>
<th>Function of Staff Reference</th>
<th>Quality of Staff Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>Staff complied with the wishes of the RRC to the extent it could</td>
<td>expert, administrator</td>
<td>responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>They were knowledgeable, open and pursuant of objectives</td>
<td>knowledge, openness, task orientedness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>Cooperative, intelligent and willing to learn (on the whole)</td>
<td>learner</td>
<td>cooperativeness, intelligence, willingness to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>Simply because they are good</td>
<td>competence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>Pleasant, knowledgeable personnel with good attitudes and proper motivation</td>
<td>pleasantness, knowledge, motivated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very satisfied</td>
<td>Very competent people, well trained. However, too objective, too professional. The human and ethical sides of community issues are not emphasized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>Organised, helped to keep group on task; dissatisfied with tightness of feedback — not enough time to react</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>Appeared to grasp some of the health related issues generated by the report; applied knowledge of survey expertise to the health area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>Meetings were called at the convenience of staff — no projection of meeting time — called (a) few meetings on same day of meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>The BENCHMARK staff performed in a punctual and efficient manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>They were doing a good job within a somewhat awkward framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>Information on meetings was not totally reliable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>They seemed to make up their minds ahead of time as to what the report would look like. Some of the more creative suggestions raised by the committee were not picked up on. Only minor editorial changes seemed to be accepted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undecided/neutral</td>
<td>With the methodology and questions used, performance was adequate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
said that they had not (31% said "no, they never had a need to contact the Program," and 46% said "no"), and 23% indicated that they had. The reason most frequently given as to why they had hesitated to make a request was that they thought that it would cost too much — an indication that some potential users were unaware of how the Program operated since few people ever paid anything for assistance provided by the Program, and since no one was ever required to pay more than $5 for a COS.

Other reasons were that the person didn't know if BENCHMARK had the information, wasn't sure that BENCHMARK provided that type of assistance, or because they could or thought they could get the information elsewhere. Most of the reasons given as to why people hesitated to make requests from the Program had to do with lack of information or misinformation about the Program — factors that should be possible to correct. The results also show that the percentage of respondents who had hesitated to make a request to the Program for information or assistance was higher among RRC respondents belonging to the BCC than among RRC respondents who did not belong.

One of the positive attributes of the BENCHMARK staff analysts frequently identified by RRC members was responsiveness (see the earlier discussion about RRC members' satisfaction with staff performance). Nonetheless, when directly asked how responsive they thought BENCHMARK was to requests for services or information, RRC members were split between those who considered the Program responsive and those who were unable to assess how responsive the Program was. Forty-two percent (42%) said the Program was very responsive, 17% said "somewhat
responsive" and 42% said they did not know. In other words, RRC members held either a positive assessment or otherwise no assessment at all of the Program's responsiveness to requests for information or services. No one's assessment was negative.

Once again, this seems to indicate that RRC members were not sufficiently aware of the Program to formulate an assessment, a conclusion that is supported by patterns of responses that emerge when the RRC members are divided into two groups — those who belonged to the BCC and those who didn't. Those who belonged to the BCC — thus having the opportunity to become better informed about the Program — were less likely to say "I don't know" in response to this question than those who didn't belong to the BCC (50% compared to 29%). This interpretation is consistent with the finding that those RRC members who belonged to the BCC and whose range of contacts with the Program extended beyond the RRC — BCC members, for example, all received copies of the Program's newsletter which contained information about services and information provided by the Program whereas RRC members did not automatically receive the newsletter and thus might have been denied the opportunity to find out about the number and variety of ways in which BENCHMARK had been responsive to requests from the community — were better informed about the Program than RRC members who did not belong to the BCC.

Almost nine of ten (88%) RRC respondents indicated that they would be either very likely (41%) or somewhat likely (47%) to ask BENCHMARK for assistance or information if in the future the need for such assistance or information arose. Those respondents who indicated
that they would not be very likely (12% — no respondent indicated that he would be not at all likely) were asked why. The reasons given were either that the data collected in CASP was not useful enough, that the data presently gathered did not serve their interests, that what they were interested in was not being dealt with by the Program, or that they did not know what was currently available. Four of ten RRC members when asked said they would be very likely to go to BENCHMARK for assistance or information in the future and another five of ten said they would be somewhat likely to.

In other words, most every RRC member had sufficient trust in the Program and staff to indicate that he would go to them in the future. Few identified any barriers preventing future utilization of the Program and staff, and the barriers that were identified did not pertain to a lack of trust in the Program or staff but rather to structural factors that are susceptible to change such as what the Program dealt with or informational factors such as what people knew about the Program. Though the question could have elicited negative affect toward the Program and staff, or a lack of trust in the Program or staff, it did not.

Finally, RRC members who belonged to the BCC were only slightly more likely than RRC members who didn’t belong to the BCC to indicate that they would request assistance or information from the Program if in the future the need for such information or assistance arose. And, once again, this difference might be accounted for by the fact that those who belonged to the BCC were better informed
about the information and services provided by BENCHMARK than those who did not (see Figure 5.1).

RRC respondents were also asked how positive they felt toward the Program as a whole. Seven of ten RRC respondents (70%) held positive feelings toward BENCHMARK -- 35% very positive and 35% somewhat positive. Approximately one in ten (12%) had somewhat negative feelings and approximately two in ten (18%) were undecided or neutral -- no one was very negative. Extremely positive responses were higher among RRC members not belonging to the BCC than among RRC members belonging (41% compared to 25%), and undecided or neutral responses were higher as well (23% compared to 8%).

These results indicate that RRC members had a substantial amount of trust in the BENCHMARK Program and staff. On the whole, respondents were satisfied with the performance of the staff, had positive affect toward the Program, regarded BENCHMARK as responsive to community needs, and were likely to return to BENCHMARK for assistance or information. Nevertheless, room for improvement in RRC members' trust in the Program and staff exists. The results suggest that some improvement in trust could have been realized by improving members' familiarity with the Program. Four of ten respondents could not assess the responsiveness of the Program to requests for information or assistance, and two of ten were undecided or neutral about their feelings toward the Program in general. Though RRC members' assessment of the BENCHMARK Program as a whole was generally favorable, their assessment of the BENCHMARK staff working on their RRC was extremely
favorable. In other words, the RRC staff analysts created a very positive and unambiguous impression on RRC members.

E. THE CREDIBILITY OF BENCHMARK PRODUCTS AND METHODS

Just as the condition of trust is important in the knowledge utilization process, so too is the condition of credibility. Potential users must regard the propagators of scientific knowledge as trustworthy and the products and methods being propagated as credible. Most of the data employed in the Social Reports produced by the RRCs was derived from the CASP survey that was conducted with 2401 area residents. RRC members could hardly have been expected to use or diffuse the results from CASP if the methodologies employed to collect and analyze the data were not viewed as credible. To assess this condition of credibility, respondents were asked questions about their perceptions of the accuracy and utility of the information contained in their Social Report. It should be remembered that few RRC members were familiar with survey research methodology and that in recent years the image of the survey researcher has suffered, in part because of a rising concern over the issue of privacy and in part because of the abuses and fraudulent uses of survey research.

RRC respondents were asked, "Do you think the information in the Social Report is a very accurate, somewhat accurate, somewhat inaccurate or very inaccurate reflection of public opinion?" The results, which are contained in Figure 5.5 show that 83% of the respondents considered the information an accurate reflection of public
FIGURE 5.5: ASSESSMENTS OF THE ACCURACY OF CASP

Question: Do you think the information contained in the Social Report is a very accurate, somewhat accurate, somewhat inaccurate or very inaccurate reflection of public opinion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All RRC Respondents</th>
<th>RRC Members Only</th>
<th>Members of RRC and BCCa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Accurate</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Accurate</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Inaccurate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Inaccurate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided/Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N=36) (N=22) (N=14)

aIncludes one respondent who was also the recipient of a COS.

opinion (36% said very accurate and 47% said somewhat accurate), 11% considered it somewhat inaccurate and 6% were undecided or neutral. Those who considered the Social Reports somewhat inaccurate were asked why. One respondent said that the sampling techniques were poor, others expressed reservations about the wording of the questions.

The results also indicate that over twice as many RRC members who served on the BCC (57%) considered the Social Reports very accurate as did RRC members who did not also serve on the BCC (23%). Extended discussions had taken place in the BCC about the technical aspects of the CASP survey, discussions which were not duplicated in the RRC, and this may account for the difference between the two groups of RRC.
members in the percentage of people who regarded the Social Reports as very accurate. Though other explanations may exist to account for this difference, this one seems most plausible. Those RRC members who belonged to the BCC were exposed to a great deal more technical information about the design of CASP, over a longer period of time, and with more opportunities to address questions than were those RRC members who did not belong to the BCC.

Respondents were also asked to assess the utility of CASP for seven applications: promoting discussion about the subject area, providing supporting evidence for present knowledge, assessing the needs of citizens, making decisions about service delivery, analyzing the combined effectiveness of existing programs in that subject area, examining the opinions of citizens, and making budgetary decisions. The question asked the respondent to rate the information from CASP according to whether it was very, somewhat, not very, or not at all useful for the seven applications.

It should be noted that the actual wording of the question, which is reproduced in Figure 5.6, asked the respondent to assess the utility of the information that was dealt with in his RRC. The respondent was not being asked to judge the utility of CASP as a whole, only that part of CASP covered in the RRC on which he served. One should remember that great variation existed in the length and nature of the modules in CASP — some, such as the module on crime and justice, were extremely long; others, such as the module on capital improvements, were very short and thus limited in breadth and depth. At the
FIGURE 5.6: ASSESSMENTS OF THE UTILITY OF INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE SOCIAL REPORTS

Question: BENCHMARK is very concerned about how information in the survey could be used. The following is a list of possible uses for the information. How useful would you judge the information is that was dealt with in your RRC, either by itself or in combination with other kinds of data, for each of the following topics?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promoting discussion about the subject area</th>
<th>Providing supporting evidence for present knowledge</th>
<th>Help in assessing the needs of citizens</th>
<th>Help in making decisions about service delivery</th>
<th>Help in analyzing the combined effectiveness of existing programs in that subject area</th>
<th>Help in examining the opinions of citizens</th>
<th>Help in making budgetary decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very useful</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat useful</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very useful</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all useful</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
aggregate level, this might have caused the assessments to have been
suppressed somewhat but it should not have affected the relative
assessments made of the utility of the data for the seven applications.

When the very useful and somewhat useful responses are com-
combined, then positive assessments of the utility of the information con-
tained in the Social Reports ranges between 40% and 98% for the seven
applications. This can be seen in Figure 5.6. For only one of the
seven applications do fewer than half of the respondents agree that the
information in the Social Reports is either very or somewhat useful.
CASP information was seen as useful by the largest percentage of re-
spondents (98%) for helping to examine the opinions of citizens and
by the smallest percentage of respondents (40%) for helping to make
budgetary decisions. On the average, two of three respondents con-
sidered the information in the Social Reports useful for the seven
applications about which they were questioned.

In Figures 5.7 and 5.8, the responses are broken down so that
comparisons can be made between the assessments of those RRC members
who belonged to the BCC and those RRC members who did not. In
Figure 5.7, the response categories have been left unrecoded; in
Figure 5.8, the four response categories have been recoded and the
percentages transformed into rank orders. Though some differences in
the assessments of the two groups of respondents exist -- a brief dis-
cussion of these differences follows -- the overall rank order of
assessments is similar for the two groups.
FIGURE 5.7: ASSESSMENTS OF THE UTILITY OF INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE SOCIAL REPORTS

Question: DEMOCRAX is very concerned about how information in the survey could be used. The following is a list of possible uses for the information. How useful would you judge the information is that was dealt with in your RSC, either by itself or in combination with other kinds of data, for each of the following topics?

Usefulness of Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPES OF USES</th>
<th>VERY USEFUL</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT USEFUL</th>
<th>NOT VERY USEFUL</th>
<th>BUT AT ALL USEFUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|               | All RSC     | RSC+           | All RSC       | RSC+           | All RSC       | RSC+           | All RSC       | RSC+           | RSC Only | RSC Only | RSC Only | RSC Only | RSC Only | RSC Only | RSC Only | RSC Only | RSC Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ Only | RSC+ One respondent who was also the recipient of a COS

Each number refers to the percentage of RSC members giving that particular response.
**Figure 5.8: Assessments of the Utility of Information Contained in the Social Reports**

**Question:** BENCHMARK is very concerned about how information in the survey could be used. The following is a list of possible uses for the information. How useful would you judge the information is that was dealt with in your ERC, either by itself or in combination with other kinds of data, for each of the following topics?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Uses</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>ERC All</th>
<th>ERC Members Only</th>
<th>ERC + BCH</th>
<th>Useful (Very and Somewhat)</th>
<th>Not Useful (Somewhat and Not Very)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting discussion about the subject area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing supporting evidence for present knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help in assessing the needs of citizens</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help in making decisions about service delivery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help in analyzing the combined effectiveness of existing programs in that subject area</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help in examining the opinions of citizens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help in making budgetary decisions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ranks are based on the percentage of ERC members responding very or somewhat useful.*

*Includes one respondent who was also the recipient of a COS.*

*Each number refers to the percentage of ERC members giving that particular response.*
The RRC respondents belonging to the BCC and the RRC respondents who had no other formal affiliation with BENCHMARK differ the most in their assessments of how useful the information in the Social Reports was for helping to assess the needs of citizens and for helping to analyze the combined effectiveness of existing programs in that subject area. Eighty-seven percent (87%) of the "RRC only" respondents regarded Social Report information as useful for assessing the needs of citizens compared to 50% of the "RRC + BCC" respondents — a difference of 27%. And 60% of the "RRC only" respondents regarded Social Report information as useful for analyzing the combined effectiveness of existing programs in that subject area compared to 36% of the "RRC + BCC" respondents — a difference of 24%.

A smaller difference between the two groups existed in their assessment of the utility of the information in promoting discussion about the subject area. Eighty-seven percent (87%) of the "RRC only" respondents said that the information was useful for this purpose compared to 71% of the "RRC + BCC" respondents — a difference of 16%. One other difference of this general magnitude existed, but in a different direction. More respondents who belonged to both the RRC and BCC (50%) said that the information in their Social Report was useful for helping to make budgetary decisions than did respondents who belonged only to the RRC (33%) — a difference of 17%. In the other assessments referenced, "RRC only" respondents were more likely to regard the CASP information as useful than were the "RRC + BCC" respondents.
In a related open-ended question, respondents were asked if they could think of any other uses for the information. Though only one respondent in five was able to think of additional uses, some of the comments volunteered are worth noting. Most frequently mentioned were comments referencing the use of the CASP data as "benchmarks" for the community — "serving as base data for new intensive investigations," "a supplement for specialized studies," "a point of departure for closer studies," and "for comparison with hard objective data related to the report."

These findings suggest that members of the RRC found CASP — including the methods used to generate it and the products based on it — credible. Nonetheless, respondents' opinions about CASP were not uniform; some RRC members regarded CASP as more accurate than others, and CASP was regarded as more useful for some things than for others.

In evaluating these findings, several things should be kept in mind. First — and this was mentioned earlier — these assessments of utility and accuracy were based on information contained in the Social Report produced by the respondents' RRC and not on CASP as a whole. Many of the CASP questions were quite general — owing to the comprehensive nature of the survey — and restricted to one point in time. In addition, some of the modules in CASP were extremely small. One module, for example, consisted of only seven questions. Consequently, it seems reasonable to conclude that if longitudinal data had been available and if it had been possible to ask more questions in many of the modules, perceptions of the utility of the data would have been higher.
Second, the primary purpose of a Social Report was to present the findings from CASP. Virtually no emphasis was placed on actually applying the findings. To the extent that the application of the data was discussed in the RRC meetings, the discussion was peripheral to the RRC's primary task; and, in fact, some RRC members found the constraints imposed on the RRC and the deliberations of the RRC somewhat frustrating for this very reason. And finally, survey research was new and not understood by most of the RRC members, and very threatening to some of them. Thus, though the assessments of the accuracy and utility of CASP information could most certainly have been higher, when evaluated in this context, it seems fair to assert that CASP was regarded as credible and useful by members of the RRC.

F. THE USE AND DISSEMINATION OF CASP BY MEMBERS OF THE RRC

One of the purposes of the RRC was to encourage RRC members to become both users and diffusers of the products and technologies of BENCHMARK. To help determine the extent to which this had happened, respondents were asked if they had done the following things: used the information in the Social Report produced in their RRC, talked about the findings from CASP with people outside the RRC, talked about the Program, referred anyone to BENCHMARK, and had further contact with the Program after their RRC. The results to these questions are contained in Figure 5.9.
Respondents were asked, "Have you ever used the information in the Social Report(s) produced by your Reports Review Committee?"

Forty-two percent (42%) of the RRC members said that they actually had used the information in the Social Report they helped produce. Another 44% said that although they had not used it, they might use it in the future; and 14% said that they had not used the information and did not anticipate using it in the future. When the response patterns are compared for the "RRC only" and the "RRC + BCC" groups, the results are virtually identical.

Those who had used the information in the Social Report they helped produce were asked how. Substantial variation in the uses to which the information had been put was evidenced in the responses given to this question. These uses included: quoted as evidence in reports and presentations, assessing needs and planning a service delivery system to meet those needs, validating needs assessments formulated in other ways, supporting and challenging policies and decisions, resource material for university courses, stimulating discussions, and education. These self-reported examples of use are basically consistent with documented instances of use based on observation (both by staff members and others) and written records.

When the use of this information is evaluated, several things should be kept in mind. First, the question that was asked of respondents is quite restrictive in that it asks RRC members if they used the information in the Social Report produced by their RRC. Program records indicate that if respondents had been asked if they had used
FIGURE 5.9: THE USE AND DISSEMINATION OF BENCHMARK PRODUCTS AND METHODS BY MEMBERS OF THE RRC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>All RRC Respondents</th>
<th>RRC Only</th>
<th>RRC + BCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever used the information in the Social Report(s) produced by your Report Review Committee?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, but I might use it in the future</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, and I don't anticipate that I will</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N = 35</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N = 22</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever talked about the findings of your Social Report with someone or mentioned them to someone (other than a member of your RRC or a BENCHMARK staff member)?</td>
<td>Yes, I've actually discussed the findings with someone</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, I've mentioned or referred to them in the course of a discussion</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>N = 13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, I've never discussed the findings with anyone or mentioned them to anyone</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td><strong>N = 13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N = 34</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N = 22</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you talked to someone (not a member of the BENCHMARK Community Conference or the BENCHMARK staff) about the BENCHMARK Program?</td>
<td>Very often — it averages about once or twice a week</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes — it averages about once or twice a month</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely — I've talked to people about BENCHMARK, but it's irregular and not very often</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td><strong>N = 12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never — I can't remember talking to anyone about BENCHMARK</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N = 34</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N = 22</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever personally referred anyone to BENCHMARK, either to obtain some service or information or to attend a BENCHMARK Community Conference (BCC) meeting?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N = 34</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N = 22</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since your participation on the RRC, have you had any further contact with the BENCHMARK Program?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td><strong>N = 12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td><strong>N = 12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N = 22</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N = 22</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a*Includes one respondent who was also the recipient of a COS.

*b*These are recoded response categories.

*c*Question not asked of these respondents.
the information contained in CASP — that is in all the Social Reports — the percentage of users would have been higher. Second, the survey of RRC members was conducted in May, prior to the time that many agencies and organizations in the community began formulating budgets. And third, evidence clearly indicates that the half-life of this information was very long and that had this survey been conducted later the percentage of users of the CASP information would have been higher.

When asked if they had talked about the findings of their Social Report, 54% of the RRC respondents said that they had discussed the findings with someone, and another 23% said they had referred to the findings in the course of a discussion. RRC members who belonged to the BCC were much more likely to have discussed the findings with someone than were RRC members who did not belong to the BCC. Seventy-seven percent (77%) of the former group responded this way compared to 43% of the latter group — a difference of 33%.

The differences between the two groups is even more pronounced when responses to the question about how often the respondent had talked to someone about the Program are compared. Ninety-one percent (91%) of the RRC respondents who belonged to both the RRC and the BCC talked to people about the BENCHMARK Program either very often or sometimes compared to only 36% of the respondents who belonged only to the RRC. In other words, RRC members who had no other formal affiliations with the Program a) were much more likely to talk about the Social Reports with people than they were to talk about the BENCHMARK Program, and b) were not very likely at all to talk about the Program — only
a third of the members of this group talked about the Program as often as once or twice a month.

Likewise, though 6 of 10 RRC members (62%) had referred someone to BENCHMARK, the percentage who had done so was much higher for the RRC members who belonged to the BCC (100%) and considerably less for the RRC members who did not belong to the BCC (41%). Respondents were asked why they had referred people to the Program — to attend a BCC meeting, for information or a report, or for some service or technical assistance. No one indicated that he had referred someone to BENCHMARK only to attend a BCC meeting. Most of the referrals were entirely functional in nature — that is for the purpose of obtaining some service or information — and all of the referrals were at least partially functional.

Finally, those RRC members who did not also belong to the BCC were asked if they had had any further contact with BENCHMARK since their participation on the RRC. As was the case with the question on usage discussed earlier, had the survey been conducted at a later date, the percentage of respondents answering yes probably would have been higher. Slightly over one RRC member in four (27%) who did not belong to the BCC said that he had had post-RRC contact with BENCHMARK, three in four (73%) had not. When the open-ended responses to these questions are coded, the results confirm a point made in the previous chapter, namely that much of the post-RRC contact was initiated by the RRC members. For half of those responding, the purpose given for the post-RRC contact was to obtain some service or information; for the
others the purpose was to help design questions for CASP II or to help plan for the Program.

Several observations can be made about the use and dissemination of BENCHMARK products and methods by RRC members. First, there was relatively little post-RRC contact between RRC members whose only formal affiliation with BENCHMARK was through the RRC and the Program. Second, when compared to a ground zero base, the usage and diffusion of BENCHMARK products and methods was quite high. Though the rate of usage was comparable for all RRC members regardless of the nature of their affiliation with the Program, the rate of diffusion was not. RRC members who belonged to the BCC were much more likely to be diffusers of the products and methods of BENCHMARK than were RRC members who did not belong to the BCC.

G. THE RRC AS A SOCIAL ARENA

One of the purposes of the RRC was to promote the development of lateral linkages within the community. Though the members of an RRC shared an interest in the subject area discussed in their Social Report, they did not necessarily know one another and they were not necessarily involved in the same type of work. In fact, analysis of the composition of the RRCs discussed in the previous chapter established that the RRCs were composed of a reasonably heterogeneous group of people.

Respondents were asked if they had met anyone new on their RRC, and whether they were glad that they had this opportunity. In
Figure 5.10 it can be seen that nine of ten (94%) RRC members met someone new on their RRC and that three of four (75%) were glad to have had this opportunity. The opportunity for social interaction and to establish new contacts seems to have been valued somewhat more by RRC members who belonged to the BCC than by RRC members who did not. Long after some of the RRCs disbanded, relationships that developed in the RRCs continued, and in this regard the RRC innovation realized success in promoting the development of lateral linkages within the community.

**FIGURE 5.10: SOCIAL INTERACTION WITHIN THE RRC**

Question: Did you meet anyone new on your RRC?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All RRC Members</th>
<th>Members of an RRC Only</th>
<th>Members of the RRC and BCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, and I'm glad</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=36</td>
<td>N=22</td>
<td>N=14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER VI

THE BEHAVIOR AND PERCEPTIONS OF RRC STAFF

A. INTRODUCTION

Up to this point, the evaluation of the RRC has focused on the RRC members and their knowledge, attitudes and behavior as they related to the Program. This was done to determine the extent to which the RRC innovation was successful in producing the conditions of awareness, interest, trust and credibility referenced in the first chapter. In this chapter the focus of the evaluation shifts to the other major participants in the RRC -- the Program staff members -- in order to examine their behavior and perceptions as they pertain to the RRC process.

Approximately four months after the BENCHMARK Program ended, in-depth, semi-structured personal interviews were conducted with those staff members who had had primary responsibility for running the RRCs. These formal interviews -- which ranged between one and a half and two and three quarter hours in length -- lasted, on the average, a little over two hours and supplement hours of informal discussion that took place with staff members while the RRCs were being convened. 55

The interviews were wide ranging. Staff members were asked questions about their behavior, such as how they prepared for the RRC
meetings, how they handled the different tasks and phases associated with the RRC process, and so on. They were also asked questions about their experiences in the RRC, such as the types of problems that arose, how RRC members behaved, and so on. And finally, they were asked questions about their perceptions of the RRC innovation, such as what the policies and guidelines governing the operation of an RRC should be, and so on. Questions used to guide the interviews are reproduced in Appendix E. Some of the information collected in these interviews is incorporated into other chapters — especially those chapters which describe BENCHMARK's RRCs. Except where necessary, information found elsewhere has not been included in this chapter.

B. STAFF PREPARATION FOR THE RRCS

As was mentioned earlier, eight staff members chaired the meetings of BENCHMARK's twelve Report Review Committees. Four of the staff members each chaired two RRCs; the other four each chaired one RRC. A number of the questions asked of these staff members concerned how they had prepared for this task.

On the basis of the responses to these questions, it is clear that staff members prepared extensively for their RRCs and that they regard such preparation as a prerequisite for a successful RRC. Several of the RRCs were conducted in what might appear to be quite an informal manner. This apparent informality belies the fact that the RRCs were all very structured and that the staff were all well prepared. This preparation took many forms.
First, staff members shared a set of well formulated expectations about the purpose of the RRC, the tasks that had to be performed to accomplish that purpose, and the process to be employed in performing those tasks. These expectations were communicated in a number of ways. There was some formal and a great deal of informal discussion amongst staff about the RRC. There were also explicitly written guidelines — copies of some of which are included in Appendix F — dealing with how to prepare for, conduct, and follow-up RRC meetings. In addition, the spirit of assessment, evaluation and collegiality that prevailed in BENCHMARK meant that each individual RRC was converted into a laboratory for the use and edification of the entire staff. In other words, no staff member went into an RRC cold; he had the benefit of the cumulative experience acquired in running previous RRCs.

Second, staff members had received a considerable amount of training — some formal, some informal — that prepared them for the RRC. Most had had formal experience within the context of the Program in running meetings dominated by users — meetings of the Special Interest Groups, the Community Conference, task forces and groups assembled to assist in the design of CASP, and so on. For some, this training was buttressed by training received as a staff member with support responsibilities in other RRCs.

Staff members were in general agreement about the importance of this type of preparation and training. Not every staff member had the opportunity to perform in a support role prior to assuming the lead
responsibility for an RRC. In fact, of those who did, only two conscientiously performed the role of support from the start to the finish of the RRC process. These staff members were unreserved in the positive evaluation they gave to the support role experience. One said that the opportunity to observe an RRC first hand and assist in its operation was "invaluable," and "the single most important factor in being able to manage my RRC." Most of the others who had not served in the support role or for whom other responsibilities had prevented from becoming very actively involved felt, in retrospect, that an apprenticeship as a support would have helped them do a better job running their RRCs. It should also be pointed out that four staff members ran two RRCs. All were agreed that the "baptism under fire" they had received in their first RRC helped to prepare them for the second.

Third, staff members prepared for their RRCs by familiarizing themselves thoroughly with the material from CASP to be dealt with in their RRC. As much data analysis was conducted prior to the first meeting of the RRC as was possible. Many staff members went so far as to begin writing sections that could be included in their first Social Report draft.

Fourth, staff members attempted to familiarize themselves with the subject areas covered in their RRCs. This involved the review of theoretical and empirical research as well as the study of the current status and past history of related local issues. RRC members attempted to prepare themselves by developing broad, substantive
expertise in the areas for which they were responsible. However, for half of the RRCs the staff members who had the lead responsibility for running an RRC did not have the lead responsibility for designing the CASP module dealt with by their RRCs, and this made the job of preparation that much more difficult.

Fifth, though it was done infrequently, some staff members prepared for their RRCs by familiarizing themselves with the people who had been recruited to serve on their RRCs and with the institutions or organizations they represented. Other staff members who did not do this felt in retrospect that it would have been a useful thing to do.

Finally, staff members prepared for their RRCs by assembling and whenever necessary designing background materials to be used in their RRCs. The Program had developed a wealth of such material—including user oriented graphic and written materials explaining technical issues related to such things as survey research and statistical analysis, and substantive issues related to such things as the CASP social reporting process. This material was of great help in facilitating the entire RRC process and in quickly improving the understanding and as a result the quality of participation of the RRC members.

C. THE RECRUITMENT AND COMPOSITION OF THE RRCs

Each staff member took an active interest in recruiting members for his RRC. Two things were regarded as particularly important: how people were recruited and who was recruited. With respect to the first, staff sought to ensure that the recruitment process was open,
that it was possible to serve on an RRC as a result of self-selection, that people who had participated in the design of CASP were contacted about serving on an RRC, and that the participation of potential users who had not participated in the design of CASP or who were not affiliated with the Program was solicited.

With respect to the second, staff sought to ensure that a diversity of views was represented on the RRC and that people who could make use of the CASP data were present. As one staff member put it, "I tried to cover all the major bases and institutions affected by the data, to get people who had something to say, to get people who represented an important sector." Staff members had to decide not only which organizations to contact, but also which individuals within the organization to contact. Most solicited assistance in making these decisions from people knowledgeable about the community.

Though all staff members responsible for running an RRC were actively involved in deciding who should be recruited and how recruitment should be handled, not all staff members did the actual recruitment themselves. Those who did felt that it was a useful thing to do both because it ensured their control over how solicitations were handled and because it provided an opportunity to find out something about and to begin to develop personal relationships with prospective RRC members -- something they considered quite important since they knew very few of the members of their RRC. And in fact, the results of the staff interviews reveal that staff members were acquainted with very few of the members on their RRC prior to the time it convened.
The interviews also indicate that only one staff member sent follow-up letters to prospective members once they had been contacted about serving on an RRC. Several staff members felt that it would have been a very good idea to do this. Staff members were divided in their opinions about the optimal size for an RRC. For most, five to fifteen seemed to be an acceptable range. Some, however, said that they could have managed very large RRCs, although that would not have been their preference. Time and again, the heterogeneity of an RRC emerged as the most important characteristic—heterogeneity with respect both to the institutions represented by the members and to the functions served by the members in the institutions they represented. Finally, some staff members cited the presence of at least some RRC members who had participated in the design of the research as an important consideration. Such people helped not only to ensure continuity in the overall research effort but also to legitimize the RRC to other members, and to answer questions from a user's perspective about decisions made regarding the research design. The presence of such people was regarded as a positive and supportive force in each RRC.

D. THE SOCIALIZATION OF RRC MEMBERS

The socialization of RRC members was regarded as an important and challenging task by the staff. Nonetheless, on the basis of interviews with staff members, it is clear that with only one major exception
no effort was made to socialize RRC members prior to the first meeting of the RRC.

One staff member held several extended meetings with an influential community leader serving on his RRC. This was done with the express purpose of bringing this person — whom it was feared might become a detractor of the research effort — "on board." Subsequently, this individual became a strong advocate of the Program — something the staff member attributes to the effort that was made to familiarize this person with the Program. One other staff member sent a letter of confirmation and questions from CASP to the members of his RRC prior to the first RRC meeting. These were the only conscientious efforts made prior to the first meeting to socialize RRC members. Some staff members felt in retrospect that briefing materials should have been sent to and personal contact established with RRC members before the first meeting.

During the initial RRC meeting, members were introduced to the Program and provided a context within which they could understand the RRC. The interview data shows that there was great variation in how this was handled from one RRC to the next. In addition, it is apparent that staff members did not provide as many briefing materials about the Program as were available. Though everyone mentioned the Community-Originated Studies program and the Technical Assistance program, only a few staff members emphasized these programs to any extent and no-one aggressively marketed them or aggressively solicited clients for them. In short, though an explanation of BENCHMARK was an integral part of the introduction given to every RRC, the explanation
was neither emphasized nor reinforced. This fact may help account for the differential levels of awareness about the Program evidenced by those RRC members who did not belong to the BCC and those who did.

The staff members were far more forceful in acquainting members with the RRC than with the Program. With only one exception, every staff member made the ground rules governing the RRC process and the rights and responsibilities of all RRC participants unambiguously clear. This was reinforced through the procedure of having RRC members officially "sign-on" to the RRC. Most of the staff members agreed that this was of considerable symbolic and practical importance. As one staff member said, "It helped build trust and confidence in the staff and the RRC effort. We took their role seriously; so did they."

Finally, the staff all agreed that their behavior and demeanor in the RRC was important both in socializing RRC members and in producing feelings of trust and confidence. Staff members were conscious of their behavior and the impact it would have on the attitudes and behavior of RRC members.

E. THE APPROACH OF STAFF TO MANAGING THE RRCS

Staff members were major forces within their RRCs. They chaired RRC meetings and were responsible for recruiting and socializing new members. In addition as the nominal and functional group leaders, they set the tone for the RRCs as well as the ground rules for the RRC endeavor. Finally, staff members served as technical experts for their RRCs. Because of the importance of their role and the impact they were
capable of having on the RRC, staff members were asked questions about how they perceived their roles, the philosophy or approach they brought to the RRC, and how they handled the RRC process. The responses to these questions about how staff perceived themselves provide an interesting comparison to the responses, discussed in the previous chapter, about how the RRC members perceived the staff.

Staff members approached the RRCs somewhat differently. Though they shared guidelines about what to do in the RRC and how to do it, they had their own individual styles. Despite this fact, some striking similarities emerge in how they approached and handled the RRCs.

First, staff members viewed the RRC members with respect, and acted toward them more as though they were allies than adversaries. Staff approached the RRC as a collaborative rather than as an adversarial proceeding. Second, staff members took the entire RRC process very seriously. Both the goals and the process of the RRC were regarded as very important. Third, staff members were genuinely interested in the input and feedback the RRC could provide. These attitudes run through how the staff approached and ran their RRCs.

Staff members were also asked questions about the roles they attempted to play and the qualities they attempted to evince in their RRCs. And here there is considerable overlap with the staff roles and qualities perceived by the members and which were discussed in the previous chapter. Staff members said that they consciously attempted to perform the role of facilitator, writer, leader, instructor, staff, technical advisor, group developer, and mediator. And they said that
they tried to be open, civil, pleasant, responsive, fair, straightforward, candid, diplomatic, confident, accommodating, and unthreatening.

There were also similarities in how staff members handled the group interaction within their RRCs, how they guided the RRC toward the task of producing a Social Report, and how they handled problems that arose during the course of meetings. A common tenet maintained by staff members was that of trying to encourage as much participation and group interaction as possible. Some staff members tried to accomplish this by creating a friendly and informal atmosphere, by trying to get to know all the RRC members, and by trying to draw them out. Some staff members went to RRC meetings early and remained afterwards to try and foster personal, one-to-one, interaction with and among RRC members outside of the RRC meeting in the hope that this interaction would continue and spill over into the RRC meeting. And still other staff members stimulated participation by asking direct questions of the members.

Most staff members tried to refrain from dominating the meetings, or stifling or cutting off discussions. They interceded only when there was a clear reason for doing so. One staff member said that once serious deliberations began he tried to make it a rule to enter the discussions only when asked or when the group "went on a detour, was deadlocked, or had hit a roadblock." Another staff member said that he never cut a discussion off "as long as it's productive and they haven't started to repeat themselves."
Staff members were careful to incorporate all the comments and suggestions made by the RRC members and to point out exactly how their comments and suggestions had been incorporated into the Social Report drafts. This constituted positive feedback for participation. Members could see the impact of their involvement and interest in the RRC process.

During the course of the RRCs, certain problems arose with which the staff members were obliged to deal. Occasionally an RRC member would be quite skeptical or cynical about the utility of the data or the social reporting effort. On occasion, an RRC member would be put off by a staff analyst's youthfulness, or suspicious of his academic affiliations.

Whenever possible, an attempt was made to pre-empt these problems — by being conscientious, demonstrating competence and confidence, providing a clear rationale for the RRC, and so on. Reasonable questions and concerns were met with reasonable responses and explanations. When some RRC members caused unnecessary problems, or pressed unreasonable questions or issues, the staff could usually count on the support of the other RRC members in resolving the problem. In fact, many staff members encouraged the RRC members to resolve these issues themselves, interceding only if some recalcitrant RRC member refused to allow the RRC to progress. In these instances, a staff member might respond firmly and then direct the group toward some other issue or task — a tact that generally received the support of the balance of the RRC.
No staff member reported any great difficulty in arriving at a consensus over an acceptable final draft of a Social Report. More often than not the process of reaching a consensus involved a great deal of discussion, some airing and confrontation of viewpoints, and a measure of bargaining and compromise. In some respects, arriving at a consensus was easier than was first anticipated. The problems that arose were talked out, and occasionally the staff analyst would play a pivotal role in producing a consensus by restating a problem or suggesting a compromise.

Staff members felt that the job of reaching a consensus was aided by a number of factors. First, most RRC members were candid so their concerns got aired and addressed. Second, most RRC members were reasonable. Third, establishing clear ground rules early on in the RRC process facilitated the reaching of a consensus. The mission, tasks, and ground rules were explicit, clear and shared. And finally, a strong group norm existed to meet the mandate extended to the RRC, and produce a report that was acceptable to everyone. There was group pressure to be productive and reach consensus.

To some extent, staff members responsible for running the RRCs considered themselves caught on the horns of a dilemma. On the one hand, the staff member had the responsibility of ensuring that a Social Report was produced and in the shortest time possible. On the other hand, he also had the responsibility of trying to convert the RRC members from potential users of CASP and the services provided by BENCHMARK into actual users of these things. The former responsibility was most
easily met by adhering, Prussian-like, to a tight and unbending schedule. The latter responsibility was most easily met by being patient, flexible, and willing to take time to address challenges of pursuing opportunities that emerged either serendipitously or as a result of careful development of solicitation. These responsibilities were not completely compatible with one another; and when they conflicted, as they occasionally did, staff members acknowledged that the former took precedence over the latter.

Staff members agreed that the meetings of the RRC were report directed. Neither the staff nor the RRC members transcended the most specifically task-oriented objective of the RRC — the production of a Social Report. Most staff members felt that given tradeoffs between objectives, the objective of producing a Social Report took and should have taken priority. Some members tried to pursue other objectives within the RRC as long as it did not jeopardize producing a Social Report; some also felt that other objectives were best introduced within the RRC but pursued after the RRC or in another forum. And finally, some felt that by structuring non-report related aspects of the RRC process more carefully it would have been possible to pursue multiple objectives successfully and simultaneously. Nonetheless, both in tone and in deed, the RRCs manifested a dedication to getting the Social Reports produced more than they manifested a dedication to accomplishing any other purpose or objective. This is not to say that other purposes or objectives were not served by the RRC, only that one purpose was served above all the others and that the RRCs were strongly report directed.
F. STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF RRC MEMBERS

During the course of the interviews, staff members referred directly and indirectly to their perceptions of the RRC members and their assessment of how the RRC members performed. As was mentioned earlier, staff members felt that the vast majority of the RRC members were candid. As might be expected, staff perceived great variation in the capabilities, interest, and performance of RRC members. Nonetheless, it is possible to characterize how staff members perceived the RRC members as a group.

As was mentioned earlier, staff members felt that the vast majority of the RRC members were candid about their opinions and reactions. In addition, most appeared to have done their homework. Several staff members remarked that they were quite surprised by how closely the members of their RRCs had read and considered the drafts. They came to meetings well prepared.

Staff members also found most — although by no means all — RRC members to be reasonable. Even most of those who were outspoken and combative in arguing for their opinions were reasonable. Though it varied, most RRC members also seemed to be genuinely interested in and enthused about their participation on the RRC.

It was the perception of the staff that many RRC members — even some of those who were planners — were unfamiliar with social science research, and not used to employing it in policy, program and resource management.
Finally, every staff member indicated that his RRC made a major substantive contribution to the Social Report. They all agreed that the Social Report was far different than it otherwise would have been had the RRC not been involved in its production. Several staff members confessed some surprise at the magnitude of the contribution made by the RRC.

G. RELEASING THE SOCIAL REPORT

Staff members were asked questions relating to how they had released their Social Reports. Though substantial discussion was devoted in a previous chapter to this issue, several points are worth noting.

First, staff members had different experiences with and perceptions about the strategy of identifying official community spokesmen to assist in the release of the Social Report. Some staff members considered the strategy to be ineffectual at best and risky and possibly counterproductive at worst. Others disagreed, and considered the strategy -- when carefully executed -- to be of inestimable value. These latter staff members considered the key to the success of this strategy to be who served as community spokesman. A spokesman who knew the media, was known by the media, himself had credibility and influence in the community, and believed in the importance of the report could increase the amount and quality of media coverage given to the report and influence positively how that report was regarded in the community.
And second, most staff members agreed in retrospect that they should have been much more aggressive in their efforts to market the reports produced by their RRC. Presentations, either at meetings or on the radio, were made by staff members for approximately half of the Social Reports. Some staff members used their RRCs effectively in identifying people to whom unsolicited copies of Social Reports should be sent. And a number of staff members issued press releases along with their Social Reports. Nonetheless, the market for the Social Reports could have been assessed more systematically and rigorously, and the Social Reports could have been disseminated more aggressively. For example, a more aggressive effort could have been made to disseminate the Social Reports via presentations on public interest and public service programming; to make presentations at meetings, gatherings and workshops; to reproduce parts of Social Reports in widely disseminated newsletters, and so on.

H. POST-RRC CONTACT

Once a Social Report was produced and the RRC's primary objective accomplished, a RRC would disband. The original understanding was that the RRC was a temporary structure, and that it would not continue to meet formally once it had been disbanded. Nonetheless, the members of a few of the RRCs did continue to meet informally for a time to construct candidate questions for the next CASP. Most of the members of the RRCs, however, did not meet again; and the staff made no concerted effort to capitalize upon the organizational work that had taken place for the RRCs to promote some other purpose or end.
As was mentioned earlier, most of the post-RRC contact that took place was initiated by the RRC members and not by BENCHMARK staff. One of the reasons that staff did not follow up on contacts that had developed during the RRC was that their time and energies were captured by other specific and concrete tasks after the Social Report for which they were responsible had been released. The RRC had been structured and programmed; any contact that took place after the RRC was not structured and programmed. As a result staff members went from one highly structured Program assignment -- the production of a Social Report -- to some other structured Program assignment. The opportunities for developing contacts and promoting knowledge utilization that arose during the RRC either slipped between the cracks or were placed on a back burner. They were never accorded the importance, legitimacy, or attention that was accorded the RRCs.

I. PERCEPTIONS OF THE IMPACT AND DESIGN OF THE RRC INNOVATION

The staff analysts were asked a number of questions pertaining to how they assessed the impact and the basic design of the RRC innovation. The responses indicate that the staff formed a very positive assessment of the RRC. As was mentioned earlier, the assessment included the impact which the RRC had on the nature and quality of the Social Reports, but it extended beyond that.

Staff members were of the mind that participation on the RRC promoted the utilization of the CASP data by the RRC members -- a contention supported by the RRC members themselves. In addition, most of
the RRC members appeared to have enjoyed their participation on the RRC immensely. It was a satisfying and productive experience with discernible payoffs. Though this was certainly not true of every RRC, one staff member reported that the members of his RRC were so excited by the RRC experience and about the findings from CASP that they had a difficult time restraining themselves from talking about the RRC proceedings until the Social Report was released. This anecdote is reported here not only because it mirrors similar experiences recounted by other staff members but also because it suggests the potential of the RRC innovation for exciting the interests of potential users.

When staff members were asked what they thought the RRC members got out of their participation on the RRC, a variety of responses was given. Some staff members remarked that the information had substantive utility for both political and management purposes. Some cited the fact that members had the opportunity to view the data "close-up," and for some people this had the impact of challenging their perceptions and understandings about many things. And the RRC process had the effect of capacity building for some of the RRC members -- introducing them to new concepts and methods, and teaching them about the use and execution of survey research.

In fact, several staff members mentioned that they felt that some of the RRC members were much less intimidated by social science research and by computers, statistics, data and social scientists as a result of having gone through the RRC process. In fact, one staff member reported that one RRC member with substantial influence in the
community was turned completely around by the RRC experience, and changed from a detractor to a proponent of the utility of survey research as an aid to planning, policy making, and management.

Finally, some staff members regarded the RRC as an important arena for social and political interaction. Some were struck by how few people on their RRCs who shared the same basic interest and operated in the same functional arena knew each other. Consequently they thought the opportunity provided for interaction was important and valued by the participants.

With respect to the impact the RRC experience had had on them, the staff members were equally positive. Every staff member save one said that he had learned a great deal from running an RRC. Mentioned were such things as: the opportunity to run a working committee, the opportunity to develop social interaction skills, the experience of being placed in a hot seat and forced to answer the questions of people who set policy, the experience of having to forge a consensus among a heterogeneous group of people with widely differing perspectives.

Staff members also valued the fact that the RRC experience afforded them the opportunity to become much more sensitive to the needs and perspectives of people outside the social science community. Finally, almost all of the staff members indicated both that they valued some of the contacts they had made in the RRC and that they felt confident that they would be able to make use of those contacts in a variety of ways should the occasion or need to do so arise.
The basic concept and design of the RRC innovation also met with the approval of the staff. Though the staff members had varied opinions about how specific design features of the RRC might be modified, no one suggested fundamental alterations in the design and concept of the RRC. In addition, though the experience had been an enervating and at times frustrating one for the staff members, it had also been an exhilarating, satisfying and edifying one as well. Staff members found that it was hard work that required careful and diligent preparation and execution. But given that care and diligence, staff members found the RRC to be workable and manageable.
CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. INTRODUCTION

This research began with a discussion of the problem of the underutilization of social science research. An innovation designed to address this problem and based on a clinical approach to knowledge utilization emphasizing the importance of the conditions of awareness, interest, trust and credibility in the knowledge utilization process was then described. This innovation, the Report Review Committee, involves the convening by social scientists of small, ad hoc groups to assist in the analysis, reporting and dissemination of social science research findings. A prototype of the Report Review Committee innovation designed and operated between 1974 and 1975 as part of the BENCHMARK Program was then evaluated. In this chapter, that evaluation will be reviewed, the innovation reassessed, and recommendations formulated about the design and operation of Report Review Committees.

B. THE BENCHMARK PROTOTYPE OF THE REPORT REVIEW COMMITTEE

The prototype of the Report Review Committee innovation that was operated between 1974 and 1975 was assessed in the previous two
chapters. The assessment was based on surveys that were conducted both with individuals from the community who served on RRCs and with the BENCHMARK staff members who were responsible for running the RRCs. The surveys attempted to ascertain the extent to which the RRC innovation was successful in creating among its members conditions of awareness, interest, trust and credibility in the research performer, the research product, and the research method; successful in promoting knowledge utilization; and feasible to operate by the social scientists on the BENCHMARK staff.

The assessment lends support to the following conclusions. The RRC achieved considerable success in creating among its members conditions of awareness, interest, trust and credibility in the BENCHMARK staff, CASP and the Social Reports, and the social science methodologies employed to develop a social reporting system at the local level. In addition, the Report Review Committee achieved considerable success in promoting knowledge utilization. RRC members used the information contained in the Social Reports they helped produce, referred people to BENCHMARK to obtain information and services, and disseminated the findings from CASP to other people in the community. And finally, those social scientists charged with the task of running RRCs found the task challenging, feasible, and worthwhile.

The assessment also shows, however, that the operation of the RRC could have been improved. The RRC could have been more effective in accomplishing the objectives and meeting the criteria alluded to above. Not all RRC members were familiar with the Program,
perceived CASP as being useful, used the information from CASP, or referred others to the Program. Furthermore, not all of the staff members responsible for running the RRCs found the task challenging, feasible, and worthwhile — even though most did. Consequently, it seems appropriate to capitalize upon the experience derived from designing and implementing a prototype of an RRC, and to review the concept of and refine the design specifications for the Report Review Committee. It is to this task that the remainder of this chapter is devoted.

C. THE PURPOSES OF THE REPORT REVIEW COMMITTEE

Within the BENCHMARK Program, the Report Review Committee served a variety of purposes — for the Program, for the social scientists charged with the task of running the RRCs, for the RRC members and the community, and for the reports produced by the RRCs. In thinking about the broader application of the RRC innovation, it is useful to distinguish a number of more generic purposes which this innovation can serve. These include:

1) Producing reports based on social science research suitable for dissemination outside the social science community

2) Increasing the awareness, interest, trust and credibility that potential users of social science R & D have in the products, methods, and performers of that R & D

3) Promoting the dissemination and utilization of social science R & D

4) Enhancing the capacity of people outside the social science community to understand and use social science R & D
5) Developing linkages between the knowledge producing and knowledge using communities, and within the community

6) Enhancing the socialization of those inside and outside the social science community

Each of these purposes will be discussed in turn.

1. Producing Reports for Consumption
   Outside the Social Science Community

   The primary purpose of an RRC is to produce a report based on social science research suitable for dissemination outside the social science community. This is the *raison d'être* of the RRC, and without it the primary justification for temporarily convening a group of individuals outside the social science community to collaborate with social scientists would be absent.

   Since the RRC guarantees user involvement in report production, the likelihood increases that the report will be relevant, timely, newsworthy and readable. Users -- including practitioners, interested and affected citizens, decision-makers, elites and the lay public -- are apt to bring a different perspective to the writing of a report than social scientists are apt to bring by virtue of their different roles, needs, interests and experiences. The resulting diversity of input facilitates the writing of a report that has broad appeal, and is more readable and understandable than reports produced by social scientists alone.

   If the production of a report for broad consumption is the primary purpose of the RRC, then it is very important to have clear guidelines related to this purpose which provide structure and direction
for the RRC. These guidelines must address the roles, rights and responsibilities of the participants, and the purposes of the RRC.

Though the presence of diverse interests in itself helps to ensure counterbalancing forces within the RRC, guidelines are necessary to guarantee that the reports produced are fair, balanced and scientifically valid.

It seems important to consider whether the nature and fidelity of the input and feedback provided by an RRC could be obtained in any other way. Though it is likely that any report could benefit from extensive review and comment, it is doubtful that the type of review and commented provided by an RRC could be provided by a group of social scientists. And if it could, it would be provided at the expense of serving some of the other purposes outlined below. In short, the RRC innovation appears to serve the purpose of producing a report based on social science research suitable for dissemination outside the social science community, and to possess some clear comparative advantages over other methods for accomplishing this purpose.

2. *Increasing the Awareness, Interest, Trust and Credibility of Potential Users*

The Report Review Committee innovation also serves the purpose of increasing the awareness, interest, trust and credibility which potential users — even those not serving on the RRC — have in the products, methods, and performers of social science research. The RRC process is an open process in which a broad spectrum of people from the community assist in the production of a research report which they
subsequently endorse. This involvement and endorsement serves to improve how people outside the social science community regard social science research — especially those who are prone to believe that most social science research products are irrelevant, based on methods that the common man can neither understand nor evaluate, and produced by people who neither care about nor have contact with "real world" problems.

For the members of the Report Review Committee, it is possible to confront these predispositions head on and to use the forum of the RRC to establish conditions of awareness, interest, trust and credibility among the members. These conditions can be fostered through a variety of techniques which are well suited to the small group atmosphere of the RRC.

In BENCHMARK's RRCs, for example, awareness was fostered through the use of briefing materials that were presented in oral and written form. Interest was developed by eliciting from members statements of problems or needs that could be addressed by the research findings or methods, and by demonstrating how the research findings and methods could be used to meet those needs or solve those problems. Trust in the staff of social scientists was fostered by being responsive to the needs and concerns of RRC members; by demonstrating an interest in and a sensitivity to what RRC members said; and by manifesting reliable, predictable, even-handed and trustworthy behavior. And credibility in the research effort was achieved by carefully and thoroughly explaining and documenting how the research was conducted — that is
by removing the black box in which the research process is normally enshrouded.

3. Promoting the Dissemination and Utilization of Social Science R & D

The RRC also can serve to promote the dissemination and utilization of scientific knowledge. This is accomplished in a variety of ways. The report produced by an RRC has broader appeal and is more marketable than a more technical or professionally oriented report would be, and thus is more likely to be diffused and used. The RRC members themselves become users of the R & D, and they also rediffuse the R & D and promote its use among their own network of associations and contacts. To the extent that the RRC serves the other purposes discussed here, it also promotes the dissemination and utilization of scientific knowledge. In the first chapter the point was made that although the channels for reporting and disseminating social science research findings are fairly well developed within the social science community, comparable mechanisms for accomplishing these tasks outside the social science community are rudimentary and primitive in comparison. The RRC constitutes one mechanism designed to serve this purpose.

4. Enhancing the Capacity of People Outside the Social Science Community to Understand and Use Social Science Research

Capacity building is not the primary purpose of the Report Review Committee. Nonetheless, it should be acknowledged that the RRC does serve this purpose and that it is an important function of the RRC. The report produced by the RRC popularizes, but in a very professional and responsible way, the methods and findings of the social sciences;
and in so doing enhances people's ability to understand, evaluate, and use social science R & D. This capacity building function is much more pronounced for those people who participate in the RRC; and even though their numbers are relatively small, the importance of this function for these people should not be discounted. Within the context of the RRC a great deal of capacity building takes place. And this function can be emphasized or de-emphasized as the situation warrants. In BENCHMARK's RRCs, for example, participants were taught about survey research, information storage and retrieval, needs assessment, evidence and inference, data analysis, and so on. In addition, the learning that took place was made that much more meaningful because of the context within which it took place and the task to which it was related.

5. Developing Linkages Between the Knowledge Producing and Knowledge Using Communities, and Within the Community

The opportunities for interaction between those inside and outside the social science community are few. The RRC presents a structured occasion for interaction between the members of these two communities. As the experience with BENCHMARK's RRCs demonstrates, this interaction fosters the development of linkages between the two communities that transcend and extend beyond the duration of the RRC. In addition, the face-to-face interaction also fosters the development of linkages within the community itself -- between the public and civic sectors and within each of these sectors.

Important too is the fact that these linkages emerge within a collaborative as opposed to an adversarial environment, thus
presenting the opportunity for a type of productive and successful interaction which itself can stimulate further interaction and which can be used to marshal resources for conflict resolution or problem solving. Though these linkages require constant attention if they are to develop into something meaningful and enduring, this fact in no way diminishes the function an RRC can serve in facilitating the development of linkages -- linkages of a type which despite how much they are needed emerge all too infrequently in contemporary society.

6. Enhancing the Socialization of Those Inside and Outside the Social Science Community

Those inside and those outside the social science community maintain myths and stereotypes about each other which constitute barriers preventing or limiting the amount of purposive and productive interaction that can take place between the two groups. During the course of the RRC, in which face-to-face contact between members of these groups takes place, the opportunity exists to examine these myths and stereotypes. The result is that a process of socialization occurs in which more accurate and complete images of "others" are formed.

Social scientists have the opportunity to become more sensitive to the needs of a variety of users and to the context within which these users operate. And users have the opportunity to understand better the perspectives and concerns of social scientists and the purposes, operation, and methods of the social sciences. Once again, though this is not the primary purpose of the RRC, it is an important one whose value should not be discounted.
D. STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE REPORT REVIEW COMMITTEE

The RRC innovation has a number of strengths and weaknesses as an examination of BENCHMARK's RRCs reveals. So that the applicability of this innovation may be better understood, a brief discussion of some of these strengths and weaknesses follows.

1. Strengths

A number of the design strengths of the RRC were referenced in the first chapter. One of these positive attributes is the benefits it promises the participant for a small cost with relatively little risk. The individual who participates in an RRC stands to benefit in a number of ways. He gets an insider's access to information that may be of great utility to him. He gets access to social scientists whose skills, resources and time he may be able to call upon. He can get a short course in social science methodology. He is afforded the opportunity to meet people with whom he knows he shares an interest and whom he may not otherwise be able to meet easily, and in a small group setting where personal contact is possible and the participation of the individual valued. And finally, he is able to take some credit for an effort that may be widely well regarded and garner some attention should he so wish.

At the same time, the costs he must pay are quite minimal and, most importantly, fixed. The RRC member is obliged only to review critically several drafts of a short report and to attend several meetings. It is easy to withdraw from the RRC; and because of its
ad hoc nature, any commitment required of a participant is clearly bounded. Finally, the risk associated with participation is minimal: the participant can easily withdraw; it not obliged to endorse a report with which he is in disagreement; can exercise considerable control over the product, and only has to invest his time, energy, and intellect. In short, as an investment for the participant, the RRC has an excellent cost-benefit ratio and affords substantial social, psychological, and professional benefits for a modest cost with a very low associated risk.

Another design strength of the RRC is that it is relatively inexpensive to operate. With the exception of any data analysis that is required (which the research undoubtedly would have required anyway) and the production of multiple copies of the report that is produced, the RRC is, by and large, labor intensive. This is not to say that there are not costs associated with running an RRC, only that the costs are not excessive and that many social scientists have access to resources — typists, supplies, duplicating facilities, meeting rooms, etc. — that reduce even further the hard costs outlays required to operate an RRC.

Though this strength or attribute should not be overestimated, the RRC — from a scientific viewpoint — does have heuristic value. The RRC affords the social scientist the opportunity to have his research assessed from a variety of perspectives, most of which are likely to be different from the perspectives of social scientists. The rich setting of the RRC can stimulate serendipitous discoveries, as
well as make the social scientist aware of data sources and phenomena with which he may not be familiar but which are clearly related to the research he is conducting. Finally, the contact with users is likely to have an impact on the social scientist's research agenda.

From a policy perspective, the RRC also has much to commend it. Through the RRC, the social scientist is able to gain access to policy arenas. Thus, penetration into policy settings is another strength of the RRC. This penetration can be used to the social scientist's advantage for the purposes of evaluating, applying, and initiating research.

Another positive attribute of the RRC is that from a technical viewpoint the innovation is simple, efficient, effective and direct. The RRC requires no complex skills, procedures, or setting to run; it provides substantial benefits for a relatively modest investment; it has been demonstrated to work; and it is directly related to the purposes it is designed to serve. In short, the RRC is an apt example of what Schumacher (1971) has referred to as "intermediate technology."

One of the most compelling features of the RRC is its ethical consistency with the creeds of educators and scientists. Those who have a commitment to the widest possible sharing of information and skills should be enthusiastic about the functions served by the RRC, because the purpose of the product of the innovation is to promote the dissemination of scientific knowledge amongst those among whom this knowledge would not ordinarily be disseminated, and because the process employed to develop that product entails and requires the
intellectual "broadening" and education of the participants. The RRC is also consistent with one of the major tenets of science, namely that research should be broadly disseminated and evaluated.

The RRC is also highly pragmatic. The innovation is feasible to create and to operate. There is little to prevent almost any social scientist in almost any setting from creating and operating one. In short, it passes the test of managerial feasibility with respect to ease and economy of operation. Furthermore, it appears to have some degree of situational robustness, that is the ability to operate successfully in different settings, and some degree of structural robustness, that is the ability to operate successfully if some of its design components are modified. Though the further application of the RRC will be required before the situational and structural robustness of the RRC can be fully assessed, it does not strain one's imagination to conceive of an RRC being operated in either a small college or large university setting and over a longer rather than a shorter period of time. Finally, the basic design of the RRC also appears adaptable for slightly different purposes — to review and promote the broader use of training materials, for example.

When the strengths or positive attributes of the RRC innovation are assessed, the above factors should be considered. In addition, however, it is important to remember that the RRC also possesses strengths in establishing the conditions of awareness, interest, trust and credibility that are prerequisites for knowledge utilization, and in serving the functions and accomplishing the purposes explicated in the previous section of this chapter.
2. Weaknesses

It is important to recognize that the RRC has certain weaknesses, many of which are in the form of limitations on its application. Though a more complete understanding of the limitations of the RRC must await the broader application of the innovation, it is possible to identify what some of these limitations may be.

In the first place, the RRC innovation is probably not suited for all types of social science research. It is important to assess the potential market outside the social science community for a report presenting the findings of a research effort. When the potential market is large and any one of a number of barriers -- such as those mentioned in the first chapter -- prevent the broad dissemination and utilization of the research, then the RRC innovation would seem to be an appropriate technique of promise and utility. When, however, the potential market is very small, the RRC innovation may not be so usefully employed. This may be the case -- though it need not always be the case -- with highly esoteric, basic research; research that is entirely methodological in nature; or with research that focuses on some issue or topic of greatest relevance to professional or "foreign" constituencies, for example. The important point to remember is that the market to be served must be carefully considered in making the decision to operate an RRC, and in the process of designing and implementing an RRC. To the extent that an RRC constitutes a bridge to a market that is not being served, the size and nature of the market and the product must be carefully assessed before the bridge is designed and constructed.
The utility of the RRC for non-programmatic as opposed to programmatic research also needs to be more fully assessed. In BENCHMARK, the RRC was part of a large programmatic research effort and the RRC undoubtedly benefited from the well established image the Program had in the community and from the fact that Social Reports were released continuously for over a year. In addition, a number of RRC members had had previous contact with the Program and had been affiliated formally with the Program in other ways. Were the RRC innovation to be employed in a situation where these conditions were absent — as they very well might be for an instance of non-programmatic research — the impact of the innovation might be affected. If this is the case, then special efforts might be required — to get people to participate and to reinforce certain aspects of their participation, for example — to offset any weaknesses that might emerge in the RRC that is not part of a programmatic research undertaking with a positive, pre-existing public image.

As managerially feasible as the RRC innovation has demonstrated itself to be, it still requires a set of minimum capabilities and commitments on the part of those who run it if it is to be successful. In other words, the success of any RRC will vary with the skill and dedication of those who use it. The greater the skill (social interaction skills are clearly of great importance for those who run an RRC) and dedication of the staff, the greater will be the success of the RRC. Thus one of the limitations of the RRC is that it is not immune to many of the systemic conditions that constitute barriers to knowledge
utilization — such as the facts that the incentive systems which
dominate social science do not reward promoting knowledge utilization,
users and producers of social science research belong to "two cultures,"
few social scientists receive the training and practical experience
required to run an RRC well, and so on. These are not limitations in-
herent in the RRC, but rather characteristics of the social system in
which the RRC must operate and to which it is not immune.

E. CAVEATS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ABOUT THE RRC

In this section, the organization of which roughly parallels
the organization of the chapter in which BENCHMARK's RRCs were de-
scribed, caveats and recommendations about the design and operation of
the RRC are discussed. These caveats and recommendations are intended
to make the RRC innovation more effective and easier to apply.

1. Recruitment

One of the most critical phases of any RRC is the recruitment
phase. Aside from the obvious impact that the recruitment process has
on the composition of an RRC, it also has an impact on the tone and
atmosphere present during the RRC proceedings. Individuals who partic-
ipate on an RRC to some extent will have their expectations about the
RRC created and their behavior in the RRC conditioned by what takes place
during the recruitment phase. In short, the recruitment phase sets the
stage for what is to follow.
The social scientist who is going to run an RRC should be actively involved in the recruitment of members. In BENCHMARK's RRCs, recruitment was often handled by other people, a practice that carries some disadvantages with it. Since many RRC members may not know the social scientist running the RRC and may not be very familiar with the institution where he is based, it is important to establish direct, personal contact between the social scientist and the prospective member as early in the overall RRC process as possible. This will afford the social scientist the opportunity to establish an informed basis for advance preparation for the RRC.

Contacts established during the recruitment phase should be reinforced prior to the first RRC meeting. Reinforcement can take the form of a letter confirming the time and place of the first meeting and background material to brief members on the purpose and task of the RRC. In the event that the RRC is part of a research effort in which potential users were involved in the design of the research and are then asked to serve on a RRC (as was the case in BENCHMARK), then it becomes particularly important to maintain regular contact with these people. Since a substantial amount of time is likely to elapse between the time the research is designed and the time that the RRC convenes, those people who participated in the design must be kept informed of progress if they are not to lose interest in the research effort.

The participation of specific individuals or representatives of specific organizations should be solicited actively. At the same time, an effort should be made to solicit the participation of experts,
practitioners, interested persons, and public officials. The principle of open recruitment is not at all incompatible with soliciting the participation of specific individuals; the principle of open recruitment only requires that anyone who wants to serve has the opportunity to serve and that a legitimate effort is made to make the possibility of serving broadly known. In other words, the integrity of the openness of the recruitment process can be maintained even though the participation of specific individuals is solicited.

Thus great care should be taken in trying to "compose" the RRC; that is, care should be taken to ensure that on the RRC are represented people and organizations who have a vital interest in the report. On occasions, the participation of these people must be solicited actively if it is not elicited through the normal recruitment channels. In one of BENCHMARK's RRCs, for example, the decision was made to actively solicit the participation of a group who were known to be affected by and interested in the topic of a report. The issue concerned was a volatile one. Had this group, which was vocal about and affected by this issue, not been involved in the RRC, the likelihood is high that it would have doubted the reliability and validity of the report and engaged in an effort to discredit it. As it was, the representation of this group on the RRC -- in addition to improving the penetration of the report in the community -- served as a catalyst for a more productive and expanded community dialogue about this issue.

At the same time, it is important to remember that the image of the RRC is a fragile one. Consequently, great care must be taken in
establishing a positive image of the RRC, and this task can be accomplished in part by establishing a positive image of the recruitment process. Since the image of the RRC is in a formative stage at the time recruitment takes place, care must be taken not to abuse the image. This could easily happen if the participation of blue-bloods or elites was courted to the exclusion of all others. An attempt to pack an RRC will probably be perceived as such and with deleterious consequences for the effort to promote knowledge utilization. Consequently, the importance of a genuinely open recruitment process should not be underestimated.

Even though an RRC may be convened for a research undertaking that is not part of a larger, programmatic, continuing, well-established effort, multiple channels of recruitment are still open and available for use. The many sources of recruitment available to the BENCHMARK Program have comparable, more general parallels that can be used by social scientists wishing to implement an RRC. This can be seen in the following lists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Sources of Recruitment for BENCHMARK's RRC</th>
<th>Comparable, General Sources of Recruitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Interest Groups</td>
<td>Established organizations in the community; professional associations, interest groups, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK Community Conference</td>
<td>Advisory boards of the institution sponsoring the research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BenchMarkings, the Program newsletter</td>
<td>Internal, organizational newsletters; newsletters of organizations; public service announcements; etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The optimal size for an RRC is difficult to specify. To a large degree this depends on the composition of the group recruited and on the nature of the task the group is to perform. **Generally, very small** (fewer than 4) **or very large** (more than 15) RRCs are difficult to manage. On the small end of the continuum, the RRC tends not to be a group; and on the large end, the RRC tends to be unwieldy and personal contact and spontaneous, universal interaction difficult to obtain.

2. **Staffing and Resources**

*Provisions for meeting all of the resource requirements for running an RRC should be made well in advance of convening an RRC.* Once the RRC is convened and the process begins to unfold, the demands on staff are extraordinarily heavy. Consequently, if the RRC is to run smoothly, careful advance planning and preparations — including contingency planning — must be made. Wherever possible this should include the preparation of briefing materials, preparatory data analysis, and so on. Provisions should also be made for reproducing and disseminating the report. Careful thought and attention should be paid to the creation of guidelines and ground rules for the RRC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Sources of Recruitment for BENCHMARK's RRC</th>
<th>Comparable, General Sources of Recruitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People involved in design of CASP</td>
<td>People involved in design of research, proposal preparation, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contacts and networks of associations</td>
<td>Personal contacts and networks of associations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The provision of staff support for the person running the RRC is strongly advised. Time during the RRC seems to be compressed and the small, often unanticipated, tasks that arise constitute major intrusions into the schedule of the person running the RRC. Consequently, the presence of a person who can perform these tasks is very helpful. Internal staff support is also required for the review of the report that is produced — an important function the value of which cannot be overemphasized and the performance of which cannot be executed by the RRC.

Those who run an RRC need to be prepared for the rigors and trials the RRC process entails. Social scientists who are thin skinned, uncomfortable and inept in intensive task-oriented settings dominated by people other than social scientists, and lacking in social interaction skills, are likely to encounter great difficulties in running RRCs. For example, social scientists must be prepared to deal with a type of criticism, questioning, and scrutiny to which professionals are not usually subject. RRC members are likely to ask questions about the relevance and applicability of the research continually. The more the social scientist has received clinical training and experience, is familiar with small group settings and techniques, is familiar with case histories of social interventions, and is an able manager, the easier will be his job of running a Report Review Committee.
3. Institutional and Organizational Setting

Previously, the point was made that the image of the RRC is a fragile one. The image that emerges has a major impact on how the RRC operates and how its efforts are received in the larger community, that is on the efficacy of a Report Review Committee as an innovation for promoting knowledge utilization. One should not forget that the RRC has a political dimension since it can mediate the relationships that normally exist among representatives of different sectors of the community. Consequently, the moment the decision to establish an RRC is made, the social scientist has entered a political arena in which he formerly may not have been involved. His actions should pass through the filter of this fact.

For example, BENCHMARK's RRCs were part of a Program that posed a threat to some of the actors with positions of power or influence in the community's decision making structure. To some extent, this threat resulted from some of the Program's aspirations and activities as they related to establishing a reliable and publicly accessible source of information about the perceptions, needs, and priorities of the citizenry. BENCHMARK staff were aware of this fact. Prior to launching the CASP effort and convening the RRCs, BENCHMARK spent a great deal of time and effort in "paying its dues" in many different arenas. This was done to establish both a reputation for being responsive, capable, "fire-fighting" social scientists, and a base of support. It seems probable that an RRC convened as part of a project or program with clearly defined and limited purposes would run into
fewer political problems — at least initially — than an RRC convened as part of a program that aspired to assuming a major role or institutional niche in the community.

One can only speculate about how the image of BENCHMARK's RRCs would have been affected had the Program been more closely identified with the University. For RRCs convened in other settings, the impact of such affiliations is to a very large degree idiosyncratic and depends on the nature of the research in question and the full context within which the research is being conducted and the RRC convened. The point is that care must be taken in evaluating the impact this larger context has on the RRC and to be governed by that evaluation accordingly. The nature of the image of the institution with which the RRC effort is affiliated will likely have a halo effect on the image of the RRC, and this effect needs to be considered. If the image of the institution with which the RRC is associated is one of influence, prestige, honesty and integrity, then the task of convening and operating an RRC is made that much easier.

The relationship of the RRC with the media must be carefully structured. Though it is possible to run an RRC and disseminate the report that is produced without involving the media at all, the support of the media greatly enhances the objective of disseminating broadly the results of the research. The relationship between the RRC and the media should be approached from several perspectives. If RRC members are going to have any contact with the media then they need to be carefully selected, and — when necessary — briefed about what to
expect from the media and prepared or trained in how to deal with the media.

The staff member should also attempt to condition how the media regards and reports the activities of the RRC. To the extent that the RRC constitutes one component in a larger process of knowledge utilization, efforts to establish good relationships with the media can begin well in advance of the RRC. The more the media respects and trusts those who are running the RRC and understands the RRC, the better will be the coverage that the RRC and the report receive and the greater will be the likelihood that the media will make use of the social scientists, the RRC members, and the report produced by the RRC as resources for improving the level and quality of discourse stimulated by media coverage.

4. Socialization

If the RRC is to perform its tasks of producing a report suitable for broad dissemination and promoting knowledge utilization, then it is imperative that the socialization process through which RRC members pass is an effective one. If it is, the RRC members become strong and knowledgeable pronouns of the research that has been undertaken, and industrious change agents promoting the utilization of that research. This socialization process, which in reality extends from an RRC member’s first to last contact with the social scientist(s) running the RRC, is most critical when the RRC members are being recruited and when the first meetings of the RRC are held.
BENCHMARK's experience with RRCs suggests that RRC members have a limited capacity to assimilate the material to which they are exposed. That is why the socialization experience must be carefully structured for RRC members. Though this experience begins when a prospective member is first contacted about the possibility of serving on an RRC, much of the socialization process must be accomplished during the first meeting of the RRC. Anyone running an RRC must consciously decide what his socialization objectives are. These objectives may include 1) establishing guidelines and rules governing the operation of the RRC, 2) laying the groundwork for strong trust relationships among the participants, 3) familiarizing the participants with certain subject matter, and so on. Whatever these objectives are, every effort must be made to see that they are accomplished, because the task of accomplishing them is a formidable one and made even more difficult by the paucity of time within which the RRC meets.

Though interaction in an RRC is intensive and task oriented -- and consequently likely to be effective in producing feelings of trust and cohesion -- it is also relatively brief, ranging from 6 to 12 hours of personal, face-to-face contact in the group meeting setting. This is not a great deal of time, a fact which underscores the necessity for clearly specifying goals and objectives with respect to socialization that need to be accomplished and a corresponding strategy for accomplishing them. This strategy should include the use of redundant briefing and reinforcing materials employing different techniques and methods -- such as outlines, paper and pencil exercises, graphics,
testimonials, anecdotes, and so on. As will be discussed later, the socialization experience requires constant reinforcement which itself entails the rapt attention and finely honed sensitivity of the social scientists running the RRC. These social scientists must become adept at quickly deciphering how the strategy is working and capable of quickly making any tactical -- and, if need be, strategic -- adjustments that are required.

5. Substantive Deliberation

Though the RRC should never become an open-ended convening, neither should it become the slave to a schedule when that schedule is unrealistic and counter-productive. Earlier a dilemma inherent in the very purposes of the RRC was mentioned. This dilemma concerns the fact that though the one objective of the RRC is to produce a report suitable for broad dissemination another is to take advantage of this situation in which knowledge users and knowledge producers interact to build rapport and understanding among the members of the two groups. These two objectives are not necessarily served optimally by the same time schedule. The tension that results must be treated on a case-by-case basis as the situation demands.

In some instances it may be very important to get a report out with the absolute minimum of delay; in other instances this objective may have to defer to other objectives. In short, though guidelines concerning the time requirements for an RRC are appropriate and even important to construct and adhere to, adherence to these time schedules should not be followed mindlessly. Evidence from BENCHMARK's
RRCs — in which several RRCs that helped produce more than a single Social Report met for periods extending over two months — clearly indicates that interest and active participation in an RRC can be sustained as long as clearly identifiable tasks need to be accomplished, as long as participation is rewarding for those involved, and as long as continuity in the RRC is maintained.

If the research undertaking is a large one, consideration should be given to convening more than one RRC and/or issuing more than one report. It is counterproductive to ask RRC members to deal with research in which they are not interested. If a research undertaking covers a variety of interest areas, it is wise to constitute separate RRCs to deal with those distinct areas. Likewise, an effort should be made to balance the amount of material dealt with by the research and the number of reports produced by the RRC; the more the material, the greater the number of reports.

Unsolicited copies of the reports produced by RRCs should be sent to people many of the names of whom the members of the RRC can provide. In BENCHMARK's RRCs, this practice evolved slowly and was formalized only late in the Program's history. In short, the report produced by an RRC should be marketed aggressively and the RRC should participate in this process. RRC members are excellent sources of names of individuals and institutions who are likely to be more than marginally interested in the report that is produced. Sent under an appropriate cover letter, these reports have a high chance of being read and the information in them used — certainly higher than if the
recipient was made aware of the contents of the report only through the mass media.

The process embodies some of the qualities of a chain letter. Each member of an RRC is likely to know many of the same people that other RRC members know -- that is their networks of associations overlap -- but he is also likely to know at least some people whom the other members of his RRC do not know. The set of people identified by the members of an RRC is usually quite large and facilitates broad reach throughout the community. Time and again, members of BENCHMARK's RRCs were able to identify people not known to the staff members responsible for running the RRC.

Reports produced by an RRC should be disseminated through multiple channels. Not only should copies of reports be distributed, an effort should be made to communicate the findings of the research through other means. This may include such things as public interest programming on the media, presentations and workshops, report summaries or excerpts in newsletters, and so on.

The strategy of pre-releasing embargoed copies of reports to people who might be contacted by the press did not operate very successfully for BENCHMARK. Because of the effort required to execute this strategy -- advance copies have to be prepared and distributed and the press notified of this action -- anyone running an RRC is advised to consider this strategy carefully. In a setting where the media are responsive to this strategy, it is likely to be worth the
effort; in a setting where the media are not responsive, the strategy has little purpose.

Likewise, the strategy of designating spokesmen to act as contact people for the media must be carefully assessed before it is employed. On the one hand, even if the media do not contact these people, the very act of designating them symbolizes the openness and collaborative nature of the RRC and underscores the varied functions served by RRC members. On the other hand, this particular strategy is not without its dangers. Report findings may become politicized by virtue of their identification with a spokesman who has a highly politicized image; and the media may manipulate a spokesman unfamiliar with handling the media.

RRC meetings should not be totally report directed and report oriented; the other purposes served by the RRC should receive substantial time and attention from the staff. Though the multiple purposes served by an RRC may compete with one another for time, attention, and resources, they complement one another with respect to their impact. In other words, if an RRC is entirely report directed, the chances are that the other purposes served by the RRC will suffer. It is important to recognize which purposes of the RRC are primary and which secondary; this does not mean, however, that the primary purposes should be served to the exclusion of all the others. Since a natural proclivity exists to allow one purpose to dominate all others constantly, great control must be exercised in ensuring that this does not happen and in maintaining a balance in the proceedings of the RRC.
Any new knowledge of skills transferred in the RRC need to be reinforced. Since in an RRC a great deal of information is transmitted in relatively little time, the danger always exists that RRC members will assimilate very little of that which is conveyed to them, either in the way of information or skills. Consequently, it is very important to reinforce all the learning that takes place. The experience with BENCHMARK's RRCs indicates that this also will have a positive impact on efforts to establish conditions of awareness, interest, trust, and credibility.

6. Post-RRC Contact

Once the RRC has officially disbanded, post-RRC contact should be aggressively promoted. There are several reasons why this should be done. The interaction that takes place in the RRC is essentially of one type and it takes place over a relatively short period of time. If the relationships established during the RRC are to be cemented and/or expanded, they need to be reinforced and in settings different than the one provided by the RRC.

In addition, the dissemination and utilization of the information contained in the report produced by the RRC can continue long after the RRC has disbanded. In other words, the utility of this information has a long half-life. To the extent that post-RRC contacts are not maintained; the opportunity to use the RRC to promote dissemination and utilization is lost. Finally, given the sunk costs in the development and operation of an RRC, the social scientist who fails to
pursue post-RRC contact is forfeiting an opportunity to capitalize on an investment that may pay handsome dividends.

Post-RRC contact can be promoted in a variety of ways, ranging from casually keeping in contact with RRC members to providing assistance to RRC members. One form of post-RRC contact that has direct bearing on one of the primary purpose of the RRC is to operate through RRC members after the RRC has been disbanded to present the findings contained in the report to the associations with which the members are affiliated.

F. THE ENTREPRENEURIAL DIMENSION OF KNOWLEDGE UTILIZATION

The RRC innovation is rooted in a social process model of knowledge utilization. Though the role of the business entrepreneur in promoting the adoption of commercial innovations is both well documented and well-understood, the role of the social science entrepreneur in promoting the adoption of social science innovations is not. Knowledge of change agency is confined to a rather narrow spectrum of physical and biological science innovations and does not penetrate very deeply into the innovations of the social sciences. From a social process perspective of knowledge utilization, the social scientist who implements an RRC is an entrepreneur. If he is to succeed in promoting the utilization of social science knowledge, then his role as an entrepreneur needs to be recognized and better understood.

To the extent that the social science profession supports the entrepreneur, knowledge utilization is likely to increase; to the extent
that it repudiates the entrepreneur, the problem of the underutilization of social science research will only be exacerbated. There can be no question but that the aggressive promotion of knowledge utilization through innovations such as the RRC carries great risks with it. Not only are charlattans likely to take advantage of this new role to promote their personal or ideological interests; but the chances are very real that the social science products or methods disseminated will be misunderstood, misused and abused. Furthermore, it will be very difficult to subject the actions of those social scientists who become actively involved in promoting the use of social science to a review on either technical or ethical grounds.

As great as the risks may be, however, the promise of rewards are equally great. The purpose of science is to serve. When efforts are made to promote the utilization of the social sciences by reducing social process barriers that impede utilization, both science and society benefit. Science benefits by having its enterprise exposed to the acid tests of applicability and practical utility, and society benefits by increasing its use of the social sciences.

In the midst of all this is the entrepreneur, the social scientist who may choose to make use of an RRC to reduce the social process barriers that prevent the broadest possible use of the research he has conducted. It is unlikely, however, that many social scientists will make use of this or other innovations designed to promote knowledge utilization if their efforts in this regard are not rewarded and respected professionally. As it presently operates, the incentive
systems that condition the behavior of many social scientists do not encourage this type of activity. The resulting loss is society's and science's

Other forces, however, are acting to promote the use of the social sciences. These forces are rooted in the needs of users, the requirements of funders, and the commitment of certain, policy oriented, social scientists. Given the forces that are compelling greater knowledge utilization, it behooves the social science profession to embrace, sanction, support and legitimize this activity so that the entrepreneurial spirit of social scientists can be both nurtured and directed toward productive ends, and at the same time tempered by the highest professional standards.

To a large degree, the professional standards required to preserve the integrity of this pursuit have yet to evolve. Standards for norms guiding clinical behavior, safeguards against abuses, the systematic growth of clinical expertise, the conversion of this experience and expertise into training programs -- all this remains to be done and more. The process of doing these things can be facilitated and hastened if the social sciences' purview is expanded to encompass the mission of knowledge utilization. Such a mission is perfectly compatible with the teaching, research and services missions of most institutions of higher education in which many of the nation's social scientists repose.
G. THE RRC INNOVATION AND CLINICALLY-ORIENTED RESEARCH

In this examination of the Report Review Committee innovation, knowledge utilization has been viewed primarily from a social process perspective. From this perspective, knowledge utilization is a continuous phenomenon. Consequently, efforts to promote knowledge utilization should not begin when the research has been completed; they should begin when the research is first conceived. What a social scientist does from the very outset of the research enterprise will have a major effect on how the research is utilized.

The Report Review Committee innovation is but one device to promote knowledge utilization. Furthermore, it is a device that is engaged after the research has been designed and after it has been conducted. If knowledge utilization is viewed as a continuous process, then it would seem reasonable to conclude that the impact of the RRC innovation could be increased by linking the RRC to other components or phases in the larger knowledge utilization process of which it constitutes only one part.

This is exactly what was done in the BENCHMARK Program where the idea for the RRC was spawned and a prototype of the RRC designed and implemented. In BENCHMARK, the RRC was linked to other phases in the research process. Users had been intimately involved in the design of the research, and the RRC complemented other innovations — such as the COS Program where the data was made available for use to everyone in the community — designed to promote knowledge utilization.
In other words, the RRC was one component in an integrated, user-oriented, clinical approach to social science research.

It is in the context of a clinic that the RRC would seem to be most effective. In fact, the RRC embodies the most important attributes of the clinical approach: researchers are closely linked to users, efforts are made to promote knowledge utilization, the phases of research and development are integrated with phases of development and utilization, attention is focused on the social context of the research, users specify the analysis that is to be conducted and the research is subjected to feedback.

Nonetheless, the RRC innovation can be engaged after the research has been conducted and no strong linkages have to exist between the research process and the RRC process. The RRC could be used to promote the utilization of research which itself was not originally designed or conducted in a clinical setting, research which was not demand generated. In BENCHMARK, the RRCs were an integral part of a pre-existing social science clinic and dealt with research undertaken in a clinical setting, but this need not have been the case.

A social process understanding of knowledge utilization clearly suggests however that the RRC innovation is better suited for research that is undertaken in a clinical setting than for research that is not. The reason for this should be obvious. The RRC is discrete; knowledge utilization is continuous. To extract the maximum benefit from the RRC innovation, the innovation should be linked to other components in a knowledge utilization system. Though the RRC
will have utility as a stand alone innovation — just how much however remains to be seen — it should have the greatest utility as an innovation that is linked to other innovations in a knowledge utilization system. This influences how the RRC innovation is conceptualized.

The RRC should be regarded as part of a knowledge utilization process. So regarded, it becomes immediately apparent that one of the important objectives of the RRC, in addition to the objective of producing a report suitable for broad dissemination, is to apply the research dealt with by the RRC to the problems and needs of the RRC members. Though this may not always be possible, emphasis in the RRC should be placed on assisting the RRC members in using the findings. In BENCHMARK, most of the energies of the staff were directed at producing a report and establishing conditions of awareness, interest, trust and credibility. Energy also needs to be directed at applying the research. This expanded notion of the missions or objectives of the RRC will then make it possible to make use of the RRC as a seed or catalyst for stimulating clinically-oriented research in settings where such research has not been undertaken.
FOOTNOTES

1. In 1968, the National Science Board established the Special Commission on the Social Sciences to address the problem of the underutilization of the social sciences. The report of this Commission, which "was charged with making recommendations for increasing the useful application of the social sciences in the solution of contemporary problems," is contained in National Science Board (1969). Though the recommendations of the Commission are almost exclusively organizational and institutional in nature, they provide an interesting contrast to the approach taken in this study which focuses far more on how the social sciences are practiced.

2. In recent years, the spigot of Federal and foundation support for research has been turned down, and the support available for research metered out far more sparingly than in the past. No doubt, this austerity is due in large part to the recession, but some attribute it as well to the credibility gap that seems to be engulfing the sciences and which manifests itself in the failure to establish a convincing linkage between what goes into R & D and what comes out of it. Amidst concern over the environment and over limits to growth (Meadows, et al., 1972), it is little wonder that many people have accepted or will come to accept that there are limits to science as well -- or worse yet, that science is an enemy and not a servant of man. Though the concern that science be more directly applicable to national needs certainly had a great deal to do with the growth of applied research programs such as the National Science Foundation's IRPOS (Interdisciplinary Research Relevant to Problems of Our Society), RANN (Research Applied to National Needs), and ISP (Intergovernmental Science Programs) Programs, funding for both applied and basic research is suffering. Back in the summer of 1973, Business Week (June 9, 1973), in an article entitled "The Budget Cutters Clobber Basic Research," reported that "research and training at the nation's best universities are shrinking as federal funds are cut," that "project grants lag behind today's inflation," "support for graduate students is plummeting," and that "the cuts in basic research are not being matched by new funds for applied science." The image of the sciences is fragile, and funding for science is not tied directly to the vicissitudes of the economy.
3. Comparable and comprehensive data on R & D expenditures in the social sciences are difficult to obtain. For one discussion on the subject, based primarily on data derived from a 1968 survey of institutions of higher education and research, see Eulau and March (1969), especially pages 84-106; and National Academy of Sciences (1969). Many estimates of social science R & D activity vary considerably, in part because definitions of what constitutes R & D differ, in part because of different accounting procedures, and in part because it is so difficult to take into account all the sources of funds for and all the performers of social science R & D. For a valuable source of data on national, state and local R & D expenditures, see the National Science Foundation's Surveys of Science Resource Series (1971, 1975a, 1975b, 1975c). The problems associated with any sort of estimate of the return on the investment made in social science R & D are even more severe: the impact of social science R & D is difficult to trace and no one agrees on how it can be measured. The guidelines that exist in many areas of business and industry for investing in R & D and for estimating expected return on that investment -- see, for example, Dean (1968) -- do not exist in the social sciences. For additional material on U.S. expenditures for and Federal policies affecting R & D, see Fisher (1971), Office of Management and Budget (1972), Barfield (1971). For an interesting proposal on centralizing federal science activities, see Science Policy Research Division (1969). See too, Harris (1970).

4. For a discussion -- and occasionally a debate -- about various aspects of this issue, see Rudner (1966 — especially pages 68-83), Lundberg (1971), Knorr and Rosenau (1969), Charlesworth (1962), and Somit and Tanenhaus (1967). This contention — that the nature of social phenomena inherently limits the payoffs that can be expected from the social sciences — hinges on the notion that phenomena must be determinate if science is to prove useful in understanding and controlling them, a notion contrary to both explanatory and engineering approaches to science. This point is further elaborated in footnote 8.

5. Many of the recommendations of the Survey of the Behavioral and Social Sciences, and of the National Science Board's Special Commission on the Social Sciences pertain to this point. See National Science Board (1969), Eulau and March (1969), and National Academy of Sciences (1969). See too, Mazur (1971). The explosion of interest in collecting data manifested itself in many areas of the social sciences, and led to the creation of numerous data archives (such as the one maintained by the Inter-University Consortium for Political Research). See, for example, Burgess and Lawton's (1972) assessment of the activity undertaken in the area of international, events data research.

6. For some interesting case studies of applied social science research institutes see Smith (1966) and Dickson (1971). Research interest in knowledge utilization has increased at a very rapid rate over the past decade. For two excellent overviews of this relatively young field of inquiry based on reviews of thousands of pieces of empirical and theoretical research, see Havelock (1969), and National Institute of Health (1972). For another excellent overview of different research traditions on the communication of innovations, see Rogers and Shoemaker (1971). Also see Bennis, et al. (1969, especially Chapter 3). The interest in identifying factors that account for and can be manipulated to promote both innovation and utilization is especially evident in the area of technology. See Gruber and Marquis (1969), Marquis and Myers (1969), OECD (1971), Doctors (1969), Schon (1967, 1971), Jones (1971), Jewkes et al. (1969), Gilfillan (1963), and Globe, et al. (1973).

7. For an excellent discussion of the relationships between research, technology and utilization, see Jantsch (1967 — especially the chapter entitled "The Fundamental Concept of a Technology Transfer Space") and Gruber and Marquis (1969 — especially the introductory chapter by Gruber and Marquis and the chapter by Toulmin entitled, "Innovation and the Problem of Utilization").

8. In recent years, there has been a growing concern in the social sciences with a) the ability to identify phenomena that are subject to control or manipulation, b) the ability to establish the relationship between these phenomena and desired conditions or end-states, and c) the ability to specify how to manipulate these phenomena so as to achieve those desired end-states. The scientific or theoretic orientation which embodies these concerns is variously known as design theory, control theory, or engineering theory. It encompasses a much broader and different conception of science than that which has dominated social science research and which above all else seeks to establish causal relationships among phenomena that makes the explanation and prediction — but not necessarily the control — of those phenomena possible. For a brilliant and illuminating discussion, see Simon (1969). One of the "fathers" of control theory is Richard Bellman. For a terse and non-technical discussion of control theory, see Bellman (1968); for a more technical
8. (continued) discussion, see Tou (1964). For a discussion related to a design theory approach in the social sciences, see Burgess and Lawton (1972 — especially pages 68-76), Burgess (1972), and Burgess (1973a). In recent years, design or engineering qualities have come to be employed as criteria against which social science research can be evaluated; see, for example, Bobrow (1972 — especially pages 24-30). For another discussion of engineering models in policy-oriented social science, see Crawford and Biderman (1969 — especially the editors' introduction to Chapter IV and the articles by Hauser and Guetzkow, pages 233-259). For a stimulating proposal for reorganizing social science research to meet design theory criteria, and for a discussion of the characteristics of research undertaken for the purpose of "engineering" or "design," see Ben-David (1973). For an interesting discussion of the role which the concept of design has in education, see Jantsch (1972). An article dealing with the extent to which economists have made use of control theory for decision-making can be found in Business Week, May 19, 1973 entitled "Optimal Control: A Mathematical Supertool."

9. The reference here is to Snow (1963).

10. The value of practical training and experience for policy scientists, and suggestions about how that training and experience could be incorporated into the education program for policy scientists, is discussed in Lasswell (1971), Dror (1971), and Bouxsein (1973).

11. The concern for developing institutional innovations for enhancing the use of social intelligence and social technologies in planning and problem solving manifests itself in a number of ways. For example, the rubric, "public technology" has been used to describe "technology which is explicitly responsive to the policy goals and operational requirements of government; it is technology for the civilian sector, designed to supply technical alternatives in carrying out governmental roles and missions." (Committee on Intergovernmental Science Relations, 1972). Public technology reflects an interest in promoting knowledge utilization to enhance the policy and program management capacities of government and to improve the application of science and technology for achieving public goals. See Crawford (1974), Hersman (1974), The Council of State Governments (1972), Committee on Intergovernmental Science Relations to the Federal Council for Science and Technology (1972), and Burgess (1975).

12. Other conceptualizations of the problems that contribute to the underutilization of social science research can be found in Caplan (1974, 1976), and National Science Board (1969 — especially pages 15-20).

14. The critical role that demand and need play in discovery and innovation -- both in science and technology -- is now an empirically, well established fact. Indeed, major advances in science and technology are as likely -- and in some instances more likely -- to arise in a demand-oriented research environment as in a research environment that is not demand oriented. See Deutsch, et al. (1971), Isenson (1969), Utterback (1974), Roberts (1973), von Hippel (1975), Rettig (1971), Myers and Marquis (1969), and Globe, et al. (1973).

15. The importance of linking (and/or integrating) all the phases of the R & D process is becoming apparent in industry. In a report exploring the reasons behind the great successes of Hewlett-Packard, Business Week (June 9, 1975) quotes Bernard M. Oliver, vice-president for R & D as saying, "At one time we split R & D and product engineering. But we discovered that the only way to get things done in a timely fashion is to have the originator of an idea carry it through to the end. We've tried to remove the fences between research and production and make a chute that starts in the lab and ends at the shipping dock." The only thing we would add is that the chute should be extended even farther as anyone who has tried to master one of Hewlett-Packard's calculators might agree.

16. For interesting discussions related to this point, see Nagi and Corwin (1972), Nagi (1965), Song (1974), Lerup (1973), and Sarason (1972).

17. One of the great advantages of a clinical approach is that it can be used to enhance those attributes of innovations which research indicates influence an innovation's rate of adoption. For a discussion of those attributes -- such as relative advantage, compatibility, simplicity, trialability, and observability -- see Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) and National Institute of Mental Health (1972).
18. In fact, it was this admixture of policy and program functions that later resulted in role ambiguity for members of the BCC and in reduced effectiveness of the BCC as an institutional mechanism.

19. Provisions governing the creation and operation of Special Interest Groups were adopted by the Scope Team of the BENCHMARK Community Conference on March 27, 1974 and are contained in "BCC Policy Memorandum: BENCHMARK Special Interest Groups."

20. Some of these barriers include: images of science and technology as evil and scientists as misguided and isolated individuals uninterested in and insensitive to the problems people have; financial constraints that prohibit access to R & D; the specialized skills and languages that arise in any scientific field of inquiry; the symbolic trappings of degrees, titles and affiliations that are present in any learned profession and promote class distinctions among individuals, and narrow incentive systems which militate against the sharing of information and skills.

21. Increased knowledge utilization assumes an increase in the number of people who make use of scientific knowledge and an increase in how much scientific knowledge is used. In short, increased knowledge utilization involves the process of converting potential users of scientific knowledge into actual users of scientific knowledge. For the potential user of social science R & D — the latter assumed here to include both the products and the methods of social science — social science R & D represents an innovation. The increased use of social science R & D represents then the adoption of an innovation by potential users. Increased knowledge utilization involves a conversion process and the conversion process involves an adoption process.

Many researchers have focused on the conditions that influence this adoption process. One researcher (Rogers, 1971), for example, has suggested that the adoption of an innovation is best understood as a process which involves passing through stages of awareness in which the individual is exposed to the innovation, interest in which the individual actively seeks information about the innovation, evaluation in which the individual makes an assessment of the innovation, trial in which the individual uses the innovation to assess its utility, and adoption in which the individual decides whether to continue the use of the innovation in the future.

In this model, awareness and interest are necessary — but not sufficient — conditions for the adoption of an innovation. The conditions of trust and credibility are also critical, because if one assumes that an individual is both aware of and interested in an innovation, his trial and adoption of the innovation may be blocked if the individual does not trust the source or propagator of the innovation or fails to regard the
innovation as credible, that is true, valid, or reliable. If trust and credibility are absent, then the evaluation of the innovation — the assessment which the individual makes of it — will be negative and the trial and adoption of the innovation blocked. Consequently, conditions of awareness, interest, trust and credibility become important factors to control if one wishes to promote the adoption of an innovation, in this case the increased use of social science R & D.

The importance of awareness, interest, trust and credibility in the knowledge utilization process has been firmly established in the growing body of theoretical and empirical research dealing with the science of knowledge utilization. In his comprehensive review of knowledge utilization research, Havelock (1969) distinguishes three schools of research that explain knowledge utilization in terms of models of change: The Social Interaction school; the Problem Solver school; and the Research, Development and Diffusion school.

According to Havelock, these schools differ with respect to assumptions that are made about the context of research, development, and diffusion surrounding a particular innovation, and about the role of the sender and the source of initiative for bringing about change:

"In the Social Interaction model, the initiative [is] in the hands of a sender, with the receiver playing a relatively passive role. The Research, Development and Diffusion model describe[s] a very purposeful diffusion process, in which a developer plays the active role in identifying a need and in developing a solution to meet that need. This solution is then disseminated to a potential receiver, who is essentially passive. In the Problem Solver model, the receiver plays an active role, identifying a need and seeking out ways to meet that need." (p. 10:81)

The differences among these perspectives notwithstanding, each acknowledges a stage in the knowledge utilization process in which trial or evaluation — and consequently conditions of trust and credibility — becomes critical. In addition, the three perspectives also acknowledge the importance of the conditions of interest and awareness, although the Problem Solver perspective tends to accept the presence of awareness and interest on the part of the potential user as given since it is the potential user (or receiver) who initiates the adoption process.

22. Other major institutional innovations developed by the program in addition to those designed especially to promote the use of CASP or already mentioned included the Technical Assistance Program (TAP), the Community Services Office (OCS), various public relations activities, and the Program's Code of Ethics.
22. (continued) The Technical Assistance Program provided planning, research and management assistance for projects unrelated to CASP. The Community Services Office coordinated community services and relations. Public relations activities included such efforts as presentations and speaking engagements, a library and binder project for placing CASP related materials and Social Reports in libraries where they could become permanent and easily accessible community resources, and briefings for the working press. The Program's Code of Ethics was a public statement of professional commitments and responsibilities of the staff.

For detailed descriptions of these institutional components of the Program, see Benson (1976), Conway, et al. (1976), Ballard (1975), BENCHMARK (1974), Burgess, et al. (1972), Burgess (1973b, 1973c, 1974) and draft materials and documents in the Program's archive.

23. The BENCHMARK Community Conference was originally called the Columbus Community Conference. The name was changed in the autumn of 1975. Throughout the dissertation, this organization is referred to as the BENCHMARK Community Conference.


25. Successful models that could be adapted for use by social scientists do exist, such as land grant institutions and agricultural extension services, teaching hospitals, Sea Grant universities, public and community health schools, and so on. In addition, the business sector has successfully employed methods for promoting the dissemination and utilization of relatively sophisticated machines and processes which deserve careful examination by social scientists. The point remains, however, that whatever the cause — and indifference, defensiveness, ignorance, and naivete have all been suggested as causes — too few social scientists make use of the guidelines and models which do exist. For an interesting perspective on the problems of innovating within the university, see Vallance (1972).


27. Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) identify as the primary sources or traditions of research on diffusion the fields of anthropology, early sociology, rural sociology, education, medical sociology, communication, and marketing. Minor traditions they identify as agricultural economics, geography, general economics, speech, general sociology, and psychology. Havelock (1969) identifies
27. (continued) 11 major fields of knowledge containing utilization relevant research including education, agriculture, communication, mental health, basic and applied sciences, technology, medicine, law, public administration, health, and social welfare. Part of the confusion is due to the fact that the interest in this field of inquiry is growing so quickly; and as Warner (1974) suggests that diffusion research is usually discipline specific even though the phenomenon of diffusion is not.

28. The response rates received from the RRC questionnaire were well within the bounds that typically can be expected from mailed questionnaires. See Erdos (1970). Questionnaires were sent in stamped, pre-addressed return envelopes, and followed up by mail and on the phone. The anonymity of the responses was guaranteed, and the purpose of the questionnaire explained in a cover letter sent to the respondent.

29. Most of these points are from Robinson (1969). Also see Zelditch (1962), Webb, et al. (1966), Wiseman and Aron (1970), Burgess and Conway (1973), and McCall and Simmons (1969).

30. BENCHMARK sent copies of Social Reports prior to their official release to people in the community who might be contacted by the media about the contents of a Social Report. For example, pre-release copies of the Social Report dealing with citizen opinions of the police were sent to the Mayor, the Safety Director, and the Police Chief so that they would have had the opportunity to read the Social Report in the event that they were contacted for comments by the media.

31. There are several problems associated with the task of assigning a single institutional affiliation to each RRC member. In the first place, many RRC members had multiple affiliations. One RRC member, for example, was both a faculty member at a state-supported university (a public sector institution), and a leader of an active and well-organized area residents' association (a civic sector institution). In the second place, a phenomenon of fairly recent origin has rendered many, formerly serviceable, classifying schemas all but obsolete. A vast profusion of organizations has arisen in response to the growth of Federal involvement in state and local affairs. These organizations are often difficult to classify because of the ambiguity that surrounds their source of legitimacy, scope of authority, purpose, funding, provisions to ensure their accountability and responsiveness, and so on. In order to deal with these problems, the following decisions were made: 1) to use a simple classificatory schema distinguishing public, civic, and university sector affiliations; 2) to make no effort to identify the universe of affiliations and networks of associations of each RRC member;
31. (continued) and 3) to identify the primary affiliation influencing a person's participation in the RRC. These decisions seemed satisfactory in alleviating most problems associated either with identifying a single institutional affiliation for each RRC member, or with classifying a particular institution according to one of the three categories employed. It must be recognized that the procedures employed to generate these data are very restrictive and seriously underestimate the scope and number of the institutional affiliations and networks of associations of RRC members.

32. In almost all cases, primary institutional affiliations were assigned to RRC members on the basis of primary institutional affiliations they provided themselves.

33. Until February of 1975, no restrictions whatsoever were placed on RRC membership. After the tenth Social Report (on capital improvements) had been released, and just prior to primary elections, the BENCHMARK Community Conference made a decision—despite the vigorous objections of the staff—that no person actively seeking an elected, public office could sit on an RRC. This represented the first time that the BENCHMARK Program—which had always operated according to the principle of self-selection—imposed a formal barrier limiting participation in the Program. This restriction notwithstanding, only one elected public official—a Columbus City Council member—attended any RRC meeting.

34. The task of identifying the primary function performed by RRC members was made difficult because of the fact that many RRC members performed a variety of functions in the institutions with which they were affiliated. BENCHMARK staff members knowledgeable about the functions performed and the roles played by RRC members were consulted to help assign each RRC member to one of four categories: planning, policy-making, service delivery, and academic. In order to help assess how far RRCs reached beyond the university, individuals with academic affiliations and functions were treated as a separate category. Individuals assigned to the planning category were considered to perform primarily the functions of generating information, developing alternatives, and recommending courses of action. In addition, the planning function was considered to be primarily a staff function. The policy making function was interpreted to include taking advocacy positions, and the making of decisions. The service delivery function was interpreted to include the execution of policy, the administration of operations or the delivery of services. In one instance, a person involved in an administrative position involving the delivery of social services was categorized as serving primarily a planning function; in another instance, a person involved in a similar position was categorized as serving primarily a service delivery function because of the person's intimate involvement in service delivery.
35. User input was channelled through three major mechanisms: open discussions about the scope and nature of CASP in CCC meetings; special open meetings held with individuals interested in a particular area of community concern; and individual contacts made with organizations and individuals in the community. Since discussion about CASP took place in the community when no BENCHMARK staff members were present, the possibility does exist that some of the RRC members who had been classified as not having participated in the design of CASP were nonetheless aware of it. To the best of our knowledge, however, this is not the case. The design process of CASP took place primarily between February and April, 1974. The field work for CASP was conducted between May and August, 1974; and the Social Reports were issued between September, 1974 and October, 1975. At the very minimum, the operation of an RRC was separated from the design of CASP by five months.

36. At the time BENCHMARK began, other programs supported primarily by the Academy were Prognosis (dealing with the exploration of emerging problems), Problems in Crime and Justice, Problems in Metropolitanization and Growth, and the Design Center for Community Communications.

37. From July to December, 1973, the BENCHMARK Program was located in one of the buildings occupied by the Mershon Center at The Ohio State University. After January, 1974, BENCHMARK moved down the street and off the University campus into the new building that had been specially constructed to house and Academy and its programs.

38. For example, a feature newspaper story (see "Experts to Monitor City's Pulse," Columbus Dispatch, October 8, 1973) written when the creation of BENCHMARK was first announced, included a photo showing the Program's Director with the Mayor, the President of the United Community Council, and the Executive Director of the Model Neighborhood Assembly. A news conference attended by the Mayor and held at the Academy for Contemporary Problems received broad public exposure as the result of wide coverage by the electronic media. Other examples of public support included such things as editorials on BENCHMARK (see "Key Study Commended," Columbus Dispatch, October 12, 1973), and the inclusion of BENCHMARK as a major source of input — along with the Chamber of Commerce, the Development Committee for Greater Columbus, and the United Community Council — in a regional plan for the year 2000 (see Al DiGennaro, Clement Khisty, and Larry Sweda. Year 2000: A Preliminary Statement. Columbus: Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission, December 19, 1973).
A Special Interest Group on public affairs — composed of people with substantial public relations experience in the community — was formed to provide advice and assistance about how best to handle the Program's relations with the media. Prior to the release of the first Social Report, briefings about the Program were held both for media executive (newspaper editors and electronic media news directors) and for reporters and journalists. A Social Report release strategy was designed which honored the press deadlines of the city's two major newspapers alternately, thus ensuring that the morning and afternoon newspapers got the "scoop" on the release of a Social Report on a rotating basis. Since the print and electronic media are not, for the most part, in competition with one another, the release of a Social Report was accompanied by a press release and occasionally by a press conference; embargoed copies of Social Reports were distributed to people whom it was felt the media might like to interview about the findings contained in each Social Report; and community spokesmen who could talk knowledgeably about each Social Report were designated.

This was caused by many things, including: 1) the hesitance of the staff to take aggressive initiatives with the media, 2) the lack of continuity in the media personnel who were assigned to cover the BENCHMARK Program, and 3) certain problems endemic to the news profession caused by the type of training received by most journalists, the manner in which the news industry is organized and operates; and the incentive system which predominates in the news industry.

See footnote 22 for citations.

Letter from the first Director of the BENCHMARK Program to the Director of the Academy for Contemporary Problems, September 10, 1974. See too the discussion of RRC members' perceptions of the staff in Chapter V, especially pages 137-147.

For example, a series of allegations about police brutality had precipitated a community-wide debate over the issues of police conduct and a civilian review board. Because CASP data related so directly to these issues, participation on the crime and justice RRCs was actively solicited from both the Division of Police and the Fraternal Order of Police — both of whom had been actively involved in the debate.

The first Social Report was issued at the end of September, 1974; CASP went into the field the beginning of May, 1974. A period of five months elapsed between the final modifications made on the CASP survey and the convening of the first Report Review Committee. Between the beginning of the design of CASP and the convening of the final RRC, approximately 21 months elapsed.
45. The pressure that existed during this period was caused by a num-
ber of factors: 1) this period had been preceded by an extended
and exhausting field operations effort, 2) other major initia-
tives had been undertaken and completed during the same period
including the writing of a USERS GUIDE, the convening of USERS
WORKSHOPS, and the formation of a number of Special Interest
Groups, 3) a great deal of staff time and energy was required by
other things including the CCC, the Program newsletter, and a
variety of activities related to dissemination and utilization
efforts, 4) future funding for the Program was being negotiated,
5) policies and procedures concerning the goals and governance
of the Program were being debated, 6) eight Social Reports were
released in the two month period between September 29, 1974 and
November 25, 1974, and 7) the Program had to adjust to a change
in leadership occasioned by the resignation of the Program's
Director.

46. Prior to moving into the Academy for Contemporary Problems, the
BENCHMARK Program had occupied quarters on the Ohio State Univer-
sity campus. At this latter location, stringent traffic control
regulations made it extremely difficult for people outside the
university to visit the Program. This situation caused a serious
problem that hampered the Program's efforts to establish linkages
with people in the community.

47. The release strategy — especially for the early Social Reports —
was also formulated with the advice and assistance of BENCHMARK's
Public Affairs SIG. In addition, a media list was prepared which
contained important information (address, phone number, editor,
etc.) of every newspaper (including community newspapers),
T.V. station, and radio station in the county.

48. The converse is also true. One could not assume that because a
person failed to pick up a draft well in advance of a meeting
that the person was incapable of providing useful, carefully con-
sidered, and penetrating feedback. That clearly was not the
case. Some people came to a meeting an hour or two early for
the express purpose of reviewing a draft; others had the ability
to pass a draft through the filters important to them by reading
that draft during the first few minutes of a meeting. In addition,
since the meeting was devoted to the Social Report, each draft
was subjected to thorough scrutiny during the meeting itself.

49. The P.A. SIG — as this special interest group on public affairs
was known — was most active during the period immediately prior
to and after the issuance of the first reports from CASP. Though
the P.A. SIG provided invaluable advice to the Program and the
first few RRCs about how to handle the release of Social Reports,
by the time the final Reports were issued this advice was generally
49. (continued) no longer needed. Consequently, only the earlier RRCs relied on the P.A. SIG for advice about how to handle the release of the Social Reports.

50. Since so little time in the Social Report production schedule was earmarked for contingencies, and because of the uncertainties associated with the process, printing delays occasionally were inevitable. A printer might not receive a final copy at the time it was promised and as a result be unable to return printed, collated, drilled and stapled copies in time for a Report's official release. When this happened, enough copies for prerelease and media distribution would have to be photocopied inhouse.

51. From the BCC Policy Memorandum on BENCHMARK Special Interest Groups adopted by the BENCHMARK Community Conference in March, 1974.

52. See footnote 28.

53. For a discussion related to control and generalizability in social science research, see Burgess and Conway (1973).

54. One of the first major issues decided by the BENCHMARK Community Conference had to do with some of the basic design parameters of CASP. Some people argued that CASP should be restricted to the intensive investigation of only a few subjects. Others argued that the first CASP, at least, should be comprehensive in nature even if that meant that many subject areas could not be intensively explored. Clear tradeoffs existed between the two approaches. After protracted discussions about the issue, the BCC decided that CASP should be comprehensive in nature. As a result, many of the subject areas dealt with in the survey were quite restricted.

55. Though these interviews were conducted after the Program had ended and in some cases quite some time after a particular RRC in question had been convened, staff members were able to give vivid accounts of their RRCs — a fact that underscores how formative and salient the RRC experience had been. In addition, time did not appear to have diminished the experience appreciably. Some staff members became quite animated as they responded to questions, and all the staff members retained very complete and well thought out opinions about the RRC process. The impact of the RRC experience is also reflected in the debriefing sessions that erupted spontaneously among staff members after almost every RRC meeting. It was commonplace for staff members to rush to find out how an RRC meeting had gone immediately after it ended and to quiz one another at length about their respective experiences.
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO RRC MEMBERS
The BENCHMARK Program is conducting a mid-term evaluation. As you may know, BENCHMARK is an experiment designed primarily:

- to produce information about the Columbus area that can be used to assess citizen needs with regard to some of the problems facing a growing metropolitan community;

- to provide assistance to various groups in using that information.

Because it is our desire to engage in activities that are useful and responsive to the research needs of a variety of groups, we are very concerned about the opinions of people who have come in contact with the program. Enclosed is a short questionnaire we are asking you to complete. Your opinions will help us evaluate the program and to make those changes that would improve the quality and effectiveness of the BENCHMARK Program. Please fill out the questionnaire as soon as possible and return it to us in the enclosed envelope. We do ask that you sign your name at the end of this cover letter. This enables us to determine who has not returned copies so that we can send a reminder. We will remove this sheet when we receive your completed questionnaire in order to maintain the confidentiality of your responses. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jonathon L. Benson
Director of Evaluation

JLB/v1

enclosure: questionnaire

Please sign your name after completing this questionnaire and return it to us.

(your signature)
We'd like to ask you a few questions in order to get your opinion about various aspects of the Reports Review Committee (RRC) and about the BENCHMARK Program in general.

1.16 First of all, before you served on the Reports Review Committee, had you had any previous contact with the BENCHMARK Program?

☐ 1. Yes - If yes, what was it?

☐ 2. No

1.17 How familiar do you feel you are with the information from the survey that was dealt with in your reports Review Committee?

☑ 1. Very familiar

☐ 2. Somewhat familiar

☐ 3. Not very familiar

☐ 4. Not at all familiar

1.18 BENCHMARK is very concerned about how the information in the survey could be used. The following is a list of possible uses for the information. How useful would you judge the information is that was dealt with in your RRC, either by itself or in combination with other kinds of data, for each of the following topics?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
<th>Somewhat Useful</th>
<th>Not Very Useful</th>
<th>Not at All Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>1. ☐</td>
<td>2. ☐</td>
<td>3. ☐</td>
<td>4. ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>1. ☐</td>
<td>2. ☐</td>
<td>3. ☐</td>
<td>4. ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>1. ☐</td>
<td>2. ☐</td>
<td>3. ☐</td>
<td>4. ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>1. ☐</td>
<td>2. ☐</td>
<td>3. ☐</td>
<td>4. ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>1. ☐</td>
<td>2. ☐</td>
<td>3. ☐</td>
<td>4. ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>1. ☐</td>
<td>2. ☐</td>
<td>3. ☐</td>
<td>4. ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>1. ☐</td>
<td>2. ☐</td>
<td>3. ☐</td>
<td>4. ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can you think of any other uses for the information?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
1.26 Have you ever used the information in the Social Report(s) produced by your Reports Review Committee?

☐ 1. Yes - If yes, how?

☐ 2. No, but I might use it in the future

☐ 3. No, and I don't anticipate that I will

1.27 Have you ever talked about the findings of your Social Report with anyone or mentioned them to someone (other than a member of your RRC or a BENCHMARK staff member)?

[CHECK ALL BOXES THAT APPLY]

☐ 1. Yes - I’ve actually discussed the findings with someone

☐ 2. Yes - I’ve mentioned them or referred to them in the course of discussions

☐ 3. No - I’ve never discussed the findings with anyone or mentioned them to anyone

1.28 What other kinds of survey questions would have provided more useful information?

1.29 Do you think the information contained in the Social Report is a very accurate, somewhat accurate, somewhat inaccurate or very inaccurate reflection of public opinion?

☐ 1. Very accurate

☐ 2. Somewhat accurate

☐ 3. Somewhat inaccurate

☐ 4. Very inaccurate

☐ 5. Undecided/Neutral

1.30 Did you meet anyone new on your RRC?

☐ 1. Yes, and I’m glad I had the opportunity to meet them

☐ 2. Yes

☐ 3. No

1.31 In general, what is your opinion about the performance of the staff from BENCHMARK that participated in your RRC? Were you very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the BENCHMARK staff?

☐ 1. Very satisfied

☐ 2. Somewhat satisfied

☐ 3. Somewhat dissatisfied

☐ 4. Very dissatisfied

☐ 5. Undecided/Neutral
Now we'd like to ask a few questions about the BENCHMARK Program in general.

1134 Have you ever heard of the Community Originated Studies (COS) Program in BENCHMARK?

☐ 1. Yes, and I'm familiar with its overall purpose
☐ 2. Yes, but I'm not too sure what its purpose is
☐ 3. No

1135 Have you ever heard of the RENMARK Community Conference?

☐ 1. Yes, and I'm familiar with its purpose
☐ 2. Yes, but I'm unfamiliar about what its purpose is
☐ 3. No

1136 Do you have a copy of the User's Guide for the first Columbus Area Social Profile (CASP I)?

☐ 1. Yes, I own one
☐ 2. Yes, I have access to one, but don't own it
☐ 3. Yes, I don't own one, but I've looked through it
☐ 4. No, but I've heard about the User's Guide
☐ 5. No, I didn't know it was available

1137 Sixteen subject areas or modules were included in the CASP I survey. Some people are aware of a few of the subject areas, while others know what most of the subject areas are. Do you feel you know what EXACTLY a few or none of the subject areas are in the survey?

☐ 1. Most (11 to 16 areas)
☐ 2. Some (3 to 10 areas)
☐ 3. A few (1 to 4 areas)
☐ 4. None

1138 With which subject areas included in the survey are you most familiar?

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

1139 Have you ever read any of the Social Reports, other than the one(s) produced by your REC?

☐ 1. Yes - if yes, which one(s)?
☐ 2. No, I have copies of Social Reports, but haven't had a chance to read them
☐ 3. No, I haven't read any Social Reports

1140 Would you be interested in participating in selecting the kinds of questions to be included in the next Columbus Area Social Profile?

☐ 1. Yes
☐ 2. Maybe
☐ 3. No
1:41 BENCHMARK provides a variety of services and information. How familiar do you feel you are with the services and information BENCHMARK can provide?

☐ 1. Very familiar
☐ 2. Somewhat familiar
☐ 3. Not very familiar
☐ 4. Not at all familiar

1:42 With which services, products or activities of the program are you most familiar? Please be specific.


Have you ever hesitated to make a request to the Program for information or assistance?

☐ 1. Yes, because I'm unsure who to contact
☐ 2. Yes, because I didn't know if you had the information
☐ 3. Yes, because I didn't know if you provide that kind of assistance
☐ 4. Yes, because I didn't know if I could get it in time
☐ 5. Yes, because I thought it would cost too much
☐ 6. Yes, because I thought I could get the information or assistance elsewhere
☐ 7. Yes, because I had trouble getting information or assistance from BENCHMARK before
☐ 8. Yes, but for some other reason (specify)
☐ 9. No, I never had a need to contact the Program
☐ 10. No

Do you still feel this way?

1:53 Have you ever made any requests for assistance or information from the program?

☐ 1. Yes - If yes, what did you request (please be specific)

☐ 2. No

1:54 How responsive do you think BENCHMARK is to requests for services or information?

☐ 1. Very responsive
☐ 2. Somewhat responsive
☐ 3. Not very responsive
☐ 4. Not at all responsive

☐ 9. I don't know
In the future, if the need arises, how likely do you think it is that you would ask BENCHMARK to provide assistance or information for you?

☐ 1. Very likely
☐ 2. Somewhat likely
☐ 3. Not very likely
☐ 4. Not at all likely

How often have you talked to someone (not a member of the BENCHMARK Community Conference or the BENCHMARK staff) about the BENCHMARK Program?

☐ 1. Very often - It averages about once or twice a week
☐ 2. Sometimes - It averages about once or twice a month
☐ 3. Rarely - I've talked to people about BENCHMARK, but it's irregular and not very often
☐ 4. Never - I can't remember talking to anyone about BENCHMARK

Have you ever personally referred anyone to BENCHMARK, either to obtain some service or information or to attend BENCHMARK Community Conference (BCC) meeting?

CHECK ALL BOXES THAT APPLY

☐ 1. Yes, for some service or technical assistance
☐ 2. Yes, for information or report
☐ 3. Yes, to a BCC meeting
☐ 4. No

Generally, how do you feel about the BENCHMARK Program? Do you feel very positive, somewhat positive, somewhat negative or very negative about the BENCHMARK Program?

☐ 1. Very positive
☐ 2. Somewhat positive
☐ 3. Somewhat negative
☐ 4. Very negative

☐ 5. Undecided/Neutral

Since your participation on the BCC, have you had any further contact with the BENCHMARK Program?

☐ 1. Yes - If yes, what was it?
☐ 2. No

Below is space for you to write any further comments, suggestions or criticisms about any aspect of the Reports Review Committee process or of the BENCHMARK Program in general.
APPENDIX B

EXAMPLES OF BACKGROUND MATERIALS PRESENTED TO RRC MEMBERS

• Program Brochure
• Newsletter
• Social Report
• Table of Contents (USERS GUIDE)
• Code of Ethics
• Newspaper Stories
• Pictographic Representations of CASP
• List of Social Reports
• List of Community Originated Studies
A Cooperative Community Effort

**BENCHMARK** is a new program in the institutional sense, but it has developed in response to a variety of forces already at work in the community and in response to clear and increasingly strong requests from the community for better information and more sophisticated analytical tools. Columbus—the 21st largest metropolitan area in the United States, located within 500 miles of three-fourths of the nation's population—offers unusual opportunities for mounting an innovative effort at community problem-solving and public education. How a metropolitan area of over one million persons, Central Ohio is the fastest-growing urban area in the northeastern United States. Issues of annexation, regional planning, revenue sharing, service delivery, and growth policy offer opportunities for broadly based public efforts to shape the future social and physical development of the metropolis. Public officials, civic leaders, and other men and women of talent and commitment are already at work exploring new mechanisms for developing goals and assessing their achievement. **BENCHMARK**/COLUMBUS joins a vital, prosperous metropolitan area at a critical moment in its development.

**What is BENCHMARK?**

**BENCHMARK** is a program to help improve the usefulness, quality, and accessibility of the knowledge a metropolitan community needs to shape its future. **BENCHMARK** is based on the assumption that a community's ability to govern itself and control its future depends on the competence of citizens and institutions to find and use the social intelligence and related social technologies required to identify community needs and opportunities. **BENCHMARK** has three objectives:

- To assist the people and institutions of a metropolitan community in using social technologies to identify aspirations, assess needs and establish priorities.
- To extend, apply, and make more useful the existing knowledge about metropolitan areas, their needs, and their problems.
- To provide a common information base for public and private groups and institutions in a community to use in working together to plan the future.

**How is the program organized and funded?**

The **BENCHMARK** Program is directed by Philip M. Burgess, a Senior Fellow in the Academy for Contemporary Problems and a professor of Political Science at The Ohio State University. The Program is supported by grants from private foundations and corporate sponsors, and by funds from The Ohio State University and the United Community Council. The Program is directed by a board of directors, including public officials, business leaders, academic experts, and community leaders. The Program is implemented through a series of projects and initiatives, including workshops, conferences, and publications. **BENCHMARK** is funded by a combination of public and private sources, including foundations, corporations, and government agencies. The Program is supported by a network of partners, including universities, government agencies, and community organizations.
BENCHMARK/COLUMBUS: A Prototype

A prototype of the BENCHMARK concept has been developed in metropolitan Columbus. Specifically, BENCHMARK/COLUMBUS produces a periodic Columbus Area Social Report, based on surveys taken every four months to assess the needs and aspirations of citizens and record their appraisals of progress toward a variety of community goals. Development of the Social Report in collaboration with citizen community groups and agencies, incorporates relevant information that is already being collected for more specialized purposes. The Social Reports integrate and synthesize information on social, economic, and environmental conditions from surveys, census data, institutional accounts, and program evaluations. They respond to the needs of a broad range of community residents—public officials, civic and neighborhood leaders, and those with interests in planning the future of the larger metropolitan region.

BENCHMARK/COLUMBUS is a community program. Its policies and programs are established by the Columbus Community Conference (CCC), a broadly based, voluntary coalition of participants from both public and private sectors. The primary responsibility of the CCC is to ensure that BENCHMARK remains truly responsive to community needs.

How does the Columbus Community Conference function?

The CCC is a "working" rather than an "advisory" group. It includes public officials, community and neighborhood leaders, research performers, and other interested parties. Although this intent has been made to establish arbitrary or mechanical quotas for representation, the CCC brings together a variety of participants with different perspectives and experiences. It convenes at least once a month to ensure community and sustained effort, each participant is expected to attend all working sessions. Those willing to commit themselves to the extensive work required are welcomed; those who cannot allot the time required may easily drop participation.

The CCC membership, changing through time under this open-ended procedure, studies the continuing design and reusage of BENCHMARK community analysis, integrates findings and considers their implications, and focuses attention on the "vital signs" that comprise "benchmarks" for continuing appraisal of community institutions. In selecting programs for BENCHMARK participation, the Columbus Community Conference insures that support is given to those community groups and agencies that are most likely to extend and improve civic competence in dealing with metropolitan or neighborhood needs.

What does the Community Analysis-Assistance Group do?

The Group has four principal missions:

1. To develop and maintain capabilities in survey research, evaluation and assessment, statistical analysis, simulation, report writing, and graphics.
2. To develop methods for integrating, synthesizing, and presenting community data for maximum use by community residents.
3. To prepare handbooks and other materials that can be used by civic leaders and the general public for assessment of community needs, planning, and evaluation.
4. To maintain close liaison with other community groups and institutions that generate and disseminate community data and information.

In addition to providing relevant information in usable form, the Group assists in training community leaders and others in the methods of social analysis, planning, and evaluation. This training program is intended to make the techniques and methodology of the social scientist more accessible to the layman who needs such skills to address community problems.
Current Projects

INSTITUTIONALIZED YOUTH CENTERS

Joe Kelly, an academy fellow in the Social Justice Program, is attempting to classify, for research purposes, all juveniles who are in detention and correctional institutions. This study is being conducted for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in Washington, D.C. It will involve the Academy as well as the Council of State Governments.

It is Joe's opinion that each child should fall into a specific classification that would accurately identify him as a status offender, criminal offender, or non-offender. Status offenders are those juveniles who are charged with, or who have committed, offenses which would not be corrected by adult, juvenile, or, sometimes, community courts. According to recent juvenile justice legislation enacted by the U.S. Congress, status offenders should not be housed in detention homes, county jails, local jails, or state correction facilities, but rather in child welfare facilities or emergency foster homes. The non-offenders are those juveniles who have been detained without having charges pending against them.

A sample of institutions will be drawn from three states: Arizona, Delaware, and Ohio, and from two non-juvenile serving institutions, such as the League of Women Voters in those states, which have had a history of institutional support and help for juvenile residents in these facilities on predetermined days. BENCHMARKS has been asked to design the sampling procedures and to train the volunteers in each of the states. Gayle Biedner, Director of

Field Operations, will begin the training sessions in mid-April, and the project is scheduled to be completed in early June.

- Gayle Biedner

OUTREACH UNDER WRAP

The BENCHMARKS Research Institute has been working with the U.S. office of the Ohio State University in Ohio to develop a study aimed at defining patterns of radio use with specific attention given to radio and television.

With a grant from the Corporation of Public Broadcasting, BENCHMARKS has asked the BENCHMARKS Program to design and conduct a public opinion survey of Franklin County residents to determine whether this study might motivate people to listen to the radio during "Prime Time" evening hours. Showing that many people watch TV out of habit, the idea was to find out whether a public radio station with an informative format would be an appealing alternative for a significant number of potential TV viewers.

Conducting the survey gave BENCHMARKS an opportunity to ask some of the same questions as did the CAPP I because of space limitations, and to test some new sampling and field procedures for telephone interviewing with no eye to CAPP II.

The final report is now being written and is due to be delivered to U.S. radio no later than April 12, 1975. The data will be available to the public May 15, 1975, and BENCHMARKS will prepare a special communications report with the assistance of a report review committee.

- Tom Jones
COS's-New Changing System

One of ECONOMY's biggest problems is the ineffectiveness of computer time which lies at the heart of the reporting process. Without computer time, there would be no Social Reports or Community Oriented Studies (COS's). Because Social Reports are directed to a broad audience and are the core reports from ECON, the cost of computer preparation and distribution is provided for in our budget. COS's are specialized reports prepared for individual requestors; until now we have been charging only an option $5.00 for a COS to cover the cost of research and postage. In order to try and stretch our resources further, we are now initiating, effective immediately, a new charging system for COS's.

At the time a COS is initiated, the requestor will be given an estimate of the total cost to produce it. Then the COS is completed, the requestor will be billed for the costs, which will be broken down into three parts:
1) RESEARCH AND PREPARATION - $1.00 -- no longer optional; 2) RESEARCH -- $1.00 -- no longer optional; 3) MANUFACTURE OR PURCHASE - $2.00 -- not optional.

This new system will begin effective immediately. The old system will continue until all the old requestors have been billed. At that time, the new system will be in place and all requestors will be billed.

COS's-New Charging System

A profile of COS's that respondents who sold housing in their favorite recreational opportunity. The information provided includes data social services charges on respondents' employment, source of income, social services, aspirations, and involvement with police.

Requestors are Jack Bolding, a Ph.D. candidate in Physical Education at U.S.F., and John Atleo.

COS's-New Charging System

112 A comparison of the attitudes and practices of residents in the city of San Francisco to that of the remainder of the city. This study was conducted in cooperation with the San Francisco Public Housing Authority.

Requestors are Ana Lamir and Steve Ballard.

COS's-New Charging System

110 The study looks at the opinions of different age groups about several transportation-related issues. The requestors are Frank Metzger, University District Organizations. Prepared by John Allen.

COS's-New Charging System

111 A comparison of the needs of University area residents with those of the rest of the central city and the remainder of the city. The information deals with housing, social services, employment, capital improvements, transportation, and crime.

Requestors are Frank Metzger, University District Organizations. Prepared by John Allen.

COS's-New Charging System

113 A comparison of the attitudes of residents in the City of San Francisco to that of the remainder of the city. This was conducted in cooperation with the San Francisco Public Housing Authority.

Requestors are Ana Lamir and Steve Ballard.

COS's-New Charging System

112 A comparison of the attitudes and practices of residents in the city of San Francisco to that of the remainder of the city. This study was conducted in cooperation with the San Francisco Public Housing Authority.

Requestors are Ana Lamir and Steve Ballard.
Background Report Text:

Background Reports are written on a variety of different subjects that would not normally be published in any other source.

They may serve as a guide to specific topics or as a source of information.

They may also be used to provide an overview of a particular area.

The purpose of a background report is to provide a comprehensive summary of the available information on a particular subject.

This background report is intended to help readers understand the context and significance of the information contained within it.

It is a valuable resource for those interested in learning about a particular field or topic.

Introducing the Workshop:

If you would like to attend the workshop, please respond to the following questions and return them to the workshop organizers.

The workshop will take place at 10 a.m. on Saturday, March 10th, at the Columbus Area Social Service (CASS). The workshop will cover a variety of topics related to interpreting computer programs.

The workshop will be led by two experts in the field of interpreting computer programs.

Registering for the Workshop:

To register for the workshop, please complete the registration form below.

- Steve Ballard, President
- John Allen, Vice President

Subscription Service:

Libraries in particular, but other organizations and individuals as well, may subscribe to the newsletter. The subscription fee is $50 per year for individual subscribers and $100 per year for institutional subscribers. The newsletter includes a summary of the latest research in the field of interpreting computer programs.

Subscription Form:

Name: ____________________________
Address: __________________________
Phone: ____________________________

Return to:

BECUCHE, 1501 Bell Avenue
Columbus, OH 43201

Subscription Service:
United Way
Governmental Affairs Division

The Columbus Foundation and the Junior League of Columbus are combining United Way to establish a new office of Governmental Affairs. Director Mark Daniels, formerly Director of United Fund, will be the primary contact to coordinate fundraising and evaluation activities. The new office will be staffed by a full-time employee, full-time volunteer coordinator, and part-time volunteer coordinators. The office will be located at 425 S. Fourth Street.

The following are the key objectives of the new office:

1. To establish a new office of Governmental Affairs
2. To coordinate fundraising and evaluation activities
3. To provide a full-time employee and full-time volunteer coordinator
4. To provide part-time volunteer coordinators

Other objectives of the new office include:

1. To develop a new funding source
2. To coordinate fundraising and evaluation activities
3. To provide a full-time employee and full-time volunteer coordinator
4. To provide part-time volunteer coordinators

The new office will be located at 425 S. Fourth Street.

United Way

Governmental Affairs Division

The Columbus Foundation and the Junior League of Columbus are combining United Way to establish a new office of Governmental Affairs. Director Mark Daniels, formerly Director of United Fund, will be the primary contact to coordinate fundraising and evaluation activities. The new office will be staffed by a full-time employee, full-time volunteer coordinator, and part-time volunteer coordinators. The office will be located at 425 S. Fourth Street.

The following are the key objectives of the new office:

1. To establish a new office of Governmental Affairs
2. To coordinate fundraising and evaluation activities
3. To provide a full-time employee and full-time volunteer coordinator
4. To provide part-time volunteer coordinators

Other objectives of the new office include:

1. To develop a new funding source
2. To coordinate fundraising and evaluation activities
3. To provide a full-time employee and full-time volunteer coordinator
4. To provide part-time volunteer coordinators

The new office will be located at 425 S. Fourth Street.
VII. Jennifer Holmes outlined thoughts and concerns about community outreach. Discussion by the conference generated new suggestions for activation scenarios (including a video tape) and for developing informative materials for several different categories of users and audiences.

VIII. Demos suggested that the conference might best be used to undertake specific projects of its own or could participate in staff initiated projects or could simply identify priority for staff projects.

She outlined several project areas that are of interest and concern to the staff:

1) Preparing special CABS reports
2) Offering extended technical assistance (not just CABS related)
3) Background work on prototyping the SANDMAN experience
4) Systematic documentation and preparation of papers for professional journals
5) Development of a speakers' bureau

The meeting ended with small group discussion of several points raised during the evening.

- Jennifer Holmes

Board Actions

March 25

March 15 and 16: Review and discussion of current projects and activities. No actions taken.

March 15: Counseling

March 16: Agendas should prepare a brief paper on CABS II with a summary on budget to be used as an introduction on funding needs.

March 25

CERTIFIED

We are continuing to try to streamline our newsletter mailing list. We hope you find Encountering a useful and interesting publication but, if you don't, we'd like to remove your name from the list.

If you no longer want to receive Encountering, please send the address label on this issue to:

BECKNOX
3131relations
Columbus, Ohio 43211

Also, if you have had a change of address, please let us know. Thank you.

Encountering is published monthly

Instructions for preparing papers for consideration:

1. Submit 2 copies of the paper to the enclosed return address.
2. Include a biography and a brief abstract (no more than 200 words).
3. Submit papers in a typewritten format, double spaced, with margins of at least 1 inch.
4. Indicate the title and authors of the paper.
5. Enclose a self-addressed, stamped envelope for return of manuscript.

JENNIFER HOLMES - Editor

Back as Back to Future Staff - Congratulations to several new future projects on the Backsitting staff!
John and Sue Allen (due in October)
John and Nancy Williams (due in September)
John and Mary Hamilton (due in November)
Social Report
Citizen Preferences for Improving the Criminal Justice System

The Social Reports are based primarily on the data from the first Columbus Area Social Profile (CASP I). When appropriate, the Social Reports incorporate data from other sources—from the Bureau of the Census, from state and local institutions, from program evaluations, and from other relevant resources.

CASP I. The CASP I data are developed as part of a social survey conducted between May 8, 1974, and August 30, 1974. The CASP I interview schedule was administered in person in the homes of 2,001 self-reported Columbus area residents. Each interview lasted approximately one and one-half hours. The questions included in the interview schedule are reprinted in the CASP I SOCIAL Profile, copies of which are available for inspection or for purchase ($5.00) in the RCOCMD Community Conference's Office of Community Services at 500 South Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43215. A copy of the actual CASP I interview schedule is also available for inspection or purchase.

The survey. CASP sampling procedures are designed to produce samples which are representative of the civilian adult population of the selected area of Franklin County. These procedures used, CASP survey results are based on interviews with 2,001 self-reported adults.

Reporting tolerances. TheseSoopsing errors are subject to sampling error. Sampling error measures the amount by which the results from one sample vary from what would be obtained if the entire population had been interviewed. Samples of 2,001 have a tolerance within two percentage points 95% of the time. Results coding errors are generally related to sample size, reports based on subgroups will have different tolerances.

The CASP Project. The CASP I data base includes all the data collected from the CASP I interviews. In addition, selected indicators from the 1970 Census and Bureau updates are integrated with the survey data to form the basis of the CASP data base. Finally, "raw data" that result from initial construction work, are data "ready," and from other ongoing analyses are continually added to the CASP I archive. The CASP I archive is maintained by the RCOCMD Data Center and may be accessed through the RCOCMD INFORMATION SYSTEM (RCIS) Program of the RCOCMD Community Conference (contact Steve Halland, Director; RCIS Program; 500 South Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43215-2585; ext. 217).

In addition, all Social Reports are written with a view to the conditions and requirements of the Code of Ethics of the Community Analysis/Assessment Group and the RCOCMD Community Conference. A copy of the Code is available on request.

INFORMATION CONTACT

Richard Convey
Community Analysis/Assessment Group
432-3700; ext. 217

Eileen Alyea
League of Women Voters
422-0962

David Ferris
Columbus-Franklin County
Criminal Justice Coordinating Council
432-2146

John Forrest
Governor's Initiative of Central Ohio, Inc.
311-1181; ext. 77
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I. Summary

Six out of ten Columbus area residents think that the punishments given to criminals are too easy, while one citizen in ten thinks that the punishments are too harsh. Area-wide, four out of ten residents think that the number one priority in the area of crime and justice is preventing crime by juveniles. Four out of ten blacks, however, think that the number one priority in the area of crime and justice is improving the way people are treated after they are arrested. In addition, citizens agree that approximately 30% of the new resources available for reducing crime and improving justice should be spent on preventing crime by juveniles.

Area residents disagree about how they think the police should spend their time, but approximately one out of two Columbus area residents says that the police do not spend enough time on the following: preventing crime, recovering stolen property, and arresting crooks.

These are highlights of findings from the first Columbus Area Social Profile (CASP 1), in which area residents were asked a series of questions about the criminal justice system. The results reported here—specifically in the third of three Benchmark Social Reports dealing with the criminal justice system—reflect citizens’ preferences about the punishments given to criminals, how money available for improving crime and justice is spent, and how they think the police should spend their time.

II. Punishments Given to Criminals

Six out of ten Columbus area residents say the punishments given to criminals are too easy; fewer than one citizen in ten thinks that the punishments given to criminals are too harsh.

In CASP 1, respondents were asked, "In general, do you think the punishments given to criminals are too harsh, about right, or too easy?" Nineteen percent (19%) of the respondents said that they do not know or that they have no answer when asked this question. Of those citizens who do have an opinion, 27% think that punishments are too harsh, 47% think they are about right, and 4% think they are too easy. When broken down by groups, some notable exceptions to area-wide findings appear. While 92% of the people at the area-wide level say punishments are too harsh, 21% of those who are between the ages of 18 and 24, 22% of those who are black, and 23% of the residents of Central Columbus think that the punishments given to criminals are too harsh. These findings are summarized in Figure 1.

III. Allocating Money for Crime and Justice

Four out of ten (44%) Columbus area residents think that the number one priority in the area of crime and justice is preventing crime by juveniles—a larger percentage of respondents than mention any of four other options suggested to them. In addition, Columbus area residents indicate they would like to see a third of any new resources available for improving crime and justice spent on preventing crime by juveniles.

In CASP 1, respondents were asked on which of the following five options would they most like to see money spent for improving crime...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Top Rank</th>
<th>Next Right</th>
<th>Top Left</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $5,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(484)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 - $9,999</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(531)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $14,999</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(544)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(508)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 and Over</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(509)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results for groups are quite similar to those at the area-wide level, with some notable exceptions. Though 60% of the people at the area-wide level indicate that the number one priority for improving crime and justice is preventing crimes by juveniles, the percentage who feel this way is lower for blacks (18%) and for residents of Central Columbus (21%), and higher for residents of Northwest Columbus (52%). Though 21% of the people at the area-wide level choose improving the way people are handled after they are arrested as the number one priority for improving crime and justice, the percentage who feel this way is higher for those between the ages of 16 and 24 (32%), blacks (42%), and the residents of Central Columbus (33%), and lower for college graduates (13%) and for residents of Northwest Columbus (14%). And finally, though 21% of the people at the area-wide level say that the number one priority for improving crime and justice is rehabilitating criminals, the percentage who feel this way is higher for the ages of 16 and 24 (32%) and lower for those over the age of 65 (13%).
Let's assume that City Council has OK'd spending a certain amount of money (represented by this one chip) to improve crime and justice. You are authorized to spend the money on one of five things—preventing crimes by juveniles, preventing crimes by adults, increasing arrests, improving the way people are handled after they are arrested, and rehabilitating criminals.

Figure 3: Allocating funds for the criminal justice system

1. Preventing crimes by juveniles
2. Preventing crimes by adults
3. Increasing arrests
4. Improving the way people are handled after they are arrested
5. Reforming and rehabilitating criminals

Figure 4: Setting priorities for the allocation of resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Preventing crimes by juveniles</th>
<th>Reforming and rehabilitating criminals</th>
<th>Preventing crimes by adults</th>
<th>Improving the way people are handled after they are arrested</th>
<th>Increasing arrests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Percentage of Resources to Each of the Options</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Citizen Opinions About How the Police Spend Their Time

Approximately one out of two Columbus area residents says that the police do not spend enough time preventing crime, recovering stolen property, and catching crooks.

Columbus area residents were asked, "Do you think the police spend too much time, about the right amount of time, or not enough time on the following things: (1) controlling traffic, (2) recovering stolen property, (3) arresting prostitutes, (4) arresting drunks, (5) catching crooks, (6) helping settle arguments, and (7) preventing crime?" It should be noted that the question refers to how people think the police spend their time; it says nothing about how the police actually do spend their time.

As can be seen in Figure 3, the number of people who failed to answer these questions is quite large. This is especially true in the question referring to arresting prostitutes where one of every four people has no opinion. This high percentage of "don't know" answers suggests either that many Columbus area residents don't know how the police spend their time or that they are undecided about how the police should spend their time on the activity in question. In addition, there is disagreement among Columbus area residents about how they think the police should spend their time, particularly with respect to arresting prostitutes and arresting drunks, and to a lesser extent with respect to helping settle arguments and controlling traffic. Though 21% of Columbus area residents think the police spend too much time arresting prostitutes, 21% think the police spend too little time on this activity. Though 24% say the police spend too much time arresting drunks, 21% say they don't spend enough time.
Likewise, 13% say the police spend too much time helping settle arguments compared to 12% who say they spend too little time; and 13% say they spend too much time controlling traffic compared to 12% who say they don’t spend enough time.

When the results are broken down for groups, differences from area-wide results can be seen, especially for blacks and the residents of Central Columbus. These are reported in Figures 6 and 7. Three out of four blacks think that the police don’t spend enough time recovering stolen property, catching crooks or preventing crime. And among blacks, substantial disagreement exists about whether the police spend too much time or not enough time arresting prostitutes. One out of three blacks (36%) think the police spend too much time arresting prostitutes; and one out of three (36%) thinks the police don’t spend enough time on these activities.

The next social report will deal with “Transportation.” It is tentatively scheduled for release on November 13, 1974.

### Table: Public Opinion of Police Activities in Columbus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Type</th>
<th>Controlling Traffic</th>
<th>Recovering Stolen Property</th>
<th>Arresting Crooks</th>
<th>Arresting Property Infringements</th>
<th>Arresting Drunken Drivers</th>
<th>Arresting Drunken Lingerers</th>
<th>Nuisance</th>
<th>Vandalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $5,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 - $9,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $14,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 and over</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All responses have been adjusted to eliminate those percentages. The percentage of people giving
*No opinion of the area-wide level for each of these activities has been calculated.

**The boundaries for these geographical areas are explained in Figure 6.
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Code of Ethics
SAFEGUARDING OBJECTIVITY:
STATEMENT OF POLICY

One important objective of the BENCHMARK Program is to produce more useful, accessible, reliable, and objective social intelligence and its interpretation in an impartial manner.

Accordingly, the BENCHMARK Program seeks to establish and interpret key social indicators under such auspices and with such safeguards as shall make its findings carry conviction to all sectors and groups of the community. Therefore, the professional and scientific staff of the BENCHMARK Program has adopted a Code of Ethics to which each member is formally committed. The Code establishes standards of conduct and principles of professional practice in the conduct of scientific work and guidelines for professional relationships with the public, with clients or users, and with professional associates.

In addition, no community report of the BENCHMARK staff may be published without the approval of the BENCHMARK Reports Board.

By issuing findings in the form of Social Reports — entirely divorced from recommendations on policy — it is hoped that the products of BENCHMARK/COLUMBUS will aid all thoughtful men and women, however divergent their views of public policy, to base their discussions and deliberations increasingly upon objective knowledge as distinguished from subjective opinion.

CODE OF PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND PRACTICES

All BENCHMARK* staff personnel involved in community social research subscribe to the code of professional ethics and practices outlined in the following paragraphs. Our goal is to support sound research practices.

We pledge ourselves to maintain high standards of scientific competence and integrity in our work, and in our relations both with our clients and with the general public. We further pledge ourselves to reject all tasks or assignments which would be inconsistent with the principles of this code.

THE CODE

I. Principles of Professional Practice in the Conduct of Our Work
A. We shall exercise due care in gathering and processing data, taking all reasonable steps to assure the accuracy and veracity of results.
B. We shall exercise due care in the development of research designs and in the analysis of data.
   1. We shall employ only research tools and methods of analysis which, in our professional judgment, are well suited to the research problem at hand.
   2. We shall not select research tools and methods of analysis because of their special capacity to yield a desired conclusion.
   3. We shall not knowingly make interpretations of research results, nor shall we tacitly permit interpretations, which are inconsistent with the data available.
   4. We shall not knowingly imply that interpretations should be accorded greater confidence than the data actually warrant.
C. We shall describe our findings and methods accurately and in appropriate detail in all research reports.

II. Principles of Professional Responsibility in Our Dealings with People
A. The Public:
   1. We shall protect the anonymity of every respondent in opinion research. We shall hold as privileged and confidential all information which tends to identify the respondent.
   2. We shall cooperate with legally authorized representatives of the public by describing the methods used in our studies.
   3. We shall maintain the right to approve the release of our findings, whether or not ascribed to us. When misinterpretation appears, we shall reserve the right publicly to disclose what is required to correct it, notwithstanding our obligation for client confidentiality in all other respects.
B. Clients or Sponsors:
   1. We shall be mindful of the limitations of our techniques and facilities and shall accept only those research assignments which can be accomplished within these limitations.
   2. We shall not accept research assignments, the results of which cannot be publicly disseminated.
C. The Profession:
   1. We shall not use membership in an association as evidence of professional competence, since many associations do not so certify any persons or organizations.
   2. We recognize our responsibility to contribute to the science of public opinion research and to social science research in general and to disseminate as freely as possible the ideas and findings which emerge from our research.
Newspaper Stories
Experts to Monitor City’s Pulse

By CAROL ANN LEASE
Of the Dispatch Staff

Columbus will have its social pulse monitored in a project that may serve as a prototype for other large U.S. cities, Ralph Widner, director of the Academy for Contemporary Problems, announced Monday.

Benchmark — named after the mark surveyors use as a reference point — is a program to help social service agencies, neighborhoods, governments and others more effectively split up the social service dollar, Widner said.

"NO METROPOLITAN area in the United States really knows how much money is coming into its community and if it's being used effectively," Widner said.

Tom Dillard, executive director of the Model Neighborhood Assembly, who helped organize the project, said Benchmark also will be a place where "just plain folks" can find out what's happening — a sort of "Jimmy the Greek of social sciences."

The Academy, a joint enterprise of Battelle Memorial Institute and Ohio State University, will fund the project aimed to start this month with $100,000 a year for three years.

PHILIP BURGESS, a fellow of the Academy and professor of political science at OSU, said about half the money will be used for supplies, computer time and similar expenses and the other half will pay salaries for the Community Analysis-Assistance Group.

CA-AG is a staff of eight professionals and about six graduate students who will compile data from the census and studies by groups like the Columbus Board of Education and the police department, conduct its own surveys and release a report about every four months, Burgess, director of the group, said.

Widner said Burgess' salary will be paid by a grant from the Marshan Center at Ohio State.

WORKING with CA-AG will be the Columbus Community Conference (CCC). This group of citizens from city government as well as neighborhood groups and social service agencies will decide what areas CA-AG should study and determine ways to focus the community's attention on the problems uncovered, Burgess said.

He added CCC is open to anyone willing to attend meetings and devote time to the project.

MAYOR MOODY pledged support of his staff and said the city probably will be one of the first groups to use the services of Benchmark.

United Community Council first explored the idea of a Columbus area social profile in August, 1972 and chose Dillard and Burgess to look into it. Benchmark was conceived in the spring of this year.

WIDNER SAID those interested in participating through CCC can contact Burgess at Ohio State or Dillard through the Model Neighborhood Assembly.

By late November, Benchmark will be located at the Academy's new headquarters presently under construction at 1901 Neil Ave., he added.

COMMUNITY PROJECT — Mayor Moody, second from right, uses a map at City Hall to discuss the Benchmark program with others working on the project. From left are Ralph R. Widner, director of the Academy for Contemporary Problems; Tom Dillard, executive director of the Model Neighborhood Assembly; Philip Burgess, director of a staff which will compile research for the project, and Samuel Fetter, president of United Community Council. (Dispatch Photo by 1000 Exhibit)
County’s ‘Picture’ Finished

By CAROL ANN LEASE
Of The Dispatch Staff

A “social profile” survey of Franklin County drew many obvious responses and some paradoxical answers about the way residents feel about the quality of life in metropolitan Columbus.

Most people interviewed by Benchmark indicated they are relatively satisfied with their lives and that they consider crime and public safety as the biggest areawide problems.

BENCHMARK, a project of the Academy for Contemporary Problems, 1501 Nell Ave., was started to provide citizens who don’t have technical research knowledge with a voice in decisions about the directions metropolitan Columbus should take.

Among those surveyed who were working, 64 percent said they were “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with their jobs, but only 11 percent said they were “very satisfied” with their incomes.

BECAUSE OF the sampling methods used, the figures in the reports will differ at most only about 2 percent, up or down from the information that would have been obtained if all people in Franklin County had been interviewed, the Benchmark staff claimed.

The first survey was to have been completed last December but was bogged down by the Columbus Community Conference, which tells the professional staff of Benchmark what issues to study.

Interviews with 2,401 Franklin County residents were completed in August and will provide the basis for a series of reports, ranging from issues such as community aspirations to feelings about recreation and housing. One report will be released about every two weeks.

RESULTS ARE PROJECTED

Continued from Page 1

Demographic Survey

Results Are Projected

Only 40 percent of those interviewed said they are “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with their physical health, but 33 percent reported a “great deal of stress” over the past year.

More than four out of five said they have family physicians; but in nearly half of the household at least one person had been treated in a hospital emergency room in the past year.

Employment. Fifteen percent of those surveyed said they could not find a job last year because of lack of experience; 12 percent cited lack of job and another 12 percent said lack of skill or training kept them out of work.

Five percent cited discrimination against women, older people and the disabled, and four percent said they were discriminated against for being black or a member of another minority group.

Most — 63 percent — said schools should spend more money on vocational and job skills programs; and 81 percent said more special programs are needed for slow learners and gifted students.

Columbus Dispatch, September 29, 1974.
Crime, safety big concerns

City residents 'satisfied'

By Nancy Mevicar
Columbus Journal Staff Writer

Crime and public safety are the major concerns of Columbus area residents, a recent survey shows, but in general, people here have a high level of satisfaction with their everyday lives.

The first Columbus Area Social Profile, a scientific survey of some 2,401 area residents, was released Sunday by Dr. Philip Burgess of the Academy for Contemporary Problems.

FIELD work on the survey began May 3 and continued through Aug 20. Specially trained persons conducted the interviews with a scientifically-selected cross-section of area residents. Each interview lasted about one hour and 45 minutes.

Burgess said the social reports are intended "to promote open, public discussion of issues facing the metropolitan area," and therefore make it easier to solve current social problems.

THE FIRST report shows that one of every four persons responding to an open-ended question about the biggest area-wide problem, said "crime."

Crime was also the top "neighborhood problem" listed by residents.

Other problems cited by a significant number of people were urban growth and expansion, drug use, lack of sufficient income, housing, and intracity transportation.

ONE part of the survey residents were given a list of possible neighborhood problems and asked to rate each one as "very serious," "somewhat serious," or "not very serious."

Crime was not included in the list, but drugs and juvenile delinquency were and they appear near the top of the list of concerns.

Also identified by at least half of those surveyed as being very or somewhat serious problems were "unsafe places for children to play" and "lack of parks."

Sewers, financial support for the schools, air pollution, and bus service fill out the problems identified as serious by at least 40 per cent of the citizens in the Columbus metropolitan area.

MORE THAN half of those interviewed were not optimistic about solving the problems they identified.

Most placed the responsibility for dealing with those problems on local government, rather than state or federal officials.

When citizens were asked to rate the safety of their neighborhoods, 61 per cent reported them to be "very safe" or "safe." 17 per cent were "uncertain," and 18 per cent said their neighborhood is "unsafe" or "very unsafe."

NEARLY half of all those living in the metropolitan area have taken some protective precautions to protect their homes and families over the past few years. One out of 20 households reported having purchased a gun. About 21 per cent have improved the locks, and smaller numbers have improved lighting, acquired a dog, installed a burglar alarm, or taken a self-defense course.

Citizen satisfaction with the quality of life was measured on a 3-point scale ranging from "very satisfied" to "very dissatisfied."

More than 60 per cent said they are satisfied with the amount of leisure time they have, and with the opportunities for recreation. More than 50 per cent of those surveyed said they are satisfied with their household income, the quality of air here, and the Columbus environment in general.

Citizen support for the public schools and postsecondary educational institutions appears to run moderately high.

ABOUT 76 per cent said they are well satisfied with opportunities for training and education.

In the area of health, three of every four residents said they are satisfied with their health, but when asked if the past year had been a period of stress, 31 per cent reported "a great deal."

Nearly 50 per cent reported "some" stress, and 30 per cent reported "not very much."

MORE THAN four out of five residents report having a family doctor, but 40 per cent have not had a physical examination in the past year.

The survey shows area residents make heavy demands on hospital emergency rooms. Nearly half of those questioned said one or more members of their household had visited an emergency room over the past 12 months.

Later reports will give more details on the quality of life, election returns, and other key questions and ratings on the basis of different racial, ethnic, class, and neighborhood areas in the Columbus metropolitan area.

Illuminating Benchmarks

With some notable exceptions, it is reassuring to learn that residents of metropolitan Columbus are reasonably satisfied with their social and economic well-being at this particular time.

*Such an attitude ordinarily fits the established character of the community, except, perhaps, in times of national upheaval, of which this is not one.

Yet, according to the Academy of Contemporary Problems, which draws this community's social profile, the majority of people, nevertheless, are not really confident the problems they perceive will be readily solved.

Given the traditional economic diversity of the area, it seems entirely reasonable the Academy's benchmark study should find that 84 percent are "very satisfied" or "satisfied" with their present employment.

But that only 11 percent say "they are "very satisfied" with their present income would seem to follow logically, considering the rapid erosion of inflation which began with last winter's oil crisis and which continues unabated.

The Academy's initial benchmarks also show general satisfaction with present transportation conditions, with personal health—although significant stress is felt with that—and with overall quality of education.

Along with these satisfactions, there are some apparent apprehensions and possibly some contradictions which we might bear watching.

In contrast to metropolitan Columbus' normally low unemployment rate, the benchmark study reveals 13 percent did not get jobs during the past year for lack of experience.

Some 12 percent said they were out of work because there were no jobs and another 12 percent said they were out of work for lack of skill for the job that was open.

These findings well might account for the fact that 83 percent, while feeling present educational quality satisfactory, nevertheless think more job skills should be taught in the schools.

That, too, fits with the overall public attitude that has been evident for some time.

Where the people of the community are found to be most disturbed is in their personal safety and the growing onslaught of crime.

That one-fourth of the residents feel more threatened by criminal violence now than they did a year ago is the most significant exception found by the Benchmark study.

Nor should it surprise anyone as much as the whole nation is being inundated by it.

The Academy of Contemporary Problems' Benchmark study comes at a time when it is needed.

Not only does it reflect how the citizens of metropolitan Columbus view their present circumstances, but it is bound to reflect as well how and in what directions they may proceed to overcome existing and foreseeable problems.

With the first one posted, each person can look forward to future benchmarks along the way by which to set a course.

Columbus Dispatch, October 3, 1974.
Columbus majority favors police board of review

By NANCY McVICAR
Columbus Citizen Journal Staff Writer

A clear majority of Columbus area residents favor some form of civilian review process for City police, according to the Columbus Area Social Profile second report.

The report also deals with the diverse views expressed by area residents on neighborhood needs, policy preferences and individual values.

RESULTS of the area-wide survey done by the Benchmark program at the Academy for Contemporary Problems will be released at irregular intervals over the next several weeks.

During the interview of some 2,601 persons for the survey, the question was asked "Do you favor or oppose setting up a citizens board to review the actions of Columbus police?"

FIFTY-SEVEN per cent said they favored such a board, 35 per cent opposed it, and 7 per cent were undecided.

Support for the principle of a civilian review of police is very unevenly divided among different groups and areas of the metropolitan region, the report shows.

STRONGEST support for a civilian review board is found among the following groups:

- Those who identify themselves as "Democrat," "Independents," or "Liberal.",
- Households whose annual income is under $10,000— and especially those with incomes under $6,000;
- Young people 18-25 years old; and blacks;
- Residents located in "Central Columbus" and "Near East Columbus.

The most substantial opposition comes from people 65 and over, Republicans, self-identified "Conservatives," residents of "Northwest Columbus," and those who have lived in Columbus 11 years or more.

JUST AS the support for the idea of a civilian review board varies with income among various groups, the overall needs of citizens appear to vary from group to group.

The first social report released Sunday, "Identified the most important social concerns were crime and juvenile delinquency.

A further breakdown by ideology, age, race, income, and income.

Continued on Page 2, Col. 1

Board of review favored, poll says

- From Page One

The needs of blacks and low-income groups are consistently 10 to 20 points higher than the average, the report shows. (See accompanying chart for complete breakdown.)

The survey also showed that those who identify themselves as "liberals" are much less likely to affirm the value of morality and somewhat more likely to value knowledge than are those who identify themselves as "conservatives."

TO MEASURE the aspirations of Columbus residents, a list of "values" was presented and each person was asked to rate them as very important, somewhat important, or not very important.

Some 96 per cent said good health was very important. Next highest ranked was "Being Lived," 97 per cent; "Being Happy," 95 per cent; "Having Respect," 93 per cent; "Being Knowledgeable," 78 per cent; "Being Religious or Moral," 67 per cent, and, at the bottom, "Having Influence," only 9 per cent, and "Being Wealthy," only 7 per cent.

OLDER PEOPLE tend to value health, knowledge, skill and morality more than other age groups. The survey showed, and they give lower marks to wealth and influence than women.

The results also showed that women gave somewhat stronger affirmation to morality than men, who are more likely to place importance on skills and influence than women.

Similarly, blacks rated the value of having skills, know-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE GROUP</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 8,000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000 - 14,999</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 - 19,999</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 and Over</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>10+</th>
<th>20+</th>
<th>40+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>Franklin County</th>
<th>Swatai County</th>
<th>North County</th>
<th>Northwest County</th>
<th>West County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEIGHBORHOOD PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED — Residents surveyed by Benchmark for the Columbus Area Social Profile were asked to rate the problems at the top of the chart as to seriousness in their neighborhood. Read the table down each column to compare each population group with the area-wide average at the top. Each number refers to the percentage of those questioned who said that problem is “very serious” in their neighborhood.
Residents polled on justice

Survey shows news media mistrust

By NANCY McVICAR
News-Journal Staff Writer

Columbus news media got a bad report card from area residents responding to a survey on their opinions about the police and courts in metropolitan Columbus.

Residents were asked to rate their chances of being treated fairly by the police, their lawyer, the judge, the jury, and the news media in the event they were charged with a crime.

NEARLY HALF, 47 percent, said they felt their chances of being treated fairly by the news media were "not very good."

It was the only question on the survey regarding the media and there is nothing in the report to indicate why people responded the way they did.

The results are part of the latest Benchmark Columbus Area Social Profile and the first of three reports in the criminal justice area.

ONE OF EVERY four Columbus area residents indicated his opinion of the police had changed as a result of incidents in which police were accused of brutality.

Five percent said they felt more favorable toward the police after the incidents, while 91 percent said they felt less favorable.

Generally speaking, area residents have a positive image of the police, the report said.

NEARLY HALF the people surveyed reported having some personal contact with police during the past year. The number jumps to 47 percent for blacks, 31 percent for those 15 to 34, and 37 percent for Central Columbus residents.

Poll shows news media distrust

*From Page One*

equally in court, the survey showed.

MOST, HOWEVER, believe if they were ever accused of a crime, they would be treated fairly by the police, their lawyer, the judge and the jury. (But not the news media.)

Of the people who had an opinion on the fairness of the courts, 71 percent said some people get better treatment than others.

Opinions on local criminal justice vary widely when the results are broken down by income, age, education, sex, race, and location of residency.

FOR EXAMPLE, only 19 percent of all Columbus area residents believe their chances of being treated fairly by police are not very good, but the number jumps to 47 percent for blacks, 31 percent for those 15 to 34, and 37 percent for Central Columbus residents.

Citzens were asked to assess their image of the police according to eight different characteristics: trained, fair, courteous, honest, strong, gentle, quick to respond, and calm.

Again, opinions varied from group to group. For example, only 38 percent of the blacks responding said they felt police are courteous, compared with 72 percent of the whites.

ONLY 31 percent of the residents of Central Columbus rated police as honest compared with 74 percent in Northwest Columbus.

Area-wide the ratings were: trained, 72 percent; fair, 60 percent; courteous, 66 percent; honest, 59 percent; strong, 63 percent; gentle, 38 percent; quick to respond, 58 percent; and calm, 56 percent.

THE FIGURES do not include the persons who had no opinions in those areas.

The second report in the three-part series on citizens perceptions of the criminal justice system will deal with how citizens view crime. It is tentatively set for release Oct. 28.

The third, to be released about Oct. 31, will deal with citizen preferences for improving the criminal justice system.

Continued on Page 2, Col. 3

Many crimes in city are not reported

By NANCY MCVICAR
Columbus Citizen-Journal Staff Writer

Nearly one-fifth of all Columbus area residents have been the victim of a crime within the past year which they did not report to authorities.

That is the finding of the latest Benchmark Columbus Area Social Profile and the second of three reports concerned with citizens' perceptions of crime and justice locally.

OF THE PERSONS who said they did not report a crime, the reasons most often given were: They didn't want to get the criminal in trouble, 30 per cent; they didn't want to get the criminal in trouble, 30 per cent; they didn't know if the crime was committed, 27 per cent.

Four types of crime accounted for approximately 61 per cent of all unreported crimes: theft, 28 per cent; burglary, 14 per cent; vandalism, 13 per cent; and drugs, 7 per cent.

for not reporting crime

were: They couldn't prove a crime was committed, 10 per cent; they were not entirely sure what took place was a crime, 14 per cent; or they didn't want to get the criminal in trouble, 9 per cent.

Twenty-two per cent of the residents of the metropolitan area regard crime as the biggest area-wide problem, and 70 per cent of those persons said they think it will get worse.

The report indicates a majority of Columbus area residents said:

• Their neighborhoods are safe, 86 per cent;
• They feel personally safe and secure, 71 per cent;
• Their neighborhoods are safe or safer than a year ago, 72 per cent.

THREE OUT of five residents of the area said property-related crimes pose the greatest problem or danger to their neighborhoods.

Many crimes in city are not reported

Residents of Central Columbus, 44 per cent;
• Those with annual income under $5,000, 30 per cent;
• Those with grade school education, 30 per cent;
• Those between 18 and 24 years old, 25 per cent;
• Blacks, 20 per cent;
• Those who feel their neighborhoods the safest included persons whose annual income is over $23,000; persons over the age of 65, and residents of Northwest Columbus.

THREE OUT of five residents of the area said property-related crimes pose the greatest problem or danger to their neighborhoods.

Also, 21 per cent said they are "very afraid" of being a victim of the crime they think is the greatest problem in their neighborhood.

NEARLY HALF of the people in Columbus have taken some special precaution to protect their homes and families from crime during the past few years, the survey showed.

The most frequently cited precaution—taken by one-third of the residents—was locking windows and doors or installing locks.

Other precautions included:

• Improved lighting at their homes, 17 per cent;
• Nine per cent have purchased guns;
• Nine per cent have purchased security blankets.
• Smaller numbers bought more insurance, took self-defense courses, installed burglar alarms, engraved their property for identification purposes, or have asked neighbors or the police to watch their house when they're gone.

The next social report will deal with "Citizen Preferences for Improving the Criminal Justice System" and is tentatively scheduled for release Thursday.

Continued on Page 2, Col. 4.

Concern for Safety Behind Barricade

TWO-THIRDS of Greater Columbus residents may be satisfied with their personal safety, but apparently many of them have their fingers crossed when they say so.

Half of the area’s residents have taken extra precautions during the last few years, mostly by installing better locks in their homes, buying guns and improving lighting.

OTHERS have installed alarm systems, taken self-defense courses, marked their possessions and bought extra insurance.

Twenty-two percent of the people say crime is the major problem of their daily lives in their respective communities and they genuinely fear for their personal safety.

This means that 12 percent do not quite know what to make of the situation.

These attitudes have not been so clearly delineated before by those living in the metropolitan Columbus area. Now they are brought to light as part of the social environment by the Benchmark study made by the Academy of Contemporary Problems.

SOME PEOPLE will say that, by comparison with other large cities, ours is a decently safe community, considering the rampant upsurge of crime across the country.

In that context, this is probably true, but the picture, nevertheless, is a grim one.

Some of the Benchmark survey’s findings, based on personal interviews with a cross-section of 2,401 residents, coincide with the nation’s crime pattern in large urban areas.

THE MORE frequent victims of crime and, thus, the more fearful, are the blacks and others living in the so-called poorer and high-population density districts. In Columbus’ case, the victimizing and fear are most concentrated in central-east section and in the Ohio State University district.

Those living in the more affluent northwest quadrant are less victimized by both crime against person and property and, thus, feel more secure.

But that, too, is changing, as police crime statistics show, but which are not included in the Benchmark study per se. No longer is any neighborhood really secure from the criminal.

The more affluent neighborhoods may feel more secure, but they, too, have armed and barricaded themselves behind locked doors to a far greater extent than they ever have before.

And what of the fear all too many express that crime will get worse?

NO SOONER had they voiced it than the Columbus Police Department released its figures for the first nine months of the year, showing serious crime up 22 percent over last year.

This is about 6 percent above the national crime average and if it continues at that rate for the rest of the year the increase will reach 30 percent. The huge increase, of course, includes burglary and petty theft.

But what is more alarming is that crime against persons is growing even faster, in this order — rape, aggravated assault and armed robbery.

CLEARLY, what the people of the metropolitan community think about crime as reflected in the Benchmark study and the police agencies’ figures as to its nature go hand in hand.

The Academy of Contemporary Problems has begun an essential social profile of the citizen and his attitude toward crime. Out of that profile, in time, hopefully, will come solutions to the fears and barricades of the present.

Columbus Dispatch, November 1, 1974.
Survey shows 41 per cent believe in bus services

By NANCY V.-VICAR
Citizen-Journal Staff Writer

About 41 per cent of Columbus Area residents consider bus service important, and a majority have a positive image of the service provided by Central Ohio Transit Authority (COTA).

Area residents were asked a series of questions about transportation needs and services by the Columbus Area Social Profile survey taken during the summer.

RESULTS, published by the Benchmark program at the Academy for Contemporary Problems, showed 78 per cent of the area residents could identify the organization responsible for bus service, COTA, while 2 per cent gave a wrong answer and 20 per cent said they didn't know.

Forty per cent of the population said availability of bus service in their neighborhood is either a very serious or somewhat serious problem.

IN RELATION to 13 other issues, the availability of bus service ranked eighth, according to the percentage of people who think it is a very serious problem.

Importance of bus service varies for different income groups, racial groups, and geographic areas.

For example, 63 per cent of those with incomes under $4,000 say bus service is important to them personally, while only 24 per cent of those with incomes over $25,000 consider it important to them.

THE GROUPS for whom bus service is most important, by their own evaluation, include blacks, 46 per cent; residents of Central Columbus, 39 per cent; those with a grade-school education, 38 per cent, and those 65 years old or over, 37 per cent.

Of those people who say bus service is "very important" to them, 34 per cent say they are dissatisfied with their transportation opportunities.

IN GENERAL, however, Columbus area residents have positive images of bus service with notable exceptions being the cost of bus fare and the speed of service.

The most positive image is related to the safety of buses, with 71 per cent rating them as safe.

Buses are also rated more positively than negatively for cleanliness (64 per cent) and convenience (52 per cent).

About 38 per cent of those interviewed said fares are too expensive, while 23 per cent said they feel the fares are cheap.

RESIDENTS were asked "What do you consider a reasonable cost for a one-way bus ride?"

Thirty-seven per cent said 50 cents is reasonable, 29 per cent said 30 to 45 cents is reasonable, and 23 per cent said 25 cents is reasonable.

Columbus residents were also asked how late at night they thought bus service should run during the week. Thirty-seven per cent said service should run until midnight, and about 11 per cent said the service should continue later than midnight.

ANOTHER 16 per cent favor 24-hour service.

The most positive image of bus service is found among citizens 65 years old or older. COTA service is available to them at 25 cents during non-rush hours, while standard one-way fare is 50 cents.

The oldsters rated COTA service higher than anyone else, in all categories of the survey.
Survey cites job barriers

One out of three Central Ohio residents had difficulty getting or keeping a job last year, according to the latest Benchmark Social Report, "Employment Situation and Related Issues."

The report, 12th in a series, deals with the kinds of problems people have in getting or keeping jobs, sources of personal income, job satisfaction, and the attitudes toward working wives.

"The two single most prevalent barriers to employment appear to be inadequate experience on the part of the applicant and a lack of jobs," according to Dennis Benson, Benchmark director.

The survey identified four distinct types of employment barriers:

- Discriminatory practices by employers;
- Inadequate job skills;
- Barriers inherent in the social system, such as lack of day care or transportation; and
- Health problems.

The report shows barriers to employment are not randomly distributed among the entire population. Certain groups experience barriers with a much higher frequency than other groups. An average of 36 per cent of the households indicated one or more barriers had been encountered, but some types of households show much higher (and much lower) frequency than the average 36 per cent.

Groups with much higher frequency included those 18 to 24-year-old, 61 per cent; single persons, 58 per cent, and non-whites, 50 per cent.

Groups with fewer problems of employment included persons 65 and older, 12 per cent; persons 45 to 65, 20 per cent, and persons with income over $10,000, 30 per cent.

The report also showed 81 per cent of the persons employed are generally satisfied with their jobs.

White collar workers (86 per cent) are slightly more satisfied than blue collar workers (81 per cent), the survey showed.

Households above $15,000 income are more satisfied (92 per cent) than households under $10,000, (78 per cent). People over 44 (93 per cent) are more satisfied than people under 25 (70 per cent).

Married persons (85 per cent) were more satisfied with their jobs than single persons (76 per cent). Women (86 percent) are slightly more satisfied with their jobs than men (82 per cent). Whites (86 per cent) are more satisfied than non-whites (77 per cent).

Columbus residents were asked to identify the types of income for their households. Some 83 per cent said salary, wages, fees, commissions, royalties or tips, and 51 per cent said they received some income from stock or bond dividends or savings account interest.

Residents were asked a series of questions in an effort to measure the attitudes toward working wives. The results show the overall attitude is positive.

The study showed general agreement that employment provides interesting outside contacts for a wife, that her income helps raise the family's standard of living, and that employment of both parents helps beat the high cost of living.

Sixty-eight per cent of those surveyed said they didn't feel working wives lose interest in their homes or families.

Those surveyed were almost evenly split on whether the employment of wives leads to more juvenile delinquency.

The survey was based on personal interviews with a representative sample of 2,481 Columbus residents during the summer of 1974. All reports resulting from the survey are available at no cost from the Benchmark Program, Academy for Contemporary Problems.

The next social report will deal with child care and is scheduled for release later this month.

Benchmark survey reveals Columbus employment barriers

...Continued on Page 3, Col. 4

Pictographic representation of CASP
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The Dissemination & Utilization of CASP Data

Social Reports

Community-Originated Studies
List of Social Reports
ASPECTS OF THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN METROPOLITAN COLUMBUS

This report presents highlights from the first Columbus Area Social Profile. In general, Columbus area residents express a high level of satisfaction with most aspects of their everyday lives. In addition, crime and general "public safety" issues are the highest ranking concerns of area residents. Other selected questions are examined. (Philip Burgess; 15 pages; September 1974)

INDICATORS OF DIVERSITY IN METROPOLITAN AREA ASPIRATIONS

This report is also an overview and deals primarily with a civilian review process for the Columbus police, general neighborhood problems, and community values. (Philip Burgess; 15 pages; October 1974)

THE QUALITY OF HOUSING IN METROPOLITAN COLUMBUS

This report deals with the Housing module of the CASP. Specifically, it examines citizen satisfaction with housing, problems with housing, and barriers to improved housing. (Steven Ballard; 15 pages; October 1974)

CITIZEN OPINIONS ABOUT THE POLICE AND THE COURTS IN METROPOLITAN COLUMBUS

This is the first of three Social Reports dealing with the Crime module of the CASP. This report deals with citizen contact with the Courts and the Police, the administration of Justice, citizen images of the police, and citizen reactions to accusations of police brutality. (Richard Conway; 11 pages; October 1974)

CITIZEN PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME

This report deals with the Crime and Justice section of CASP. This report looks at citizen assessments of personal and neighborhood, fear of crime, precautions taken by citizens against crime, and the failure of victims to report crime. (Richard Conway; 11 pages; October 1974)

CITIZEN PREFERENCES FOR IMPROVING THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

This is the last of three Social Reports concerning the Crime and Justice section of CASP. This report examines citizen opinions about how the police spend their time. (Richard Conway; 14 pages; November 1974)

INDICATORS OF TRANSPORTATION NEEDS AND PRACTICES

This is the first of two Social Reports on the CASP Transportation module. This report deals with the availability of transportation, train service, transportation and employment patterns, and general satisfaction with transportation opportunities. (Steven Ballard; 15 pages; November 1974)

CITIZEN OPINIONS OF HIS SERVICE IN METROPOLITAN COLUMBUS

This is the second of two Social Reports on the CASP Transportation Information. This report examines the importance of bus service to Columbus area residents, bus fares, preferences for scheduling, and citizen images of bus service. (Steven Ballard; 17 pages; November 1974)

(Continued)
CITIZEN PERCEPTIONS OF SOCIAL SERVICE NEEDS AND AGENCIES IN METROPOLITAN COLUMBUS

In this report, citizen perceptions of social service needs are examined, particularly the need to show concern, the need to provide assistance, and priorities among types of assistance. In addition, the report studies where citizens go for help or advice and images of service agencies and programs. (Richard Conway; 15 pages; January 1975)

CITIZEN PERCEPTIONS ABOUT SELECTED NEIGHBORHOOD FACILITIES

This report focuses on the Capital Improvements section of the survey. Items examined include perceptions of the conditions of neighborhood streets, adequacy of street lights and storm sewers, and most needed neighborhood improvements. (Jonathan Benson; 12 pages; February 1975)

CITIZEN PERCEPTIONS OF HEALTH AND EMERGENCY FACILITIES

The Health Social Report deals with preventive health care including standard medical exams and smoking habits as well as emergency facilities including use of emergency rooms and proximity to emergency medical facilities. (Thomas Conrad and Michael Schwartz; 12 pages; February 1975)

EMPLOYMENT SITUATION AND RELATED ISSUES

This report looks at perceived barriers to employment, sources of personal income, job satisfaction, and attitudes toward working wives. (Dennis Benson and Philip Burgess; 12 pages; May 1975)

THE NEED FOR CHILD CARE IN THE COLUMBUS METROPOLITAN AREA

This report examines the level of need for child care, the people who have a need for daily child care, citizen views concerning important aspects of child care facilities, location of day care centers, problems with employment due to lack of day care centers and satisfaction with child care facilities. (Jonathan Benson; 13 pages; May 1975)

FOOD SHOPPING AND SPENDING

This report examines the criteria people use for choosing a food store and the patterns of food spending in the Columbus area. (Thomas Conrad; 13 pages; July 1975)

RECREATION AND LEISURE ACTIVITIES

Behavior and preference of adults with respect to recreational activities and opportunities are examined. People's satisfaction with available recreational facilities and willingness to pay entrance fees are also reported. (John Allen; 19 pages; August 1975)

CITIZEN PERCEPTIONS OF EDUCATION

This is the final report in the BENCHMARK Social Report series for CAP-1 and deals with citizens' perceptions of the quality of public and higher education compared to three years ago, spending priorities for public school programs, parental influence on public school programs and policies, the importance of various activities for institutions of higher education, and overall satisfaction with educational opportunities.
List of Community Originated Studies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONS NUMBER</th>
<th>MEMOIRE</th>
<th>TITRE/THÈME</th>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>RÉSUMÉ</th>
<th>BUTS</th>
<th>RÉSEPTE STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Legislative Service Committee</td>
<td>&quot;Light Rail Passenger Study&quot;</td>
<td>Computer printout: margin for selected transportation initiatives</td>
<td>To aid assessment of potential ridership on light rail passenger system</td>
<td>Released: 11/16/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>Governor's Task Force on Credit for Housing</td>
<td>&quot;Credit Reform in Corporate Housing&quot;</td>
<td>Written report profiling groups over 20% of total credit demand</td>
<td>Include in written report to Governor</td>
<td>Released: 11/16/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>Columbus Community Service Office</td>
<td>&quot;Initiatives of Child Care, Education, and Social Services in Metropolitan Columbus&quot;</td>
<td>Computer printout: selected initiatives in child care, education, and social services</td>
<td>Assessment of need for social services in area</td>
<td>Released: 11/16/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>Hartford Community Council</td>
<td>&quot;Hartford Profile of Hartford Community&quot;</td>
<td>Written report profiling characteristics of area and identifying areas with recreation patterns</td>
<td>Use as basis for a proposal for recreation center</td>
<td>Released: 11/16/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>Columbus Bureau of Development</td>
<td>&quot;Building Conditions in Different Areas&quot;</td>
<td>Computer printout: Building codes and selected demographics</td>
<td>Impact on development plan and program for community development</td>
<td>Released: 11/16/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>Columbus Area Redevelopment Corporation</td>
<td>&quot;Columbus Area Redevelopment Study&quot;</td>
<td>Computer printout: crime and justice, housing, and transportation needs</td>
<td>Input to research and planning study for this area</td>
<td>Released: 11/16/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>Columbus Public Schools</td>
<td>&quot;Opportunities in Columbus&quot;</td>
<td>Computer printout: educational opportunities broken down by demographics</td>
<td>Input to study by Department of Education, Research and Planning</td>
<td>Released: 11/16/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>Columbus Area Redevelopment Corporation</td>
<td>&quot;Opportunities in Columbus&quot;</td>
<td>Written report profiling areas and needs of available recreation facilities</td>
<td>Impact to study of area need for recreation facilities</td>
<td>Released: 11/16/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>Community-Coordinated Child Care</td>
<td>&quot;Study of Child Care Needs&quot;</td>
<td>Computer printout: Margins for specified service areas</td>
<td>Input to analysis of planning and service coordination for area child care</td>
<td>Released: 11/30/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>Columbus Police Department</td>
<td>&quot;Anual analysis of Crime and Justice&quot;</td>
<td>Computer printout: marginal data by major-offense areas</td>
<td>Input to planning and research</td>
<td>Released: 11/16/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>Volunteers in Probation</td>
<td>&quot;Volunteers&quot;</td>
<td>Written report: profiling community volunteers</td>
<td>Information to be used in volunteer recruitment</td>
<td>Released: 11/16/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>HCD</td>
<td>&quot;Crime and Juvenile Delinquency Study&quot;</td>
<td>Computer printout: Profile of citizens initiating acts of violence against crime</td>
<td>Follow-up on data released in Social report</td>
<td>Released: 11/20/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>Inner City Coalition</td>
<td>&quot;Old Town Columbus&quot;</td>
<td>Computer printout: Profile of inner-city residents</td>
<td>Aid to re-development plan for inner city</td>
<td>Released: 11/30/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>HOPE</td>
<td>&quot;Housing Needs Among Low-Income Areas&quot;</td>
<td>Computer printout: Housing needs broken down by socio-economic areas</td>
<td>Impact to housing-related studies</td>
<td>Released: 11/30/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>Academy for Contemporary Studies</td>
<td>&quot;Social Service Patterns&quot;</td>
<td>Computer printout: Social service patterns</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Released: 11/30/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td>JCSS</td>
<td>&quot;Social Service Patterns&quot;</td>
<td>Computer printout: Social service patterns</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Released: 11/30/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
<td>JCSS</td>
<td>&quot;Social Service Patterns&quot;</td>
<td>Computer printout: Social service patterns</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Released: 11/30/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>JCSS</td>
<td>&quot;Social Service Patterns&quot;</td>
<td>Computer printout: Social service patterns</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Released: 11/30/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>JCSS</td>
<td>&quot;Social Service Patterns&quot;</td>
<td>Computer printout: Social service patterns</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Released: 11/30/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>JCSS</td>
<td>&quot;Social Service Patterns&quot;</td>
<td>Computer printout: Social service patterns</td>
<td>Informational</td>
<td>Released: 11/30/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>TITLE/TOPIE</th>
<th>AUTHOR(S)</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C22</td>
<td>Attitudes Toward the Community in the Sheltered Area</td>
<td>Douglas Yiela</td>
<td>Released: 6/10/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C23</td>
<td>Elderly Housing Project Needs and Problems in the Driving Path Area</td>
<td>League of Women Voters</td>
<td>Released: 5/10/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C24</td>
<td>Health Care Problems in the Mount Carmel Medical Center Neighborhood</td>
<td>Martha Seiteralli</td>
<td>Released: 3/19/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C25</td>
<td>FP: Tests for Older Men</td>
<td>Community Health Care Service</td>
<td>Released: 3/10/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C26</td>
<td>An Assessment of Service Needs in the Millipede Area</td>
<td>Catholic Social Service</td>
<td>Released: 4/10/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C27</td>
<td>Demographic Profile of Attitudes Toward Education</td>
<td>Donald Thomas - Columbus Tech. Institute</td>
<td>Released: 5/10/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C28</td>
<td>Demographic Profile of Northwest Columbus</td>
<td>Northwest Area Human Relations Council</td>
<td>Released: 4/10/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C29</td>
<td>An Assessment of Service Needs and Community Attitudes</td>
<td>Southwest Community Health Center</td>
<td>Released: 7/10/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C30</td>
<td>Attitudes Toward Transportation by Young People</td>
<td>Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>Released: 4/25/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C31</td>
<td>Employment Opportunities for Older People</td>
<td>Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>Released: 4/25/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C32</td>
<td>Occupational Needs of Older Age Groups</td>
<td>Open Attitude Recreation Dept.</td>
<td>Released: 6/10/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C33</td>
<td>Profile of the Northside</td>
<td>Goldie</td>
<td>Released: 12/10/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C34</td>
<td>The Political and Community Environment of the Eighth Ward Area</td>
<td>Mike Black</td>
<td>Released: 7/10/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C35</td>
<td>An Analysis of Income and Housing Needs and Priorities</td>
<td>Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission</td>
<td>Released: 7/10/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C36</td>
<td>Human Rights and Discrimination in the Eighth Ward Area</td>
<td>Dave Groening</td>
<td>Released: 8/20/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C37</td>
<td>Related GPA I Questions and Conclusions</td>
<td>Summary Analysis</td>
<td>Released: 10/10/75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

EXAMPLES OF CASP QUESTIONS
REPRODUCED IN THE USERS GUIDE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>REFERENCE NUMBER</th>
<th>LABEL</th>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Most imp service to be provided for the Columbus area</td>
<td>Which one of the following do you feel is the most important to be provided for the Columbus area?</td>
<td>Response cards were given to respondent containing alternatives listed: 1. Better street maintenance and repair 2. Improved and expanded bus service 3. More bike paths 4. More public parking spaces 5. Street improvements, widening streets 9. DK/NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Importance of bus service personally</td>
<td>How important is bus service to you personally - very important, somewhat important, or not very important?</td>
<td>1. Very 2. Somewhat 3. Not very 9. DK/NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Organization responsible for bus service</td>
<td>Do you happen to know what organization or group is responsible for the operation of the bus system in Columbus?</td>
<td>1. CITTA 2. Anything else 9. DK/NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>How late should buses run</td>
<td>During the week how late at night do you think bus service should run?</td>
<td>1. 6 or earlier 2. 7 PM 3. 10 PM 4. 11 PM 5. 12 6. 1 AM 7. 2 AM or later 8. 24 hours 9. DK/NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Bus service - Clean</td>
<td>What is your impression of bus service in Columbus?</td>
<td>See Reference Note 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Bus service - Fast</td>
<td>11. Slow 9. DK/NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Reasonable rate for one-way bus ride</td>
<td>What do you consider a reasonable cost for a one-way bus ride?</td>
<td>Actual amount coded in cents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

EXAMPLE OF COVER LETTER SENT TO PEOPLE RECEIVING UNSOLICITED COPIES OF SOCIAL REPORTS
The BENCHMARK Program released its thirteenth Social Report on May 30, 1975, entitled "The Need for Child Care in the Columbus Metropolitan Area". BENCHMARK is an experimental program supported by the Academy for Contemporary Problems. Two of BENCHMARK's primary purposes are to produce information about the Columbus area that can be used to assess citizen needs with regard to some of the problems facing a growing metropolitan community, and to provide assistance to various groups in using that information.

Each Social Report is reviewed and approved prior to release by a Reports Review Committee (RRC). This committee consists of individuals from different sectors of the community who have a personal and/or professional interest in the topic covered. The members of the Child Care RRC suggested that your organization might be interested in the findings of this report.

Generally, the report shows that there is a much greater need for child care services than present facilities can fulfill. An estimated 38,300 children have a need for daily child care services compared to 9,350 possible places for children in child care facilities in the Columbus area. Also, it was shown that about one out of four people who have a need for daily child care states that either he/she or someone in their household has had problems getting or keeping a job because of lack of day care or family care services. In addition to these problems, there is a lack of knowledge about the quality of child care facilities and a lack of agreement that child care while parents work is even a problem in the Columbus area. Almost seven out of ten (67%) of all the people in the Columbus area say they are uncertain about the quality of child care services and 54% feel that lack of child care facilities while parents work is not a very serious problem.

The BENCHMARK Program would be glad to assist others in analyzing this data and to make further analysis for specific types of uses. Generally, this assistance is provided free, unless there are unusually large direct costs associated with the assistance. If you have any questions, please feel free to call or write at any time. In addition, I would be very interested in receiving any comments you have about the Social Report.

Jonathon L. Benson
Director of Evaluation
(421-7700; ext. 275)
APPENDIX E

QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN STAFF INTERVIEWS
How was the recruitment of members for your BAC handled?
How actively involved did you personally get in the recruitment of members?
How well did you know the people on your BAC?
How did you decide how you were going to run your BAC?
Did you have any problems in running your BAC — such as getting the members to participate or to arrive at a consensus — and how did you handle those problems?
How did you distribute drafts of Social Reports, and what is your opinion about that method of distribution?
Did you get the sense that the members of your BAC read the drafts you gave them?
Once the Social Report had been released, did you keep in contact with the members of your BAC? Did any of them keep in contact with you? Did any of them contact you to request something?
How did you handle the tasks of selecting a community spokesman and involving the spokesman in the dissemination of the Social Reports?
What do you think the members of your BAC got out of their participation?
What did you get out of the BAC experience?
If you had your BACs to do over again, what would you do differently — either to improve the process or to make things easier, for you?
How did you prepare yourself for the BAC, and do you feel you could have been better prepared? Is there any other "homework" you feel you could or should have done?
What did you do consciously to establish among the BAC members the conditions of awareness, interest, trust and credibility?
Can you think of anything you might have done inadvertently to establish these conditions?
On the basis of your experience, tell me what your opinion is about the following statements:
- the idea of having an open recruitment process is incompatible with the idea of soliciting the participation of certain people in order to ensure that important potential users are represented
- people who fail to attend a meeting of an BAC should not be allowed to continue to participate
- BACs should not deviate from the task of producing a Social Report
- Social Reports should be impartial
- the selection of a community spokesman involves considerable risk
- unless Social Experts take advocacy positions, they can't be relevant

What do you think is a good aim for an BAC?
How would you describe the atmosphere of your BAC; what are the things you most remember about your BAC?
Do you know of specific instances in which members of your BAC exact copies of Social Reports and diffused them?
Do you know of specific instances in which members of your BAC used the information discussed in your BAC?
What is your opinion about the impact the BAC experiences had on the participants — for example, do you think the experience caused them to change their opinions about things such as social sciences or social science research?
How interested do you think the members of your BAC were and was it difficult to sustain their interest?
Describe the role played by your support person.

Did it your opinion that the members of your RAC were candid, or did you get the sense that some of them were guarded in their participation? How do you think the manner in which the RAC was conducted affected the participation of the members and social interaction during the meetings?

Do you think it was important to maintain the privacy of the RAC proceedings?

Did you make the ground rules clear?

Did you find that some RAC members raised questions about the validity and reliability of the data?

Did you need a thank you letter to the members of your RAC?

Did you issue a press release along with the Social Report? What is your assessment of the utility of the press release?

Did you present the findings of your Social Report anywhere?

How do you assess the contacts you developed through the RAC?

Did your experience on the RAC make you any more sensitive to the needs or concerns of users?

Did the members of your RAC provide you with substantive help in the preparation of the Social Report? Did their participation make a difference in the final product, or was their participation merely pie in the sky?

How much did you emphasize the OS and TA programs to the members of your RAC?

What was the most creative or clever thing you did in your RAC?

What was the most foolish thing you did in your RAC? What do you regard as your greatest failure or mistake?

What guidelines did you receive about running the RAC, and do you feel these guidelines were adequate?

Did you serve in a support role before you served in a lead role on an RAC? Did you serve as a support at all? Do you feel that serving as a support helped prepare you to run an RAC?

On your second RAC, did you feel more comfortable, and do you think you did a better job? Do you do anything differently?

What philosophy or approach did you bring to your RAC?

What impact do you think the composition of your RAC had on the RAC?

How do you feel the members of your RAC perceived you, BENCHMARK and the Academy?

What format did you follow in running your RAC?

What materials did you give or show to the members of your RAC?

How seriously did you treat the signing on process? Did you emphasize the rights and responsibilities of all the participants?

Did you distribute a list of the RAC members to the participants?

If you had any of the following problems, how did you handle them?

- The person who was consistently critical or skeptical
- People who failed to attend meetings
- People who regarded your youth and affiliation to the university negatively
- People who wouldn't accept the ground rules
- Insufficient time, and changes in the production schedule
- People who used the RAC as a forum to espouse their own ideologies

Did you encounter any problems in getting people to accept drafts?

Do when did you send unbranded copies of Social Reports, and how do you assess that practice?

How much contact did you have with the media once you released the Social Report?

What functions did you attempt to perform in your RAC, and what qualities or attributes did you attempt to manifest?

How do you assess the policy and guidelines followed in the RAC process?

How report-directed was your RAC?

Do any of the major findings from the interviews conducted with RAC members surprise you? How do you account for some of them?
APPENDIX F

GUIDELINES FOR STAFF MEMBERS
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Staff Memorandum
September 12, 1974
P.M. Burgess
R.A. Convey

SUBJECT: Staff Guidance for the Production, Review and Release of the Social Reports

The recommendations of the Public Affairs SIG and the Scope Team regarding BENCHMARK policies for the production and release of the Social Reports were approved by the CCC at its monthly meeting on September 11.

The following attempts to give flesh to those policies in our internal operations. The following assumes

1) that we'll try to produce the "periodic" Social Reports on a weekly basis

2) that the topics or subject matter for the reports have already been established and are known

3) that all reports will be released on Wednesdays.

Given these assumptions, we will try to follow the production schedule in the attached activities network.

The "start" date for the CA-AG analyst, of course, is open. The first important deadline in the projected 17-day production schedule is the "Day 4" (Thursday) briefing of the CCC's Reports Review Committee. This and all subsequent deadlines must be met.

The attached activities network arrays the "action units" over time (17 consecutive days). Activities include the following explicit and implicit functions:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explicit</th>
<th>Implicit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>BENCHMARK data center assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report writing</td>
<td>Review of related data sources, discussions with knowledgeable individuals, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical review, comment and approval by CA-AG's RRG</td>
<td>Those on the RRG will give the report prompt, immediate and critical attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community review, comment and approval by CCC's RRC</td>
<td>Differences, if they arise, will have to be negotiated. RRC has primacy on issues of style and emphasis. RRG has primacy on adequacy of evidentiary base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing and reproduction of drafts</td>
<td>Establishing standardized formats and instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction, assembly and mailing of reports</td>
<td><strong>All staff must be available to ensure the critical deadlines are met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press conference</td>
<td>Prepare for press conference together with CCC rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>Be available for post-release interviews—especially for electronic media and be clear about the scope of the comments we can make in the light of the Code of Ethics and related policies that have been approved by the CCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be available to discuss related &quot;Community-Originated Studies&quot; with those who went to go beyond the content of the Social Report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FIGURE 1: SOCIAL REPORTS’ PRODUCTION–REVIEW–RELEASE PROCESS**

A 17-DAY SEQUENCE OF ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Component</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCC’s Reports Review Committee (RCC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Meet for briefing by CA-AC analyst; ID critical issues to be addressed; tentatively ID community spokesmen for the Press conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CA-AC Analyst</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Analysis for this report begins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Prepare appropriate handouts for lunch meeting with RCC; alert RCC to imp. issues found in preliminary run</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Services Coordinator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Call members of the SCC assigned to report; schedule lunch meeting on Thursday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Report #2 Sequence Begins)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Pick up Press mail labels from computer; prepare envelopes for mailing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Prepare Press mail labels [out of their envelopes]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Place Reports at ACP desk for pick up by RCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CA-AC’s Reports Review Group (RRC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Receive draft report by noon and prepare critique/feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* 10:00 AM meeting with CA-AC analyst for feedback &amp; suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BENCHMARK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Graphics coordinator attends lunch meeting with RCC; receives initial instructions from CA-AC analyst &amp; report's graphic displays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Typists complete draft report at noon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Typists: complete &quot;final&quot; draft at 13 copies by noon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Final review of report at lunch meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Final review of report at lunch meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Hold Press Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Hold Press Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Final draft of Report to typist by 9:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Final draft of Report to typist by 9:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Critical Events
NOTES AND COMMENTS

A. Two weeks prior to release

1) The CA-AG analyst responsible for the initial draft of the report will begin the process of data analysis on Monday.

2) The CCC's Community Services Office will call CCC members who want to serve on the Reports Review Committee and set up a luncheon meeting for Thursday.

3) On Thursday, the CA-AG analyst will make a brief oral report to the Reports Review Committee. Initial results from the data analysis will also be available. The purpose of the meeting is to give the CA-AG staff members a better feel for the range of issues that might be emphasized in the report and to discuss where additional relevant information might be located for inclusion in the report. In addition, the meeting will develop a list of individuals in the community who might be contacted for participated in the press conference planned for the release of each report.

4) Following the meeting, the CA-AG analyst will give initial instructions to the graphics coordinator for preparing whatever graphic materials may be required.

B. One week prior to release

1) The CA-AG analyst will complete his initial draft over the weekend and on Monday.

2) The draft will be typed and circulated for internal review by Tuesday noon.
3) Comments from the staff will be returned to the analyst no later than 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday. The analyst will then revise his report based on internal comments, criticisms, and/or additional analyses that have been performed and turn it in for retyping by 9:00 a.m. on Thursday.

4) The "final" draft by the analyst will be available at the ACP desk anytime after 12:00 noon on Thursday. Members of the Reports Review Committee will be asked to pick up a copy on Thursday so they can read it fully and carefully, prepare comments, criticisms, and suggestions prior to the Friday meeting of the Reports Review Committee.

5) On Friday, the Reports Review Committee will meet to exchange and discuss their final comments and suggestions and to give final approval to the release of the report as modified or amended during the meeting. If there is (1) agreement that substantially more work is required or (2) disagreement as to the acceptability of the report in its draft form, the Reports Review Committee will have the remainder of the day and evening to work on the report. The RRC will convene again on Saturday at 10:00 a.m. to reach a decision on the final draft.

C. The week of release

1) On Monday the approved version of the report will be typed in a final draft form—double spaced and not to exceed 1500 words and four (4) tables. Thus each report may have a maximum of eleven (11) pages and a minimum of four (4) pages:
2) On Monday afternoon, the reports will be reproduced in preparation for a Wednesday Press Conference. The press conferences will be held so as to alternate between the deadline hours of the CJ and Dispatch.

3) On Monday, a member of the Reports Review Committee will contact individuals in the community with an interest in the subject matter of the report and invite their formal participation in the Press Conference on Tuesday. The reports will be hand-delivered to these individuals on Tuesday morning so they can be fully familiar with the content prior to the Press Conference.
Staff Memorandum
January 6, 1975
S.C. Ballard
R.A. Conway

Subject: Guidelines for the Production, Review, and Release of Social Reports

The following pages summarize much of our experiences in producing six social reports. We recognize that these suggestions will need ongoing review and revision but we hope that they help reduce some uncertainties and problems associated with the production, review, and release of social reports.

Several changes in our thinking have evolved since the last staff memorandum addressing this subject (consult PMB memo, 9/12/74). Most importantly, we recommend that the full-time involvement of the CA-AG support is essential to the efficient and effective production of social reports—cuing largely to the demands on the lead of writing the drafts and interfacing with report review committees. Essentially, we recommend that the CA-AG support assume primary responsibility for the coordination of the entire process as well as whatever support help is specified by the CA-AG lead. It is hoped that this support will greatly reduce the probabilities that inferior social reports will be produced because of problems associated with ACP administration, printing delays or mistakes, table formats, etc.
We take very seriously the CA-AG internal review of report drafts—which have in the past substantially improved the drafts and facilitated the integration of RRC feedback. We have found the RRC environment to be (at least) important, challenging, enervating, and extremely sensitive politically—whose requirements range from letting RRC members explicate fully their reservations with the data to drawing the line on what BENCHMARK's purposes are, what is realistically possible to do in a social report, and the limits to the number of reports per module. It is important to recognize the purposes and constraints under which RRC members work in this process, but most critically we should recognize and remember the tremendous overall success of the RRC process—to the program's goals, the utilization of social reports, and the ongoing integration of users who have the greatest stake in the information.

Additionally, we recommend that the review process should, more realistically, consume 21 days and that we should aim for one social per module but under no circumstance do more than two per module.

Finally, we recognize that much of the responsibility for the tasks outlined should remain flexible and that many activities and tasks are carried on simultaneously.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Data Analysis</td>
<td>a. Review marginals</td>
<td>LEAD - (SUPPORT)</td>
<td>Care should be taken with analysis requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Review CASP INDICATOR SUMMARY SHEET (USERS GUIDE) to I.D. related variables</td>
<td>LEAD - (SUPPORT)</td>
<td>Give data center as much lead as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Submit a considered list of X-tabs to D.C.</td>
<td>LEAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Convening Report Review Committee</td>
<td>e. Invite members to RRC</td>
<td>SUPPORT - LEAD</td>
<td>OCS should be briefed on purposes of RRC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Ask Jennifer for list of CCC members who have expressed interest</td>
<td>OCS</td>
<td>This contact with potential member is often critical and certain information should be conveyed—concerning nature of RRC process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Hears from Design Stage (Jennifer has lists)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subsequent meetings will be arranged during first RRC. Support should be sure this is accomplished and reserve room immediately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Consider others in community.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings should be in ACF rooms. Lodge facilities are insufficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Establish date, time, and place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. SECURE ROOM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. First RRC</td>
<td>a. Handout and retrieve copies of RRC sign-up sheet, and RRC Guidelines form.</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Construct from the sign-up sheets an RRC membership list which includes</td>
<td>LEAD</td>
<td>NH: Many RRC members will know very little, if anything, about RRC or RRC process. Therefore it is essential to review carefully the nature of RRC, the review process, the role of the RRC, and the Social Report Guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Name</td>
<td>LEAD</td>
<td>All RRC members must fill out and return sign-up sheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Day phone</td>
<td>LEAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Night phone</td>
<td>LEAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Address</td>
<td>LEAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Organization/Affiliation</td>
<td>LEAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Position.</td>
<td>LEAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Return all sign-up sheets to CCR.</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>Most important product of first meeting is to get RRC on board. This has, in the past, included letting RRC members say where they’re coming from.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Have RRC brochure available for RRC,</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Have samples of a social report to show RRC.</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Pass out:</td>
<td>LEAD</td>
<td>Be sure RRC knows in advance that they will need to pick up drafts at ACF and review before next meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) copies of 17-day process</td>
<td>LEAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) questions from that module from USERS GUIDE</td>
<td>LEAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) pass intro to module from USERS GUIDE</td>
<td>LEAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) return of marginals for that module.</td>
<td>LEAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. Cover lead’s proposed schedule for writing and reviewing draft.</td>
<td>LEAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h. Explain that each module should be covered in one social report and at least two reports.</td>
<td>LEAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY</td>
<td>TASKS</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. Subsequent ERC meetings | a. Have group name ERC spokesperson.  
  b. Record all ERC recommendations. | LEAD  
  SUPPORT | - Specific not general recommendations should be given to graphics for review.  
  - Fast social reports have been successful in providing an overall summary and punchlines for each section of the report. |
| 2. Writing reports | a. Give graphics as much lead time as possible.  
  b. Give typists as much time as possible to produce tables. | LEAD  
  SUPPORT | - Critically review format of tables; e.g., notes, DK/NA's, etc.  
  - Consider titles of tables carefully. |
| 3. Review process | a. Staff should give highest priority to request to review drafts of social report.  
  b. Internal staff review is critical to social report. Review should come prior to review by ERC.  
  c. Final copies must be proofed by at least two people besides lead. Especially critical are tables. | SUPPORT  
  SUPPORT  
  SUPPORT | - Tables and figures must be proofed from data, not from draft. |
| 4. Publication and Dissemination | a. Design release strategy with Mary Jenkins.  
  b. Consult with KLB re: publication turn-around and environmental graphics for press conferences.  
  c. Originals kept by KLB.  
  d. Proof printed copies. | LEAD  
  SUPPORT  
  SUPPORT  
  OPS | - |
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