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A Program Evaluation of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes' Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services Project

This thesis presents the results of a program evaluation conducted for and of The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes' (CS&KT) Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services Project. The CS&KT Project provides rehabilitation services to Indian people with a disability who live on the Flathead Indian Reservation. It operates much like the State of Montana vocational rehabilitation agency, however as provided by law, Indian cultural values are integrated into this program's approach to service delivery.

The evaluation incorporated both the input/output approach and theory-driven approach in its design. The evaluation design combined qualitative and quantitative methods in the following three areas: (1) written material review, (2) interviews—with project staff, clients, people who attended training sessions, and employers, and (3) mail-based survey.

Input/Output approach evaluation results indicated that the CS&KT Vocational Rehabilitation Project exceeded the goals set out in the 1989-1990 proposal by 23 to 50 percent in six of eight project areas.

For the theory-driven approach, survey participants were divided into three categories (1) people who were referred to and contacted by the program but did not begin services, (2) people who applied to the program but did not begin services and/or clients who began services but withdrew from the program without a successful closure, and (3) clients currently receiving services or whose cases were closed as successful rehabilitants.

Theory-driven results indicated that program completion was not influenced by how members of each of the three groups perceived of and valued employment, that program completion did not appear to be influenced by the educational and employment goals of members within the three groups, there appeared to be no differences between the groups that might influence entrance into the program, the personalities of the project personnel do influence the success of the program, and that the initial contact method or referral process did not appear to influence a person's attitude towards the program.
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I. INTRODUCTION

According to Posavac & Carey (1985), in the not too distant past it was assumed that human service programs worked; there was no doubt that program participants were helped and that the program was a success. Today, that assumption can no longer be made. Human service programs must be held accountable for their actions and be evaluated to determine whether the need exists for the program, whether the program is "likely to be used, whether the service is offered as planned, and whether the human service actually does help people in need" (Posavac & Carey, 1985, p.5).

The goal of program evaluation is to provide information about human service programs in the same way accountants and auditors monitor activities and provide information to facilitate the decision-making process in for-profit organizations. In a private firm, evaluation takes place through the marketplace as well. If the organization is successful, it stays in business and makes a profit. If it is not successful, usually, it will go out of business.

Unfortunately, measuring the effectiveness of human service programs is not quite as straightforward. Program evaluation, a method of measuring human service program effectiveness by using concepts from sociology, psychology,
administrative and policy sciences, economics, and education, is the public sector equivalent of an accountant and/or an auditor. The information gained through an evaluation ideally should improve the quality of a human service program and the evaluation should help a program's managers to make informed decisions.

This thesis presents the results of a program evaluation conducted for and of The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes' (CS&KT) Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services Project. The project provides a full range of vocational rehabilitation services to American Indians with a disability who are residents of the Flathead Indian Reservation. Rehabilitation services provided by the program are comparable to Rehabilitation Services provided under the State Vocational rehabilitation service program to individuals with disabilities residing in the State. However, as provided by law, Indian1 cultural values are integrated into this program's approach to service delivery and training in cultural aspects of service delivery to American Indians are provided to project staff and to non-project

---

1 According to Bryan (1985) the word "Indian" is preferred by people of American Indian descent when referred to in the collective sense. He claims that it is mainly the academic world that refers to Indians as Native Americans. Bryan says that the order of preference is that Indian people first want to be called by a name that is tribal, then in a collective sense to be known as Indian. Throughout this paper the terms American Indian and Indian are used interchangeably.
rehabilitation service providers in the surrounding geographic area as well.

This evaluation investigated the following three areas:

1. Project objectives stated in the CS&KT Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services Project grant proposal for the 1989-1990 year.

2. Adherence to the recommendations from the 1988-1989 program evaluation of the project.

3. The impact of cultural values and traditions on program effectiveness and/or success.

This thesis is divided into four sections. They are Background, the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes Rehabilitation Project, the 1988-1989 Evaluation, and the 1989-1990 Evaluation.

The "Background" section of this proposal:

1. Describes what a disability is.

2. Discusses societal views of people with a disability.

3. Describes the Vocational Rehabilitation system in the United States; one of the many programs enacted by legislators in response to societal pressure to address the problems facing a person with a disability.

4. Describes the low socio-economic status of American Indians and how that places them at a greater than average risk for developing a disability.
5. Describes the underutilization of the general vocational rehabilitation system by American Indians.

6. Describes the American Indian Rehabilitation Legislation, which established a competitive granting process to provide rehabilitation services for American Indians with disabilities residing on federal and state reservations.

The "Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes Rehabilitation Project" section of this thesis describes a local project funded under the American Indian Rehabilitation Legislation; the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes Rehabilitation Project on the Flathead Reservation. The description includes a discussion of the project's purpose, client eligibility and rehabilitation criteria, and program personnel and governance.

The "1988-1989 Evaluation" describes the previous years evaluation methodology and results.

The section titled the "1989-1990 Evaluation" discusses the rationale for project evaluation and describes the results of this evaluation based on all of the information presented in all of the sections in this thesis. This section is divided into three parts: Attainment of 1989-1990 Project Objectives, Evaluation of the Project's Response to the 1988-1989 Evaluation, and the Impact of Cultural Values and Traditions on Program Effectiveness and/or Success.
Finally, the "Conclusions" section presents conclusions and recommendations and future directions for understanding the influence of the findings of the evaluation.

Background

The following sections provide background information to assist with understanding the purpose of vocational rehabilitation programs, past interactions between Indians and the Vocational Rehabilitation System, and the vocational rehabilitation programs that were established to serve Indian people with a Disability.

Disability Defined

A disability is defined in the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, for Title I (Vocational Rehabilitation Services) as a "physical or mental disability, which for such individual constitutes or results in a substantial handicap to employment and can reasonably be expected to benefit in terms of employability from vocational rehabilitation services."

Societal Views of a Person Who Has a Disability

Unfortunately, a person with an outward disability is viewed as "different" by many people without a disability. Often there is a social stigma attached to the disability which for some results in some amount of social isolation (anomie) and/or different role expectations than for people without a disability.
In talking about being different from others, Freidson (1965, p.72) said that in social terms:

"a handicap is an imputation of difference from others; more particularly, imputation of an undesirable difference. By definition, then, a person said to be handicapped is so defined because he deviates from what he himself or others believe to be normal or appropriate. In this sense, the concept of deviance is central to rehabilitation activities."

Freidson (1965, p.74) further stated that:

"deviance constitutes a role and implies a process of labelling and therefore the likely existence of a set of epiteths connected with it. The process of labelling accompanies and may even produce the assumption of a deviant role by providing the focus for stereotyping behavior."

The theory of the "marginal man" applies to people with a disability (Freidson, 1965). An example of the marginal man is an immigrant whose previous values and behavioral patterns are in conflict with those of the new country. A person with a disability who is out of work, who requires help with daily living activities, and receives subsistence payments is in conflict with predominant values and behavioral patterns and can be characterized as being at the marginal end of societal norms. Freidson claims that a person with a disability possesses social characteristics that place him or her into a minority group of the society; a less privileged group that is considered by mainstream society to behave and think in ways deviant from overall community norms.
As a minority, people with a disability experience prejudice and discrimination similar to the experiences of other minorities. Safilios-Rothschild (1976, p.41) claimed that

"disabled people can be conceptualized as a disadvantaged or minority group because they have a great deal in common with the old, blacks, women, the poor, and other minorities in that they are treated and reacted to as a category of people."

Doob (1988, p.274), talked about "the process of prejudice and discrimination encountered by the physically, mentally, and emotionally disabled" and said that "the same steps that occur in the sexism and ageism process occur for the disabled." Doob (1988) presented five components of prejudice and discrimination that help classify a group as a minority. They are:

1. High social visibility.
2. Ascribed attributes of inferiority.
3. Rationalization of status.
4. Accommodating behavior practices.
5. Discrimination.

Additionally, Schaeffer (1984) gave five characteristics of a minority or subordinate group. They are:

1. Members of a minority experience unequal treatment from the dominant group in the form of prejudice.
2. Minorities have physical or cultural characteristics that distinguish them from the dominant group.
3. Membership in a minority or majority group is not voluntary

4. Members of a minority group generally marry members of the same minority group.

5. Members of a minority group are aware of their subordinate status, a perception that may lead to strong group solidarity.

As a group, people with disabilities experience nine of these ten characteristics. There appears to be nothing published on whether or not people with disabilities marry each other. This may be because a person with a disability (according to a personal communication with the Disability Statistics Program Information Service in Berkeley, California):

1. Often becomes disabled as an adult and if he or she is not married, the most likely result is that he or she will not marry.

2. Is most likely to be a man, resulting in an oversupply of men.

Vocational Rehabilitation: A Societal Response

Rehabilitation legislation is the result of the attention focused on the problems faced by people with a disability. Rehabilitation laws were passed to effect societal change. The primary goal of the 1973 legislation
and the 1978 and 1986 reauthorizations was to bring this minority group into the mainstream of American life.

The beginnings of disability rehabilitation and rehabilitation legislation can be traced to the 1798 act of Congress, which established a marine hospital fund to care for sailors who had a disability. At that time, sailors were considered vital to the national economy, international trade, and empire building (Sussman, 1976). Recognizing the value to society of returning people to work, rehabilitation focused on vocational goals. That continues to be the focus of vocational rehabilitation today.

Vocational rehabilitation legislation continued to be passed through the years finally culminating in the Rehabilitation Act of 1972. The Act broadly defines and outlines the function of each state's Department of Vocational Rehabilitation. It provides a:

...statutory basis for the Rehabilitation Services Administration, to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Office for the Handicapped, and to authorize programs to...

Develop and implement comprehensive and continuing State plans for meeting the current and future needs for providing vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped individuals and to provide such services for the benefit of such individuals, serving first those with the most severe handicaps, so that they may prepare for and engage in gainful employment;

Evaluate the rehabilitation potential of handicapped individuals;
Develop, implement, and provide comprehensive rehabilitation services to meet the current and future needs of handicapped individuals for whom a vocational goal is not possible or feasible so that they may improve their ability to live with greater independence and self-sufficiency;

Initiate and expand services to groups of handicapped individuals (including those who are homebound and institutionalized) who have been underserved in the past (U.S., Congress, 1973).

According to Sussman (1976), the goal of the 1972 Rehabilitation Act and Public Law 93-113 (1973), was to enable a person with a disability to become part of the labor force and add an economic value to society. These bills authorized policy and programs to "restore the sick to health" and to rehabilitate people with mental or physical disabilities if these individuals potentially could contribute to the gross national product. Contributing to the gross national product could occur in two ways: (1) through individuals who returned to gainful employment in order to support him or herself and add to the productive wealth of society, and (2) through rehabilitating a person to the fullest extent possible consequently contributing to his or her independence level (not necessarily employment). This would reduce a person's maintenance costs and release his or her caregiver(s) to work at other productive pursuits.

A further explanation of the vocational rehabilitation system is provided by Gellman (1973, p.16) who said:
the rehabilitation system in the United States is based on a goal which is vocational in the broadest sense: to assist a rehabilitant to perform adequately in a productive role. This major objective involves developing the desire and capacity to function productively in either competitive employment or nonprofit work which contributes to the welfare of the community. Intermediate steps toward this end are self-care, increased work competence (the ability to function and adapt in a work setting), improved placability (the ability to secure employment), and enhanced adjustability (the capacity for continued adaptation to a work environment). If the rehabilitant cannot bridge the gap to competitive employment, the rehabilitation goal becomes placement in a nonprofit work system or in productive work in the home.

The Vocational Rehabilitation System

The following paragraphs from Gellman (1973, p.17&18) describe the vocational rehabilitation system in the United States. It is a description of the system within which the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes' Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services Project functions.

Federal and state funds are dispersed through the state (vocational) rehabilitation agencies, which provide direct services for clients and purchase or procure from other public or private agencies such services as are not provided by the state (vocational rehabilitation) agency. The typical state (vocational rehabilitation) agency assess applicant eligibility, accepts clients for (vocational) rehabilitation services, evaluates rehabilitants for (vocational) rehabilitation potential (with the aid of medical or rehabilitation facilities and workshops), provides counselling, training, or further education, and job placement either directly or indirectly. State (vocational rehabilitation) agencies refer rehabilitants to and purchase services from medical institutions and physicians, vocational counseling agencies, rehabilitation centers, workshops, and educational facilities. The costs are met by the federal and state governments.
The (vocational) rehabilitation service system interacts with other major systems, such as medicine and psychotherapy, welfare, education, and manpower, and it refers rehabilitants to the other healing or helping systems as well as receives referrals from them.

The axes of the (vocational) rehabilitation system are: active case-finding; a coordinated multidisciplinary goal-oriented approach; the use of experiential methodologies; and follow-through to ensure optimal vocational adjustment.

American Indians Who Have a Disability

The Socio-economic Status of American Indians and Its Influence on Disabilities

According to A Study of the Special Problems and Needs of American Indians with Handicaps Both on and Off the Reservation (O'Connell, 1987) four factors; education, economic status, occupation and labor market participation, and cultural differences are consistently related to health status. Using these indicators to measure how American Indians fare when compared to other minorities or the anglo culture, demographic studies show American Indians are the most disadvantaged minority in each of these areas. For example, American Indians have the lowest educational attainment of all minority groups (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1983). In 1980 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1983), the poverty rate for American Indians was double that of the general population with 27.5 percent of the American Indian population below the poverty level compared to 12.4 percent of the general population. In 1986, the unemployment rate
for American Indians was almost 5.5 times that of the gener­al population (O'Connell, 1987). When compared to the general population, approximately 1.5 times as many Indians reported a work-related disability (Bureau of the Census, 1983). Also, because of the types and limited number of jobs available on reservations, Indian people most often work at service or blue-collar and seasonal occupations, which has two primary effects: (1) an increased exposure to work-related accidents and (2) lower pay resulting in a lower economic status. Finally, many Indians attempt to maintain their traditional values. However, the continued influence of the Anglo society poses a threat to traditional beliefs "which may affect the ability to withstand social, economic, and psychological stressors" (O'Connell, 1987, p.5).

Campbell (1989) said that the health and disability problems of American Indians are linked not only to the existing social climate but also to the political and eco­nomic forces that help shape the social climate. He also claimed that there are many preventable health problems like "fetal alcohol syndrome, bacterial meningitis, otitis media, diabetes, accidents, mental disorders, and substance abuse" (Campbell, 1989, p.10) that continue to exist in higher proportions among the American Indian people because of their social disadvantage. Further, the final report of A Study of the Special Problems and Needs of American Indians
with Handicaps Both On and Off the Reservation (O'Connell, 1987) agreed that the following health and disability conditions which are considered to be "health and educationally-related disability conditions" (O'Connell, 1987, p.16) are disproportionately represented in the American Indian population:

1. High rates of alcoholism in the American Indian that result in death, disability, poor infant health at birth, long-term developmental delays, and mental retardation.

2. High rates of sensory impairments of the eye and ear.

3. A hospitalization rate for diabetes mellitus (likely to result in a disabling condition) 2.8 times that of the U.S. population.


American Indians and the Vocational Rehabilitation System

Vocational rehabilitation among the American Indian population has not been successful (O'Connell, 1987). A study of state vocational rehabilitation administrators and district managers (O'Connell, 1987), identified the following barriers as possible reasons for this nonproductive relationship between American Indians and vocational rehabilitation agencies:
1. A lack of employment opportunities for vocational rehabilitation clients on or near reservations.

2. Cultural differences that affect vocational rehabilitation's ability to appropriately serve Indian clients.

3. Cultural differences that affect the American Indians' ability to fit into the traditional vocational rehabilitation service delivery patterns.

4. The geographic isolation of reservation-based Indians and associated problems with transportation for accessing services.

5. Lack of interagency cooperation, in both identifying and serving vocational rehabilitation clients.

6. A significant substance abuse problem that results in more difficult disability conditions to rehabilitate.

American Indian Rehabilitation Legislation

In 1986 an amendment to the 1972 Rehabilitation Act provided for vocational rehabilitation services specifically for American Indians with disabilities residing on Federal and State reservations. Funding was authorized for American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Service Grants. Section 130 (a) and (b) presented below, provided general parameters for the services:

Section 130 (a). The Commissioner, in accordance with the provisions of this part may make grants to the governing bodies of Indian tribes located on Federal and State reservations (and consortia of such governing bodies) to pay 90 percent of the
costs of vocational rehabilitation services for handicapped American Indians residing on such reservations. The non-Federal share of such costs may be in cash or in-kind and the Commissioner may waive such non-Federal share requirement in order to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b)(1). No grant may be made under this part for any fiscal year unless an application therefore has been submitted to and approved by the Commissioner. The Commissioner may not approve an application unless the application

(A). is made at such time, in such manner, and contains such information as the Commissioner may require;

(B). contains assurances that the rehabilitation services provided under this part to handicapped American Indians residing on a reservation in a State shall be, to the maximum extent feasible comparable to rehabilitation services provided under this title to other handicapped individuals residing in the State and that, where appropriate, may include services traditionally used by Indian tribes;

(C). contains assurances that the application was developed in consultation with the designated State unit of the State (U.S. Congress, 1986).

This amendment was enacted to counteract vocational rehabilitation's cultural bias. Vocational rehabilitation reflects the values of an industrialized, urban, European-American, English-speaking society. For example, clients from different cultures often do not understand the system and fail to meet the expectations and requirements of vocational rehabilitation agencies (Lowrey, 1987). Because of this, these clients frequently are thought of as being lazy and/or unmotivated. Since the
system is regulated so rigidly by the federal government, few demonstration projects have been conducted to show how to modify vocational rehabilitation so agencies are culturally sensitive to or provide culturally relevant services for the diverse populations in this country (Lowrey, 1987).

According to Susan Daniels, Associate Commissioner for Developmental Programs, Rehabilitation Services Administration, (1990), the American Indian programs were established because:

Available data indicate that the incidence of disability is considered higher in the American Indian Community than in the general population. On the other hand, the vocational rehabilitation delivery system today is not fully geared to serving the widely dispersed Native American population, particularly those living on reservations. There is a need for rehabilitation service delivery models that would link the various Federal, State, and tribal programs already available for the rehabilitation of American Indians with handicaps. Further, there is a need for models that would take into consideration the cultural values and beliefs of the various Native American tribes while at the same time providing an opportunity for American Indians with handicaps to be served in a manner comparable to other handicapped individuals served under State vocational rehabilitation service programs.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Service Grants

A limited number of vocational rehabilitation programs, funded to work on the reservations, are selected through a cyclical competitive process. Successful projects are funded for either one or three years. Each funded project provides services as specified in its proposal and operates
as an addition to the existing state vocational rehabilitation system. Because the reservation projects are demonstration projects, state vocational rehabilitation agencies are not required to incorporate any of the methods developed by the projects into their methods of operating. Therefore, systemic change is not a required outcome of the projects.

**The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes Rehabilitation Project**

The following section discusses the purpose of the CS&KT Project and the interaction between the project and the State of Montana Department of Vocational Rehabilitation. It describes the differences between the state agency and the CS&KT project and lists the objectives to be accomplished during the current operating year. In addition project governance and personnel, program admission and successful and unsuccessful rehabilitation closure criteria are presented.

**Background Information**

**Program Origin**

The CS&KT Project began operating on October 1, 1987, as a two-year grant to the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes by the U.S. Department of Education. Subsequent to that two-year project, the Tribes again submitted a competitive application and were awarded a three-year project to

The need for this project on the Flathead Reservation is demonstrated in the following paragraphs (much of the following facts are excerpted from the project's original grant application and rephrased for this thesis). Prior to 1986, officials from the Area Office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Indian Health Service in Billings, Montana estimated that 936 (18%) Indian people on the Flathead Indian Reservation had a disabling condition that constituted a substantial handicap to employment and might make them eligible for vocational rehabilitation services. A count made during 1986 by representatives from the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes' Health Department identified 428 or 45 percent of the 936 Indian people (estimated above) with a disability living on the reservation (113 people were identified as having a severe disability, 206 with an alcohol-related disability, and 109 with a drug-related disability).

During 1985-1986, 33 Indian people on the Flathead Reservation received vocational rehabilitation services from the state agency (any contact with the program is considered as vocational rehabilitation). There were three to five people on the active caseload (people who actually received vocational rehabilitation services) during that year and one or two cases were placed in employment. The low number
served may be due to budget cuts within the State of Montana Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services (the department within which the Rehabilitative Services Division is housed) during the previous three years; a time during which services to all persons with disabilities on the Flathead Reservation were reduced. For example, in 1986 the state vocational rehabilitation office on the Flathead Reservation in Ronan was closed. As a result, the reservation was served two days each month by the Kalispell vocational rehabilitation office. That service subsequently was discontinued and was taken over by the Missoula vocational rehabilitation office. Currently a vocational rehabilitation counselor from Missoula works on the reservation two days each month.

In 1987-1988, during its first year of operation, the CS&KT Project caseload exceeded the state vocational rehabilitation's 1985-1986 Flathead Reservation caseload. During that year 46 Indian people received vocational rehabilitation services, 29 people were accepted into the active caseload, and four people were placed into employment. In its second operating year, 52 Indian people received vocational rehabilitation services, 18 people were accepted into the active caseload, and six people were placed into employment. During the project's third operating year, 95 Indian people received vocational rehabilitation services, 23 people were accepted into the active caseload, and 10 people
were placed into employment. At the time of this thesis, 22 applications for service from the CS&KT Project were pending.

Program Purpose and Goals

The purpose of the CS&KT Project is to provide rehabilitation services to Indian people with a disability who live on the Flathead Indian Reservation. The project's design resulted from cooperative planning among the following institutions and agencies: (1) the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, (2) Salish Kootenai College, (3) the State of Montana SRS, Rehabilitative Services Division, (4) Summit Independent Living Center, (5) the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes Health Department, and (6) Missoula Community Medical Center Rehabilitation Center. The State of Montana Department of SRS, Rehabilitative Services Division reviewed and approved the project design.

Procedures for implementation and activities of the CS&KT Project generally are the same as for the State of Montana Department of SRS, Rehabilitation Services Division. The similarities and differences in operation are noted below.

1. Both agencies focus on vocational outcomes of people with disabilities.

2. Both agencies serve the Flathead Reservation, however, the CS&KT Project serves only Indian people residing on the Flathead Reservation.
3. The CS&KT Project follows the same basic vocational rehabilitation guidelines for providing services as the state agency.

4. The state vocational rehabilitation agency offers the CS&KT Project, as time and resources permit, consultative and training services on the technical aspects of the federal/state rehabilitation program.

5. The state vocational rehabilitation program is under no obligation to modify its operating procedures to incorporate procedures the project has found successful.

6. A client is not limited to using only one program; he or she can choose which program to use, and if a client's needs are great, he or she can be served by both programs.

While the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes' Vocational Rehabilitation Project operates much like the State of Montana vocational rehabilitation agency, its primary emphasis is on cultural sensitivity to its clients. For example since Indian people often have a different concept of time and appointments than that held by the anglo culture (Good Tracks, 1973), meeting times are not strictly adhered to. In the state vocational rehabilitation system if a client misses a specified number of meetings, his or her case will be closed. This does not automatically happen to clients of the CS&KT Project. Another example is that Indian people often look at a new program warily and wait for it to prove itself before taking advantage of its
services. The CS&KT Project, knowing how difficult it might be to obtain acceptance by the community, located its offices on the primary campus of the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes' Community College to take advantage of the college's established standing in the Indian community.

Client Eligibility

Admission to project services is based on the following criteria:

1. A person must have a severe physical or mental disability that constitutes a substantial handicap to employment, and;

2. There must be a reasonable expectation that project services will benefit the individual in terms of vocational outcome(s), and;

3. Priority for services is given first to Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribal members, next to first descendants of Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribal members, and finally to members of other tribes living on the Flathead Indian Reservation.

If an individual meets the criteria for 1 and 3 above, he or she is eligible for an extended evaluation, but no services. If an individual meets all three criteria, he or she is eligible for extended evaluation and for rehabilitation services.
Rehabilitation Criteria

A client participating in the program is determined to be rehabilitated and services to that person terminate when the following conditions are met:

1. The client has been evaluated for rehabilitation potential and, if warranted, received counselling and/or guidance, and;

2. The client has received vocational rehabilitation services in accordance with his or her Individualized Written Rehabilitation Plan, and;

3. The client has achieved a suitable vocational goal and has maintained that goal for at least 60 days.

Location of the Project

The CS&KT Rehabilitation Project is located on the primary campus of the Salish Kootenai College.

The College provides office space for personnel of the CS&KT Rehabilitation Project that is shared with staff of the Salish Kootenai College Students With Disabilities Support Services Project. The office occupied by the project during the past year is a large open room with dividers sectioning off work areas. There is also a conference area. At the time of the evaluation the office housed seven full-time and two part-time staff members of both projects. The building, offices, and restrooms are all wheelchair accessible. Both projects will soon move to a new building on
campus that also is wheel-chair accessible. In the new quarters, there is a private office for the project Director, an office for staff of the CS&KT Vocational Rehabilitation Project, and an office for staff of the Students With Disabilities Support Services Project. Also, when needed for privacy and testing, the project can use an office assigned to it which is in the college library (the library is in a separate building).

Project Personnel/Governance

The project operates within the administrative structure of the College. During the past year project staff included an Administrator, Director, Coordinator, Counselor, two Technicians, and a Secretary/Clerk.

Overall project guidance is provided by a Project Advisory Committee made up of Confederated Salish & Kootenai tribal members and a representative of the State of Montana Department of SRS, Rehabilitative Services Division (who is not Indian or a tribal member). Each committee person is a member of an agency important to and/or related to the project. Committee members are:

1. Robin Woodrich, State Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor
2. George Cowan, CS&KT Personnel Department
3. Randy Morigeau, Higher Ed. Counselor at Salish Kootenai College
4. Janet Barce, Tribal Health Social Worker
5. Roger McClure, Salish Kootenai Board of Trustees
6. Tracey Buckless, Middle School Counselor
7. Bud Barnaby, Tribal Cultural Committee

Dr. Joseph McDonald, President of Salish Kootenai College is the project Administrator at .25 FTE (in kind). In this position, Dr. McDonald reports to the Project Advisory Committee and the Salish Kootenai College Board of Trustees. He is responsible for liaison activities with tribal administration, supervising the project Director, and providing an internal review of project activities. Dr. McDonald has over 30 years experience as a high school teacher, secondary principal, college instructor, athletic coach, and college president. He serves on a number of tribal and national Indian associations.

Mr. Michael Hermanson is the project Director at .20 FTE. This position is the project's primary administrative position. Mr. Hermanson is responsible for supervising project personnel, determining applicant eligibility, reviewing plans developed by the project Counselor, and developing the training sponsored by the project. Mr. Hermanson has over 16 years of experience in rehabilitation working as a rehabilitation counselor, social worker, project coordinator, and human services instructor. He has a Bachelor's degree in Psychology and a Master's degree in rehabilitation counselling. Currently, Mr. Hermanson is
completing requirements for an Ed.D. at the University of Montana.

For eight months, Ms. Barbara Landstrom was project Coordinator at .25 FTE. In this position she reviewed cases and conducted Microcomputer Evaluation and Screening Assessment (MESA) tests. The MESA is a series of tests used to evaluate a person's aptitude for performing various occupations. Ms. Landstrom split her time between the CS&KT Vocational Rehabilitation Project and the Students With Disabilities Support Services Project. Splitting her time between the two projects proved to be inefficient and recently she began coordinating the Students With Disabilities Support Services Project full time.

During the 1989-1990 year Ms. Gail McBroom was the project Counselor at 1.0 FTE. Her duties included: accepting applications, arranging client evaluation(s) and service(s), developing individualized client rehabilitation plans, and developing job placements. Ms. McBroom left the project at the end of the 1989-1990 project year and the project Counselor position was filled by Ms. Rosemary Mcleod.

As a result of a growing caseload and expanded project objectives, the project Director and Counselor had taken on new responsibilities. In two areas these responsibilities turned out to be more than two people could efficiently handle. Consequently, in September, 1980 two new positions
were created. They are the Elderly Outreach Technician and the Job Development Technician. The Elderly Outreach Technician position was created as a result of an analysis of program participants conducted by Mr. Hermanson. He noted a trend in the growing numbers of clients in the elderly group. Upon further investigation, he determined that there were a number of possible clients on the reservation in the 45+ age group and decided to create a position to recruit them. The Elderly Outreach Technician and the Job Development Technician positions are discussed below.

Ms. Carolyn Peterson serves as the Elderly Outreach Technician at .5 FTE. In this position, Ms. Peterson contacts and recruits clients in the 45+ age group.

Ms. Marie Lamoose is the Job Development Technician at 1.0 FTE. In this position Ms. Lamoose is completing a vocational survey of the Flathead Reservation. The survey includes information on jobs at major employers, estimates of turnover, and wage ranges. Additionally, she is supervising the development of awareness video tapes to be used for job development. It is hoped that contact with the employers will create project awareness and client placements.

The Secretary/Clerk, Ms. Jeris Fred, works full-time and reports directly to the project Director. The Secretary/Clerk maintains and updates all project records,
does all project typing, and is responsible for project bookkeeping.

**Project Objectives to be Accomplished During 1989-1990**

The following objectives were listed as goals for the project's 1989-1990 operating year.

1. By September 1990, and each project year thereafter, a minimum of 40 Indian clients with disabilities will receive comprehensive individualized rehabilitation services.

2. By September 1990, and each project year thereafter, a minimum of 15 Indian clients with disabilities will participate in the development of an Individualized Written Rehabilitation Plan. The IWRP may be for extended evaluation services or rehabilitation services.

3. By September 30, 1990, a minimum of 15 Indian clients with disabilities will receive independent living services.

4. By September 30, 1990, and each project year thereafter, a minimum of ten Indian clients with handicaps will be placed in permanent employment.

5. By September 30, 1990, and each project year thereafter, the project will develop and present a minimum of two training programs related to special needs of American Indians with disabilities. The training will be offered to the other professional services involved in the rehabilitation of project clients.
6. By September 30, 1990, and each project year thereafter, the project will sponsor a one week long cultural healing encampment to introduce project clients and project staff to traditional healing practices and cultural life style.

7. By September 30, 1990, and each project year thereafter, 15 project clients will complete a vocational evaluation process (utilizing the project's Microcomputer Evaluation and Screening Assessment system).

8. By September 30, 1990, the project will have in place a complete policies and procedures manual that provides consistent direction in the carrying out of the day-to-day provision of rehabilitation services.
II.
METHODS

Historical Overview of Program Evaluation

In the early stages of the conceptualization and development of program evaluation as a discipline scientific research methods were greatly emphasized. This was done to promote program evaluation as a new science that was distinct from casual or arbitrary judgements of a program's effectiveness (Chen, 1990). According to Chen (1990), this new discipline focused on methodological issues. The three most influential methodologies on program evaluation were: the classic randomized experimental design (other quasi-experimental or pre-experimental designs were appropriate to the degree they approximated the classic experimental design), the naturalistic approach (qualitative or ethnographic), and the econometric approach.

These approaches have contributed much to the field of program evaluation. For example, the experimental design approach has contributed to understanding the issues of internal validity and bias. The naturalistic approach has helped evaluators to better understand multiple stakeholders' needs and concerns and provide information about the
day-to-day operation of a program. The econometric approach contributed methods for working with nonexperimental data. However, Chen (1990) says that proponents of one methodology most often use only the methodology they believe in and demonstrate "tunnel vision" with respect to other methodologies. Chen (1990) argues that this inflexibility has narrowed the utility of these methodologies when applied to program evaluation because each focuses only on the things that that methodology does well and ignores those things that the other methodologies address. Consequently, program evaluations performed using only one methodology may not have produced important and necessary decision-making information.

Recently, however, evaluators are recognizing the need to forsake the adherence to one methodology and broaden their focus to deal with multiple values and issues in order to provide relevant and useful program information. This is accomplished by incorporating program theory into evaluations and accomplishing the evaluation using one or a combination of methods appropriate for the theory. Chen (1990, p.38) says that program theory can be thought of as:

the systematic collection of empirical evidence for the purposes of:

(1) assessing the congruency between normative and actual program structures (including the structures of program treatment, implementation environment, and/or outcome); and
(2) verifying the program's impact, its underlying causal mechanisms, or the degree of its generalizability.

Further, he suggests that theory-driven evaluation are valuable for the purpose of refining or developing, "program structure and operations, to understand or strengthen program effectiveness and utility, and, therefore, to facilitate policy decision making regarding the program" (Chen, 1990, p.38).

The theory-driven approach is similar to past program evaluation practices in that it uses established data collection methods and empirically verifies theory. It differs, suggests Chen (1990), in its focus on program theory rather than just on process or input/output factors. According to Chen (1989), the theory-driven approach is useful for: identifying crucial issues in an evaluation, integrating program implementation into the evaluation process, diagnosing problems in program structure and underlying causal mechanisms for program improvement, and/or in enhancing the use of evaluation results. The current evaluation incorporated both the input/output approach and theory-driven approach in its design. A discussion of each as they apply to this evaluation follows.

Process and Outcome Approach

Posavac & Carey (1985) list four common types of input/output evaluations: need, process, outcome, and efficiency. Within this framework, the current evaluation
focused on two of the four areas: process and outcome. The purpose of the process evaluation was to determine if the program was implemented according to the objectives in the 1989-1990 grant application and served the proposed population. The purpose of the outcome evaluation was to determine if the program achieved its stated goals.

Theory-Driven Approach

In addition to evaluating adherence to the project's stated objectives and progress toward achieving 1988-1989 evaluator's recommendations, this evaluation looked at "what makes this program work." Michael Hermanson, CS&KT Project Director, defined "work" as:

1. The greater number of Salish & Kootenai Indian clients on the project's caseload (20-25 in year 1, 30-35 in year 2, 40 - 50 in year 3) when compared with the number served by the state prior to project implementation.

2. An individual's success defined as completing stated goals and/or obtaining a job.

Finney & Moos (1989) in discussing theory-driven evaluation methods emphasize the influence that client pretreatment and intervention factors have on a program's operation. Because both client pretreatment and intervention factors were considered as important factors contributing to the success of the program they became the basis of the theory-driven part of this evaluation. Intervention factors included in this evaluation were: the
influence of employee's personalities on the program's success, the initial contact or referral method's influence on a person's attitude towards the program, the influence of non-interference on the program's success, and whether or not the project's affiliation with the Salish Kootenai College contributed to programmatic success. Client pretreatment factors included in this evaluation were: the perception and value of employment and its relationship to program completion, a person's educational and employment goals, and whether or not cultural and traditional values influenced a person's entrance into the program. By incorporating the theory-driven approach, this evaluation was able to evaluate the effects of intervention and client pretreatment factors on "what makes the program work."

**Evaluation Design**

The evaluation design combined qualitative and quantitative methods in the following three areas:

1. Written material review.
2. Interviews—with project staff, clients, people who attended training sessions, and employers.

The evaluator visited the offices of the CS&KT Rehabilitation Project from September 4-7, 1990 and while there, met with project personnel (including the Administrator, Director, outgoing Counselor, Job Development Technician,
Elderly Outreach Technician, and Secretary/Clerk), interviewed two supervisors at placement sites, reviewed evaluations of training and encampment activities, and conducted interviews with 17 project clients. Additional interviews were conducted by telephone with three employment placement supervisors and with recipients of a recent training activity.

Written materials (e.g., grant proposal, previous evaluations) and verbal information (e.g., discussions of governance, project philosophy) were supplied by the project Director prior to, during, or after the on-site visit. Client and staff interviews and the mail-based questionnaire are discussed below.

Client Interviews

In-person interviews were conducted with 17 clients who received services from the program during the 1989-1990 project year. Participants were selected by project staff based on the project objective areas they participated in during the year. Originally, 23 clients were to be interviewed, but six clients were not able to participate due to personal reasons. All but four clients were interviewed on the Salish Kootenai College campus. Three people were interviewed in their homes. One person was interviewed at work.

The number of people interviewed in each project objective area is as follows:
Project Objective 1, Rehabilitation services, 17 interviews.

Project Objective 2, The IWRP process, six interviews.

Project Objective 3, Independent living services, eight interviews.

Project Objective 4, Placement in permanent employment, five interviews.

Project Objective 6, Encampment, five interviews.

Project Objective 7, Microcomputer Evaluation and Screening Assessment system, six interviews.

Both quantitative and qualitative interviews were conducted. Quantitative interviews were conducted using the Client Satisfaction Questionnaire by Larsen, Attkisson, Hargreaves, and Nguyen, which was adapted to ask questions specifically about each project area evaluated (e.g., the overall program, independent living, microcomputer evaluation, etc.). The questionnaire was recommended by Patterson and Leach (1987) for assessing client satisfaction in vocational rehabilitation and by Bornstein and Rychtarik (1983, p. 202) as a "simple scale to administer, with sound psychometric properties, and requires approximately 5 minutes for completion." According to Bornstein (1990), "the scale can easily be modified to meet programmatic needs without losing soundness." Depending on the project area, the questionnaire asked people to respond to six or eight questions. A mean score was derived for each question by summing the clients' ratings for that question and dividing by the
number of clients. Clients rated their satisfaction using a 1 to 4 Likkert scale. A one rating indicated complete dissatisfaction, a 4 indicated complete satisfaction. The scale offered no neutral point. An overall mean score indicating general satisfaction with a project area was also computed by summing the mean score for each question and dividing by the number of questions asked about that project area.

In the qualitative portion of the interview, clients talked about the program either before, during, or after the questionnaire was administrated. Because project personnel did not think the clients would feel free to talk if the interview were tape recorded, interviews were not taped. However, notes were taken both during and after interviews.

Staff Interviews

Free-form qualitative interviews were conducted with project staff to get staff input on programmatic strengths and weaknesses.

Mail-Based Survey

A mail-based survey was sent to all people the program had served or had contact with since it began four years ago. The people were divided into three groups as follows:

1. People who were referred to and contacted by the program but did not begin services.
2. People who applied to the program but did not begin services and/or clients who began services but withdrew from the program without a successful closure.

3. Clients currently receiving services or whose cases were closed as successful rehabilitants.

The purpose of the survey was to obtain information from as many clients as possible on areas program personnel thought were components of the program's success. Questions on the survey were asked to try to determine why a client originally talked to the CS&KT Project staff, what a client thought the purpose of the project was, whether or not the project followed the principle of "non-interference," whether or not the program benefited from its location at the college, and what five things a client liked most and least about the program. Because their interactions with the program differed, each group received a slightly different questionnaire. Copies of the survey may be found in Appendix A.

The first mailing consisted of a questionnaire, a letter from the CS&KT Project Director, a letter from the evaluator, and a self-addressed, postage paid, envelope. To encourage people's participation, the project awarded a $50 prize through a drawing. Our receipt of a completed questionnaire was required to enter the drawing. Each return envelope was numbered according to the three program status groups and became a person's entry to the drawing.
Besides the drawing, the letter from the project Director encouraged people to participate. It also indicated that the Director had reviewed the questionnaire, that the information asked for would help evaluate the project, and that people's responses would be confidential. It introduced the drawing and indicated that participation was voluntary and completion or non-completion of the questionnaire would not effect eligibility for services.

The evaluator's letter stated why a person was sent a questionnaire, stated alternative methods for responding (e.g., arrange for a face-to-face interview or receive help with filling out the questionnaire), reiterated that participation was voluntary and confidential, and it discussed the drawing. After three weeks, people who had not returned their questionnaires were sent another packet consisting of a letter from the evaluator, a questionnaire, and a self-addressed, postage-paid envelope.

One hundred thirty-six surveys were mailed with one follow-up mailing. Sixty-two surveys (49.2%) were returned. Twenty-nine surveys were mailed to the Referred group; ten were returned—a 34.4 percent return rate. Fifty-one surveys were mailed to the Began/Didn't Finish group; 17 were returned—a 33.3 percent return rate. Forty-seven surveys were mailed to the In/Completed Program group; 35 were returned—a 74.5 percent return rate. The highest return rate came from the group with the most program involvement.
No follow-up contacts were made to people who did not return their surveys after the second mailing due to the unavailability of specific addresses or telephone numbers for many of the potential respondents. Some of the difficulties with locating nonrespondents included:

1. Most unreturned surveys were mailed to a post office box, therefore, no address was available for the evaluator to call on.

2. Although CS&KT Project staff knew most of the people who did not return surveys or knew relatives of them, staff said it would be difficult to locate these people because they were transient and/or had summer employment. Although they tried, staff were unable to locate current addresses for them. I was told that even calling on the last known address would be difficult because in many cases the residence was remote, difficult to get to, and difficult to explain how to get there. Staff cautioned that even if I was successful in tracking down a nonrespondent, it would not be wise for an interviewer to show up unannounced at a person's home.

3. Telephone numbers were not available for most people in the Began/Didn't Finish and Referred categories.

Questionnaire responses were analyzed using crosstabs and chi-square tests of significance.
III.
RESULTS

Process and Outcome Evaluation

The following results are presented according to each 1989-1990 project objective.

Project Objective 1

By September 1990, and each project year thereafter, a minimum of 40 Indian clients with disabilities will receive comprehensive individualized rehabilitation services.

To have received "comprehensive individualized rehabilitation services," a person must be working on or have completed an IWRP, be in or have been in extended evaluation, be receiving or have received services, or have successfully achieved a vocational goal. This is a different category than "receiving services" discussed under "Program Origin," above where 95 people had some sort of contact with the program.

During the year, the program provided comprehensive individualized rehabilitation services to 49 Indian people. The program more than met its goal of providing comprehensive individualized services to 40 Indian people. In fact, project personnel exceeded the stated goal by 23 percent.

Seventeen clients who received these comprehensive individualized services during the year answered the
satisfaction questionnaire and were interviewed about their experience with the program. The program was rated highly by participants, with an average rating on the satisfaction survey of 3.7 out of a total possible of 4.0. Ratings for the questions asked on the satisfaction questionnaire follow.

Table 1
Program Area: Comprehensive Individualized Rehabilitation Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall rating = 3.7</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>No. Interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the quality of the overall program?</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you get the kind of service you wanted?</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the program met your needs?</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a friend were in need of similar help, would you recommend the program to him or her?</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with the amount of help you received?</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the program helped you to deal more effectively with your problem(s)?</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an overall, general sense, how satisfied are you with the program?</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you were to seek help again, would you come back to this program?</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clients complimented program staff's willingness to help them and work with them in the vocational rehabilitation process. One primarily homebound person said "they brought me everything I needed. The program travelled to me
all the time." Another said that the "support they provided me was invaluable. I can't emphasize how important their support has been to me." When asked if she received the kind of service she wanted one client responded by saying "yes definitely, and more."

Project Objective 2

By September 1990, and each project year thereafter, a minimum of 15 Indian clients with disabilities will participate in the development of an Individualized Written Rehabilitation Plan.

By the end of the year, a total of 23 clients had participated in the development of an Individualized Written Rehabilitation Plan. The project exceeded the targeted goal for this objective by 53 percent.

An interview was conducted with and a client satisfaction scale was completed by six clients who participated in the IWRP. During interviews clients discussed their experience(s) with the IWRP process. The discussions indicated that clients understood the process, their rights, and their responsibilities. The six people interviewed understood the IWRP goals agreed to by them and the program. On the satisfaction questionnaire, clients gave the IWRP process an average rating of 3.1. The satisfaction scale results for he IWRP are:
Table 2
Program Area: Individualized Written Rehabilitation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall rating = 3.1</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>No. Interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the quality of your Independent Written Program?</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the plan what you wanted?</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the plan meet your needs?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were you satisfied with the plan?</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the plan helped you deal more effectively with your problems?</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an overall, general sense, how satisfied are you with the plan?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While generally positive, a few respondents appeared to have some concern with their IWRP (see Table 2). Several clients did not think the plan they got was what they wanted. With a 2.8 rating, this item ranked the lowest of the IWRP items. One client said she "did not know what all the available options were; I like to see everything laid out," another disagreed with her primary goal, and a third said that his "disability and special needs were not considered at all in the IWRP."

The project Director and the Counselor attributed people's dissatisfaction to decreased meetings between the Director and Counselor. The Director and Counselor said that as the year progressed they did not meet to discuss cases as frequently as before because of the project Director's increased workload. The Counselor said she missed the
Director's input into client's cases. The evaluator believes that it is possible that the dissatisfaction may be attributed to the infrequent meetings and the resulting lack of input and feedback by the project Director.

**Project Objective 3**

*By September 30, 1990, a minimum of 15 Indian clients with disabilities will receive independent living services.*

The CS&KT model includes an active independent living component. Twenty-two clients received independent living services supplied by or brokered by the program. This exceeded the stated objective by 47 percent.

A wide array of independent living services were provided by the project during the last year. These included, but were not limited to the following:

- Purchasing a business development plan for a client
- Providing advice about and assistance with selecting and locating equipment
- Coordinating recreational activities (e.g., rafting, wheelchair basketball)
- Notifying people about and providing transportation to two workshops (family skills and sexual awareness)
- Obtaining adapted materials for a client to study for a driver's license exam
- Notifying people of, providing transportation to, and paying registration for clients to attend an arthritis workshop
- Evaluating independent living as part of an occupational therapy evaluation
- Purchasing adapted household equipment
- Assistance with filling out forms (e.g., general assistance, financial aid, employment application)
- Loaning equipment
- Assistance with moving
- Assistance with obtaining services from Medicaid
- Assistance with sorting out Medicaid and Social Security issues
Eight clients who received independent living services were interviewed and answered the satisfaction questionnaire. The average satisfaction score for independent living services was 3.8. The results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>Project Area: Independent Living</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall rating = 3.8</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the quality of the independent living services you received?</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the services you received, what you wanted?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the services meet your needs?</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with the services you received?</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the services helped you to deal more effectively with your problems?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an overall, general sense, how satisfied are you with the services you received?</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores for this component indicate that, in client's opinions, the independent living project area is one of the most highly appreciated and regarded components of the CS&KT Project.
Project Objective 4

By September 30, 1990, and each project year thereafter, a minimum of ten Indian clients with handicaps will be placed in permanent employment.

The project achieved its projected goal of placing ten clients into permanent vocational situations. In fact, this year more people were placed than during the two previous years combined. During those two years, a total of six people were placed in permanent vocational situations. The following is a list of placements along with application, IWRP, service, and placement dates. The dates are given to illustrate clients' movement through the rehabilitation process.

Bus Driver
(application 6/14/89, IWRP 9/6/89, services 10/13/89, placement 10/16/89)

Counselor
(application 1/25/88, IWRP 3/17/88, services 3/22/88, placement 7/16/90)

Counselor
(application 3/29/88, IWRP 7/12/88, services 7/19/88, placement 1/2/90)

Hide Tanning, Crafts
(application 2/15/88, IWRP 3/22/88, services 6/19/89, placement 10/10/89)

Homemaker

Homemaker
(application 5/18/89, IWRP 7/19/89, services 9/11/89, placement 10/26/89)

Independent Post & Pole Logger
(application 11/20/89, IWRP 1/16/90, services 4/6/90, placement 4/9/90)
Janitor
(application 4/22/88, IWRP 12/6/88, services 1/12/90, placement 1/19/90)

Social Service Aid
(application 10/11/88, IWRP 12/28/88, services 6/7/89, placement 7/10/89)

Social Service Aid
(application 8/15/89, IWRP 4/6/90, services 6/5/90, placement 6/25/90)

Five people placed in a permanent vocational situation were interviewed. Three of them completed a satisfaction rating scale. The average overall rating on the satisfaction scale for permanent placement was 3.2. The results are as follows:

Table 4
Project Area: Placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall rating = 3.2</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>No. Interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the quality of the placement or placement services you received?</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the placement or were the placement services the kind you wanted?</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the placement or placement services meet your needs?</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with the number of placement services you received?</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your placement helped you to deal more effectively with your problems?</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an overall, general sense, how satisfied are you with the placement or placement services you received?</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is the first year the project has met its placement goal, and according to the project Director, this placement trend should continue. Mr. Hermanson thinks two factors may account for the increased number of placements for this and future years. First, from his experience, a program does not experience frequent placements until it has been operating for two to five years. Second, this year two of the placements were people who had completed their multi-year educational goals. Mr. Hermanson believes that clients who started with the program in the first two years will soon complete their educational goals and will be ready for vocational placement. He sees this as a continuous cycle where some people begin their education program as others finish.

Project Objective 5

By September 30, 1990, and each project year thereafter, the project will develop and present a minimum of two training programs related to special needs of American Indians with disabilities. The training will be offered to the other professional services involved in the rehabilitation of project clients.

During the past year the project presented three training programs related to special needs of American Indians with disabilities. The project also exceeded the goal set for this objective.

The first session was presented to seven supervisors who work for the Community Medical Center Rehabilitation Center. The second training session was presented to 11
staff members of the Community Rehabilitation Center who attended the annual "encampment." The third session was presented to ten employees of the Community Rehabilitation Center's Work Occupational Readiness and Consultation Center (WORC).

Evaluations submitted by people who attended the first training program were reviewed. Additionally, the evaluator attended the session presented at the WORC Center and subsequently interviewed the manager of the WORC Center about the session.

The session the evaluator attended did not appear to meet its stated goal of teaching people about the special needs of American Indians with disabilities. Instead, the presenters discussed their own experience(s) either as a person with a disability or as a professional working with a person with a disability. In most cases those experiences were not different from what any other American with a disability has experienced.

In addition, the evaluator observed that the third session was loosely structured. When asked, Mr. Hermanson confirmed that the first session was conducted in the same manner as the one the evaluator attended. At these sessions, Mr. Hermanson gave a brief introduction, followed by the presentations of invited speakers who talked about their experience(s) as a person with a disability or their experience(s) as a rehabilitation professional working with Indian
people. When the presenters finished, participants asked questions.

Evaluations of the session conducted at the Community Rehabilitation Center were positive. Participants said they learned something, although comments indicated that, since they were supervisors, they could not directly use their new knowledge with clients. However, they indicated that they might be able to pass the knowledge on to staff they supervise.

As a result of the presentation at the WORC Center and information shared there, the WORC Center's policies and procedures manual was revised to include a section on Indian elders and Indian culture. People agreed that the discussion session at the end was particularly appreciated by and enlightening for this group. It was the overall consensus of these participants that they learned information that would be helpful and would be used in their future interactions with Indian people. However, participants thought the presentation should have been more structured. They thought sessions could be structured to: (1) discuss goals of the session during the introduction, (2) include more time devoted to problem-solving or discussing specific situations, and (3) have presenters better tie their presentations into the topical goals of the session.

Another outcome of the training session at WORC was that CS&KT Project personnel were encouraged by the WORC
staff to discuss with clients whether or not they wanted to include family members, as appropriate, in discussions of and/or evaluations for their vocational rehabilitation.

The evaluation of the training session at the encampment will be discussed below.

Project Objective 6

By September 30, 1990, and each project year thereafter, the project will sponsor a one week long cultural healing encampment to introduce project clients and project staff to traditional healing practices and cultural life.

This year the encampment was held during the week of June 18th-27th. It was attended by 30 people (11 clients, seven client family members, one staff member, and 11 professionals from the Community Rehabilitation Center).

The encampment was a week-long event held in the mountains of the Flathead Reservation. The CS&KT Project contracted with an organization called Wintercount, directed by Mr. Ron Therriault, to conduct the encampment. Mr. Therriault was in charge of the entire encampment which included, but was not limited to, providing daytime and sleeping tents, selecting and preparing food, and deciding the format for the encampment (e.g., activities and scheduling). During the week, people participated in activities
that were focused on bringing Indian people in touch with their heritage or introducing anglos to Indian heritage. Activities included beading, hide tanning, nature walks, storytelling, toolmaking, quillwork, stick games, drumming, and singing.

Although the encampment was primarily for project clients and family members, employees of the Community Rehabilitation Center were invited to attend as part of the project's training contract with Community Rehabilitation Center. None of the participants were required to attend for the full week. Participant's stays ranged from one to two days to the entire week. Some people commuted from home while others stayed overnight at the encampment.

Interviews were conducted with seven clients who attended this year's encampment. Five of them completed the satisfaction rating scale. The encampment's average overall rating on the satisfaction scale was 3.2. The results are as follows:
Table 5
Project Area: Encampment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall rating = 3.2</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>No. Interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the quality of encampment?</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the encampment the kind of service you wanted?</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the encampment meet your needs?</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with the kind of services you received at the encampment?</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the encampment helped you to deal more effectively with your problems?</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an overall, general sense, how satisfied are you with the encampment?</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Client comments about the encampment were positive. They ranged from "it was fun" to it "allows people with disabilities to see that just about anything is possible."

In addition to the interviews and the rating scale, the evaluator reviewed encampment evaluations submitted by employees of Community Rehabilitation Center. All of the evaluations from this group were positive. Many from this group commented that participating in the encampment gave them a better understanding of past Indian culture and its ties with Indian people of today.

While the comments and rating scale scores showed that participants enjoyed the encampment, there are questions as to why the CS&KT Project continues it. Staff and clients
alike are not sure how the encampment ties in with furthering vocational rehabilitation goals and one staff member suggested that the same outcomes might be achieved in a different way (e.g., holding cultural sessions at the College). Further, criticism surfaced regarding one of the stated purposes of the encampment, which was to introduce cultural healing. It was the viewpoint of some people who were interviewed that not much cultural healing took place at the encampment.

In discussing these concerns with the project Director, he reported that some cultural healing activities did take place. For example, separate sweats were held for Indian and anglo visitors. However, because the encampment was conducted by a Salish tribal member, the majority of the special healing activities were for Salish people. People from other tribes were referred to their respective cultural committees for more information. Mr. Hermanson also pointed out that the encampment itself is a sort of cultural healing—a getting in touch with one's self. In fact one client said that for him the encampment gave a:

"a different perspective on values. It helps me take a different look at life as an Indian. At the encampment you are respected for who you are. It helps me get my mind straight, which I need to do before I can do anything else. The encampment gets me ready for other things."
Project Objective 7

By September 30, 1990, and each project year thereafter, 15 project clients will complete a vocational evaluation process, utilizing the project's Microcomputer Evaluation and Screening Assessment (MESA) system.

During 1989-1990, 12 people completed vocational evaluation using the project's Microcomputer Evaluation and Screening Assessment system, reaching 80 percent of its stated objective.

The evaluator interviewed six clients who completed the MESA. All six clients answered the satisfaction questionnaire. The average MESA rating is 2.9. Scores on the individual questions are as follows:

Table 6
Project Area: Microcomputer Evaluation and Screening Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>No. Interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the quality the MESA?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the MESA the kind of service you wanted?</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the MESA meet your needs?</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with the amount of MESA services you received?</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the MESA helped you to deal more effectively with your problems?</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an overall, general sense, how satisfied are you with the MESA?</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From comments made by a few of the clients who were interviewed, it appears they did not think the MESA influenced or helped them decide upon their vocational goal. For example, during interviews, three people remarked that the test and results were "interesting." One person commented that it "didn't do much, can't say it did or didn't help me decide." And finally, another said that it "reinforced my skills but didn't tell me anything new." Additionally, clients commented that there was a long lag time between taking the test and receiving an interpretation of their scores.

At a rating of 2.9, the MESA received the lowest satisfaction score of all project objectives reviewed. This is not a bad score, it is above the midpoint of the scale and is one-tenth of a point away from a "good" rating. Mr. Hermanson attributed the lower average rating to the fact that the MESA's were not interpreted and the results conveyed to the client in a timely manner. Consequently, he has intervened in the process and is now interpreting the MESA's. He was surprised that clients did not find the MESA useful and thought it might be because the person interpreting the results was not an expert in interpreting the MESA. He said that, in his experience, clients have remarked that the MESA was instrumental in helping them decide on a vocational goal. Perhaps the dissatisfaction expressed by the clients interviewed for this objective stemmed from the MESA's
administration and interpretation rather than on the potential helpfulness of the MESA itself. Or perhaps clients told the evaluator, not the project Director, what they really thought about the MESA.

With the changes Mr. Hermanson has made as to who administers and interprets the MESA, it appears the problems experienced during this past year are less likely to occur in the future.

Project Objective 8

By September 30, 1990, the project will have in place a complete policies and procedures manual that provides consistent direction in the carrying out of the day-to-day provision of rehabilitation services.

This project objective was initiated pursuant to a recommendation made after the 1988-1989 evaluation. That recommendation encouraged the clarification of roles and responsibilities of project staff in the CS&KT Vocational Rehabilitation Project and other Salish Kootenai College programs with the shared missions of providing assistance to adults with disabilities.

A policies and procedures manual currently is being written. However, at the end of the 1989-1990 program year, it was not yet finished.

The evaluator encourages its completion.
Progress Toward the Recommendation of the 1988-1989 Evaluation Team

It is recommended that efforts increase to promote job opportunities for CS&KT Rehabilitation clients and other individuals with disabilities living on the Flathead Reservation.

It was recommended that the project develop a computerized job bank of all employers in the area. The job bank should contain job opportunity information for prospective employees and information about employing people with disabilities for potential employers.

The project Director understands the importance of this recommendation to the project's success and, as a result, this recommendation became a project objective for the upcoming 1990-1991 year. To address the issue during the past year, project staff:

1. Continued contact between the project and the local State of Montana Employment Service and the Tribal Personnel Office.
2. Developed guidelines for self-employment.
3. Attended a job analysis and development state vocational rehabilitation sponsored workshop.
4. Hired a Job Development Technician to complete a vocational survey of the Flathead Reservation. This survey will collect information on jobs, estimates of turnover, and wage ranges for major employers on the Flathead Reservation.

In the evaluator's opinion, progress was achieved on this recommendation during the past year. Increased aware-
ness of job opportunities and increased employer awareness are important steps toward increasing employment opportunities for the project's clients. Converting this recommendation into a project objective for the upcoming year and hiring the Job Development Technician appear to be an effective approach towards achieving stated placement goals.

Staff Interviews

Interviews were conducted with the outgoing Counselor, Job Development Technician, Elderly Outreach Technician, and the Secretary/Clerk. Interviews also were conducted with two staff members of the Disabled Students Services Project, the Coordinator, and the Peer Counselor.

Within the CS&KT Vocational Rehabilitation Project, two employees, the Job Development Technician and the Elderly Outreach Technician, had been working in those capacities only a short time. However, because of past employment by the CS&KT Project as a Rehabilitation Aide, the Job Development Technician does have some familiarity with the project.

Due to recent staff turnover, it is difficult to tell how well the group works together or to gauge its cohesiveness, and/or its effectiveness. All staff members indicated their confidence in Mr. Hermanson's leadership and acknowledged his caring attitude towards clients. In their
opinion, the 1989-1990 project year was a success. They thought clients respected and appreciated their efforts. However, in all interviews concerns were expressed in one or more of the following areas: lack of communication and staff meetings, the project Director's overextended commitments due to his efforts on other projects (especially towards establishing a four-year degree program in Rehabilitation at the Salish Kootenai College), and his heavy teaching load.

**Theory-Driven Evaluation**

In this section the results of the mail-based survey were used to determine the influence of program intervention and client pretreatment factors. Seven hypothesis are presented and discussed.

**Demographic Profiles**

This section contains demographic information about survey respondents.

One hundred thirty-six surveys were mailed with one follow-up mailing. Sixty-two surveys (49.2%) were returned. Twenty-nine surveys were mailed to the Referred group; ten were returned—a 34.4 percent return rate. Fifty-one surveys were mailed to the Began/Didn't Finish group; 17 were returned—a 33.3 percent return rate. Forty-seven surveys were mailed to the In/Completed Program group; 35 were returned—a 74.5 percent return rate. The highest return rate came from the group with the most program involvement.
No follow-up contacts were made to people who did not return their surveys after the second mailing due to the unavailability of specific addresses or telephone numbers for many of the potential respondents.

Although fairly evenly split by sex, there were more males (53.2%) who returned their surveys than females (46.8%). About two-thirds of the respondents were under 45 years of age (66.1%) with more males (53.5%) in the under 45 age group and, conversely, more females in the 45 and over age group (48%). Fifty-six of the 62 respondents are enrolled members of a recognized tribe, four are first descendants, the descendency of two were unknown. Almost 63 percent of the respondents are Salish, 8.1 percent are Kootenai, 3.2 percent are both Salish and Kootenai, 8.1 percent are Blackfeet, and 14.5 percent are members of other tribes. Thirty-seven percent of the respondents had a functional disability (a physical disability other than amputation), 3.2 percent had a visual disability, 1.6 percent had a hearing disability, 6.5 percent had an amputation, and 51.7 percent of the respondent's had an unknown disability. Over half of the respondents had completed high school or a GED. (54.8%), 19.4 percent had less than a high school education, 21 percent had either attended or completed vocational training or an Associate of Arts degree, and 4.8 percent had attended college or had a
college or graduate degree. More respondents were in the In/Completed Program group (56.5%). The next largest group was the Began/Didn't Finish group with 27.4 percent of the respondents, followed by the Referred group with 16.1 percent of the respondents.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

Entrance into the program is not influenced by the cultural and traditional values of members of the following three groups: (a) those who dropped out of the vocational rehabilitation program, (b) people who participate/participated in the program, or (c) those contacted by the program or who contacted the program but did not participate.

To assess the influence of cultural and traditional values on entrance into the program, people were asked if they thought education increased or decreased tribal values, how they placed themselves on a scale ranging from totally anglo to totally Indian, and the importance to the respondent of maintaining and for Salish & Kootenai people to maintain a traditional way of life. It was thought that attitudes towards the perceived influence of education on traditional/cultural values might be correlated with self-placement on a traditional/cultural scale and would ultimately relate to a person's program status.

Results

As can be seen from Table 12, the proportions in the Began/Didn't Finish and the In/Completed Program groups
closely parallel each other. Only the Referred group appears to be different, with approximately 78 percent of the people in the group considering themselves more or totally Indian, with the majority (67 percent) regarding themselves as totally Indian. In addition, members of the Referred group considered themselves half and half Indian less often than members of the other groups. No one who responded to the survey considered themselves to be totally anglo.

Table 7
Where Do You Place Yourself by Program Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>Anglo</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Began/Didn't Finish</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In/Completed Program</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For all tables, test of significance results will be shown only when statistical significance is achieved.

More than members of the other two groups, members of the In/Completed Program group thought that education reinforced tribal traditional values (Table 13). The Began/Didn't Finish group agreed, but did so less often than the In/Completed Program group. From the data in Table 13, it can be seen that a much higher percentage of the Referred group thought that education eliminated traditional values.
Table 8
Has Education Reinforced or Eliminated Traditional Values by Program Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N=59</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Reinforced</th>
<th>Eliminated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Began/Didn't Finish</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In/Completed Program</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 14 shows all groups felt more strongly that education reinforced their own traditional values. In fact they thought it reinforced their own personal values more often than they thought it reinforced traditional values in general.

Table 9
How Much Education Has Increased or Decreased your Traditional Values by Program Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N=53</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Reinforced</th>
<th>Eliminated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Began/Didn't Finish</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In/Completed Program</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members of all groups (Table 15) thought it was important for Salish & Kootenai people to maintain the traditional way of life. For both the Began/Didn't Finish and the Referred groups, 100 percent of the respondents agreed, however, it is interesting to note that 6.2 percent of the in-completed group, two people, disagreed.
Table 10
Is it Important/Not Important for the Salish & Kootenai People to Maintain Traditional Ways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N=59</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Began/Didn't Finish</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In/Completed Program</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 shows that a smaller percentage of each group thought it was important for them to maintain the traditional way of life than thought it was important for Salish & Kootenai people to maintain traditional ways (Table 15). From the data in these tables, it appears the Referred group not only thought it important to maintain the traditional ways, but were more likely than people in the other two groups to personally live according to the traditional ways.

Table 11
Is it Important/Not Important for You to Maintain Traditional Ways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N=60</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Began/Didn't Finish</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In/Completed Program</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

When looking at the data presented for this hypotheses, the Referred group stands out as more traditional in a number of areas. Members of the Referred group considered
themselves more "Indian" more often than members of the other two groups. They were more inclined than members of the other two groups to think that education decreased both tribal and personal traditional values. From the data, it also seems that they not only thought it important for the Salish & Kootenai people to maintain traditional ways, but were a little more willing than members of other groups to personally continue in the traditional ways themselves.

Because of their answers about the effects of education on traditional values, it is possible that there is another explanation for members of this group to not become clients of the CS&KT Vocational Rehabilitation Program. It is possible they stayed away from the program because they feared the possible negative effects of further education on their cultural/traditional values. It is possible that members of the Referred group were alienated by the program's location on the S&K College campus or by the program if education was stressed when they were first told about it. It is possible that these people did not become clients, in part, because they viewed the program as having to do with education rather than providing a wide range of vocational services and training.

Again the Referred group is contradictory. For example, they are the least educated but realized that they need more education. However, they thought that education had eliminated the importance of traditional tribal values, and
that education had decreased their personal traditional values. It seems this would be the cause of some conflict; the realization that more education is needed to get ahead or keep a job, but the fear that it would change them so that they would not be what they consider to be a truly traditional Indian.

It is interesting to note that respondents thought it was more important for Salish & Kootenai people to maintain the traditional ways (Table 14) than for them personally to maintain the traditional ways (Table 15). Because the questionnaire did not delve into this matter, it's unclear how those respondents who answered that it is not important for them to maintain the traditional way of life, expect that the Salish & Kootenai people should and will maintain the traditional ways if they themselves do not. Do they think it is someone else's responsibility; possibly the responsibility of cultural committee?

Test of Significance

The data analyzed show no significant differences between the groups when analyzed using chi-square tests. Because of this the null hypothesis is accepted. There appear to be no differences, between the groups, that influence entrance into the program. However, this is likely due to the small number of survey respondents especially in the Referred group.
Although the data show no significant differences, a trend was noted that showed members of the Referred group appear to be different from members of the other two groups. It is possible this difference is part of the reason people in the Referred group did not apply for services from the CS&KT Vocational Rehabilitation Project.

Hypothesis 2

Completion of the program is not influenced by how members of each of the following three groups perceive of and value employment: (a) those who dropped out of the vocational rehabilitation program, (b) people who participate/participated in the program, or (c) those contacted by the program or who contacted the program but did not participate.

To determine how clients and potential clients perceive of and value work, the survey asked respondents about their employment status at the time of filling out the questionnaire. To determine their attitudes toward work respondents were asked if they thought working for pay was necessary, if it was something they thought they should do, if they agreed that working for someone else for pay was something people ought to do, and if it was good for the CS&K Tribes to have someone in each family working for pay.

Results

More than half the survey respondents were unemployed (63%). However, as shown in the following table, people in the Referred group were more likely to be employed than people in the other two groups.
Table 12
Employment Status by Program Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N=63</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Began/Didn't Finish</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In/Completed Program</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to questions about attitude toward work, people in all three groups agreed that for them, personally, working for pay was necessary, they agreed that working for someone else for pay was something people ought to do, and they agreed that it was good for the Salish and Kootenai people to have someone in each family working for pay. However, when asked whether working for pay was something they personally should do, fifty-one percent of all the respondents agreed that it was better for them, personally, to stay at home. Table 8 shows that the Referred group was different from the other two groups in their responses to this question.
Table 13
Preference for Maintaining a Household Versus Working for Pay by Program Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N=61</th>
<th>Maintain Household</th>
<th>Work for Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Began/Didn't Finish</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In/Completed Program</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Based on 50 percent of them being employed at the time of the survey, it is possible that at least half of the Referred group did not apply to the program because they were employed and thought they did not need vocational rehabilitation services. It also may be that members of this group did not apply because of their more traditional emphasis; they perceived it as an educational program because of its location at the Salish Kootenai College and feared participating because education might eliminate their traditional values.

The In/Completed group's low employment rate may be because many of this group were in the program at the time of the survey and were not yet ready for the job market.

Even though a higher percentage of all three groups thought that working for pay was necessary, that people ought to work for someone else, and that it is good for the Salish & Kootenai people to have someone in each family working for pay, more of the respondents would rather
maintain a household than work for pay. It seemed contradictory to have almost everyone recognize the importance of work and agree that it should be done, but have more than half of the respondents think they should stay home and maintain a household rather than work for pay. Because a high portion of the Referred group agreed that it is better to stay at home and maintain the household, it is possible that the Referred group's traditional values are operating here.

To see if their answers were due to more than just program status, a crosstab of these data was done controlling for sex. The crosstab revealed a possible sex bias in answering this question. Sixty-one percent of the women and 42 percent of the men agreed with the statement that they would rather maintain a household than work for pay. While there is a tendency for a larger percentage of the women to want to stay home, it is interesting that such a large number of men also want to stay home. It is possible that the men's traditional values are being demonstrated in response to this question.

Test of Significance

Chi-square tests indicated no significant differences between the groups on any of the variables. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. Data support the hypothesis that perception and value of employment do not vary by group membership.
Hypothesis 3

Completion of the program is not influenced by the educational and employment goals of members of the following three groups: (a) those who dropped out of the vocational rehabilitation program, (b) people who participate/participated in the, and (c) those contacted by the program or who contacted the program but did not participate.

No specific questions were asked about educational goals. Instead, questions asked about educational attainment, the least amount of education perceived as necessary, the importance of education, and the importance of a degree or diploma. For employment goals, people were asked what kind of work they currently performed or performed when they were working, if they wanted to stay working at their current job for a few more years, the type of job they would rather be doing if they did not want to stay at their job for any length of time, and what prevented them from getting the type of job they wanted. Both employed and unemployed respondents were asked questions about work. If someone was not employed he or she responded about the type of job he or she usually performed.

Results

Education. As can be seen from the following table, the three groups are different from each other. A higher percentage of people in the Referred group did not finish high school, a higher percentage in the Began/Didn't Finish group had finished high school or obtained a GED, and a higher
percentage of people in the In/Completed group were educated in some manner beyond high school.

Table 14
Educational Attainment by Program Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N=62</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>No High School</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>GED</th>
<th>Vocat. Train./ College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Began/Didn't Finish</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In/Completed Program</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighty-two percent of the respondents thought they were in need of more education (Table 10). Although all groups thought they could use more education, the Began/Didn't Finish group was less likely to say they needed more education than the other two groups.

Table 10
Do you think you have had all the schooling you need?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N=60</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Began/Didn't Finish</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In/Completed Program</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16
What Is The Least Amount of Education a Person Should Have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N=62</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>No High School</th>
<th>High School/GED</th>
<th>AA/Voc. Train.</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Began/Didn't Finish</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In/Completed Program</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At a ratio of two to one, members of the Began/Didn't Finish group thought that a high school education was enough (Table 11). The In/Completed Program group thought, more often than the others, that vocational training or college was the minimum amount of education a person should have. People in the In/Completed Program group agreed, slightly more often than the others that vocational training or an AA degree was important, but that college beyond an AA degree was not necessary (a ratio of 2:1).

All groups thought a degree or diploma of some kind was important. One hundred percent of the Referred group thought that a degree or diploma of some kind was important. This 100 percent response rate coupled with 88.9 percent of them saying they need more education, indicates that members of this group realize the need for education beyond the level many in that group have attained.
Employment. Laborer/blue collar worker was the occupation most of the respondents worked at. People in the Began/Didn't Finish group most often worked as: laborers/blue collar workers (57%), human service workers (21%), or as clerical workers (14%). People in the In/Completed Program group most often worked as: laborers/blue collar workers (40%), human service workers (24%), professionals (12%), technicians (12%), and as clerical workers (12%). People in the Referred group most often worked as: laborers/blue collar workers (80%) and technicians (20%).

The Began/Didn't Finish group appeared more content with their jobs than members of the other two groups and wanted to continue in their same jobs for several more years (69%). The group most wanting a change in occupation during the next several years was the Referred group (71%). Sixty percent of the In/Completed Program group were working at a job they did not want to work at for several more years.

Of the 31 percent in the Began/Didn't Finish group who were working in a job they did not want to remain in for several more years, 30 percent responded that their work provided them with the experience they need to get the kind of job they want in the future (laborer, human service worker), eight percent responded that it did not, 62 percent did not respond. Of the 71 percent in the Referred group who do not want to stay at their jobs, 14 percent said their
job provided them with experience they need to get the kind of job they want in the future (human service worker, clerical worker), 57 percent responded that it did not, 29 percent did not respond. Of the 60 percent in the In/Completed Program group who worked at a job they did not want to stay at, 20 percent said the job provided them with the experience they need to get the kind of job they want in the future (laborer/blue collar worker, technician, human service worker, clerical worker), 36 percent said that it did not, 44 percent did not respond.

Discussion

Members of the Referred group were less educated than members of the other two groups. When asked if they had enough education, although all groups responded more often that they did not have enough, people in the Began/Didn't Finish group responded more often than did people in the other groups that they did have enough education. It could be that people in the Began/Didn't Finish group did not finish their program because it included educational goals. The evaluation did not specifically address this question. More research is needed to explore the relationship between the involvement of educational goals in the IWRP and a person's likelihood of finishing the program.

Another reason for the Began/Didn't Finish group not finishing the program may be due to their apparent contentedness with their jobs. It is possible the Began/Didn't
Finish group did not complete their programs because they did not see a value in it. The program's goal is to educate or train people so they can be employed in occupations suited to their disability or personal needs/desires, which does not appear to be important to members of this group. Even if they were interested in getting a new job, people in this group may think a better avenue to a new job is through on-the-job experience in their current employment rather through vocational rehabilitation training.

The Referred group recognized that people should have, at a minimum, more education than they had personally currently achieved. They appear to recognize they do not have enough education, but for some reason did not take advantage of the program to get more. With their low educational achievement level, it could be that, because of its location at the college, members in this group felt intimidated by the program. Questions to get at their reasons for not applying to the program were not asked on the questionnaire so no conclusion on this matter can be made.

The Referred group, which seemed most dissatisfied with their employment situation, is curious because this program could help them get a better employment situation, but they did not take advantage of the program's offerings.

It is also curious that 60 percent of the In/Completed Program group were in jobs they did not want to continue working at for the next several years. Because the
questionnaire did not address these issues, it is difficult to know why. It could be that people who expressed discontent were in the program at the time of the survey, were working at temporary jobs or it could be because the program had placed them in jobs they did not like; satisfying the goal of making placements for the program, but not satisfying the client.

Test of Significance

Chi-square tests performed on these data showed no significant difference between the educational and employment goals of the groups. It appears that educational and employment goals do not influence program completion. However, while there are no statistical differences, there are probably substantive differences in the educational and employment goals of the groups. These tendencies were noted with both the Began/Didn't Finish group and the Referred group. The CS&KT program should consider these differences and their influences in its future intake methods. For example, intake procedures might include questions concerning a person's past educational level, assessment of attitude towards and value of education, and an employment and educational goal-discovery process, along with the vocational assessments the program currently performs to help establish appropriate, attainable vocational rehabilitation objectives. For people who are Referred, but who for some reason do not apply to the program, a more detailed
explanation of what the program could help them accomplish might be helpful. Perhaps this group requires more than one contact to help them understand the program. It appears members of this group realize that an educational level higher than many in this group have attained is desirable. However, because such a high percentage have not finished grade school, it is possible that they feel intimidated by any type of school or a program located at a post-secondary educational institution. It may be appropriate to emphasize to people who are considering the program that outcomes other than education are appropriate and encouraged.

**Hypothesis 4**

The personalities of project personnel do not influence the success of the program.

No question specifically asked about how employee's personalities affected the program's success. However, indirect questions addressing this aspect of the program were asked. The questions asked respondents if they would quit if a key employee left and how the program would change if a key person left; the reasons why they did not finish or did not apply to the program (respondents were supplied with a list of reasons why they left, with staff as a possible choice); and finally, respondents were asked to list things they liked most and least about the program.
Results

When asked if they would quit if a key employee left (Table 17), more people in the In/Completed Program group said they might or would continue with the program, while more people in the Didn't Finish group said they might or would leave the program. People in the Referred group were not to answer this question unless they had knowledge about the program.

Table 17
Continue With Program if Key Employee Left

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Might or Definitely Would Continue</th>
<th>Might or Definitely Would Not Continue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=49</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Began/Didn't Finish</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In/Completed</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 24.82$, d.f.=1, 10.827<.001

When asked their opinion on how the project would be affected if a key employee left, most people, 70.6 percent of the 51 respondents to this question said they were not sure if the program would be better or worse; 21.6 percent thought it might be or would be bad for the program; and only eight percent of the respondents thought it would be or might be good for the program if a key employee left.

When the reasons given for not finishing or for not applying to the program were analyzed, two of the 18 people in the Began/Didn't Finish group and one of ten people in
the Referred group said that staff were the reason for not completing the program or not applying.

Both of the questions asking what people liked most or least about the program were open ended. Staff or staff attributes were four of the top seven items that people liked most about the project. Responses to these questions were ranked according to their frequency. Staff ranked second (information ranked first) and friendliness, counselling, and support (all staff-related attributes) tied for fifth place. Nothing pertaining to staff appeared in the rankings for what people liked least about the project.

Discussion

From survey responses, it appears that staff are well liked and their efforts are appreciated by respondents. Even when people who Began/Didn't Finish or did not apply to the program, supplied their reasons for not doing so, staff were mentioned as the reason only 10 percent of the time. People in the Began/Didn't Finish group were more likely to say they might or would leave the program if a key employee left (Table 17) than people in the In/Completed Program group, which might indicate that they did not leave the program because of the personnel.

Respondents indicated that staff's efforts made it easier for clients to understand and accept the vocational rehabilitation process and staff provided welcome information, counselling, and support. People in the In/Completed
Program group indicated that key staff members were not the primary reason for their continued work with the program (Table 16). Since they were not sure how the program would change if a key person left, it might be that people in this group would continue because they thought that the program would not change from the way it operated in the past.

Test of Significance

A chi-square test on respondent's answers to the question "Do you think that if the program manager or counselor left the program, you would quit the program?" indicated that the null hypothesis should be rejected because a difference not attributable to chance exists between the Began/Didn't Finish and In/Completed Program groups on this issue. It shows that the personalities of project personnel do influence the success of the program in some manner although it is difficult to tell how from the answers given by the two groups. These data in conjunction with the survey's comments section, where 34 people responded with 25 positive and one negative comment about the program, demonstrate much of the program's success is due to the knowledge, dedication, capability, and caring attitude of key program staff. Therefore, I reject the null hypothesis and conclude that the personalities of project personnel do influence the success of the program.
Hypothesis 5

The initial contact method or referral process does not influence a person's attitude towards the program.

No direct questions were asked about a person's attitude towards the program but people were asked to comment, either positively or negatively about the project. Respondents also indicated on the survey how they found out about the program.

Results

Table 18 presents data on how the respondents found out about the program and whether the respondents made positive, neutral, no knowledge, or needs improvement comments about the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Client</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Employee</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 18, respondents answered more often with positive comments about the program, no matter how they found out about it.
Test of Significance

The expected cell frequencies in the above table do not meet the minimum requirements to perform a chi-square test (the table was collapsed). Although the data cannot be statistically tested, no trends are noted in the data to indicate any differences between how people felt about the program and the way a person was introduced to the program, which could lead to accepting the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 6

Incorporating the principle of non-interference into program philosophy has not influenced the success of the program.

The questionnaire addressed this hypothesis indirectly by asking respondents if they thought the program followed the principle of non-interference and by asking how people felt when someone suggests they make a change in their life.

Results

Of the 52 respondents who answered the question about non-interference, 67.3 percent said "yes" the program incorporated non-interference in its operations, 26.9 percent did not know, and 5.8 percent said no. One of the three people who said that the program did not practice non-interference was from the Began/Didn't Finish group, the other two were in the In/Completed Program group. Three-quarters of the people who responded that they did not know
if the program practiced non-interference or not were in the Began/Didn't Finish group.

Almost half (48.9%) of the 45 people who responded to the question about how they felt when someone suggests they make a change in their life said they had no problem with it, 31.1 percent responded that it depended on who the person was or on what was suggested, 20 percent did not like suggestions made to them.

Discussion

Whether or not non-interference influences the program's success is difficult to assess from these questions. It is possible that because two-thirds of the respondents said the program practiced non-interference and because the program appears to be successful in terms of the numbers of people it rehabilitates and at accomplishing its annual goals, it can be inferred that non-interference contributes to the program's success. However, the theory of non-interference says that Indian people do not like change suggested to them and when change is suggested they do not like the interference. The answers to the "change" question appear to contradict this premise because almost half of the people who responded to this question, said there was no problem when change was suggested to them, and when combined with "it depends on the person/situation/change suggested answers," a full 80 percent of the respondents do not seem to have a problem when someone
suggests change. It should be noted that all but two of the 45 respondents to this question were from the Began/Didn't Finish and In/Completed Program groups—the two groups that appeared less traditional than people in the Referred group. However, people in the Referred group were not supposed to answer these questions unless they had knowledge about the CS&KT Program. Of the two in the Referred who did answer the question, one responded that he or she had no problem when someone suggests change and the other responded that it depended on the person/situation/change suggested.

Test of Significance

No test of significance was performed for this hypothesis because the expected cell frequencies for the chi-square table did not meet the minimum requirements for the use of this test.

Hypothesis 7

The project's affiliation with the Salish & Kootenai college has not contributed to programmatic success.

Results

This is a complex hypothesis with data to either support or disprove it coming from various questions on the survey. The complexity also stems from the fact that the word "success" was not defined in the proposal for this thesis. For this analysis, success is thought of in terms
of the project's ability to attract prospective clients and have them become clients of the program.

1. The survey asked respondents if they thought the program benefitted by its location at the college (people in the Referred group did not answer this question). Seventy-three percent of the respondents (in the Began/Didn't Finish and in the In/Completed groups) agreed that the program benefitted by its location at the college. Approximately 46 percent of the respondents thought the college's close or central location was handy and/or provided easy access, 12 percent thought that the program benefitted from the college's facilities and/or programs, and 8 percent thought the college provided visibility for the vocational rehabilitation program.

2. Respondents were separated into the following demographic groups:

a. Male/Female. As a group, male respondents are less educated than female respondents. More males quit school before finishing high school (27.2%) than did females (10.3%). None of the males responding to the survey had attended college versus 10.3 percent of the females who did.

Males were more likely (54.5%) than females (24.1%) to think that a person's education should stop at high school or with a GED. Females (34.5%) thought people should get vocational training or an AA degree more often than males
(24.2%) and 31 percent of the females thought a college degree was necessary versus 12.1 percent of the males.

b. People who are less than 45 years old or who are 45 and over. Thirty-nine percent of the people 45 years old and older did not complete high school, while 7.7 percent of the people under 45 years old did not complete high school. No one in the older group attended college while 7.7 percent of the younger group either attended or graduated from either a Bachelor's or a Master's program. The older group was about as likely to have some vocational training or an Associate of Arts degree (21.7%) as the younger group (20.5%).

Almost 14 percent of the older age group thought a person's education should end before high school while 7.3 percent of the younger group thought this. Fifty-nine percent of the older group thought that high school or a GED was enough education compared with 29 percent of the younger group. More of the younger group thought education should continue on beyond high school than the younger group. Thirty-nine percent of the younger group thought an AA degree or vocational training was necessary versus 13.6 percent of the older group and 24 percent of the younger group thought a college education (either graduate or undergraduate degree) was necessary versus 13.6 percent of the older group.
c. Traditional/nontraditional. The results from Hypothesis 1 indicated that people in the Referred group were more traditional than members of the other two program groups. They thought that education decreased both tribal and personal traditional values.

Discussion

As stated before, depending on one's point of reference, the program can be thought to contribute or detract from the program's success. For example, respondents in the Began/Didn't Finish and In/Completed Program groups thought the program benefitted from its location at the college primarily because the college is central and accessible. Also, for the 36.5 percent of the respondents who thought of an AA degree or a college education as the minimum amount of education a person should have, the program's affiliation with the college might be viewed as positive. However, for the respondents who said they thought of vocational training (14.3%) or a high school education (49.2%) as all that was necessary or for people who thought that education decreased traditional values, the program's location at the college could be intimidating and/or detrimental. If the demographic information for educational attainment and minimum levels of education a person should have represents that of other tribal people on the Flathead Reservation, then prospective clients who are males, or people who are 45 and over, or people who did not finish high school, or people who
consider themselves more traditional might not be attracted to the program because they perceive it as more educational rather than vocational.

Test of Significance

Chi-square tests of significance were performed on the data from the question that asked if the program benefitted from its location at the college, on the male/female, and age data with no significant differences noted. Although the data are not significant, they do indicate that depending on one's sex and age and the way these variables relate to perceived minimum levels of education and educational attainment, the program's location at the college could be viewed as either contributing to or detracting from the program's success if success is viewed in terms of the prospective clients who either pursue or decide not to pursue entering the program based on its location and its perceived focus.

Further research on the interaction of sex, age, and traditional values on program policy and location and on how these variables influence perceived minimum educational levels and educational attainment needs to be done to determine if these factors do, in fact, influence program clientele and ultimate program success.
IV.

CONCLUSIONS

Process and Outcome Evaluation
Comments and Recommendations

Comments

The CS&KT Vocational Rehabilitation Project exceeded the goals set out in the 1989-1990 proposal by 23 to 50 percent in six of eight project areas. It is notable that clients thought highly of the project and staff as demonstrated in the following quotes which were selected from among the numerous positive statements made about the program.

"The coordinator helped a great deal with paperwork and with other things like calming me down when I needed it. She even did things for me on her own time."

"The project is a big positive in my life. It has helped me get a better outlook on my life than I have had in ten or more years."

"I want to compliment the program. Everybody in the program is good and helpful. It is an important program."

Reasons for this success include:

1. The support provided by the CS&K Tribes and the College as evidenced by the .25 FTE contributed by the College President.

2. The project Director's familiarity and experience with the vocational rehabilitation system and his ability to
translate this into a program that effectively reaches and serves Indian people on the Flathead Reservation.

3. An energetic, dedicated, caring, and capable staff that are dedicated to carrying out the goals of the project.

4. The support of past and current clients and College employees. In many cases clients learned about the program from current or past clients or from someone at the College knowledgeable about the program's ability to help people. These endorsements help to enlist new clients and to strengthen the program's position in the community.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made as a result of the process and outcome evaluation.

Everyone seemed to enjoy the encampment. Some people learned from it, others used it as a vehicle to get in touch with themselves or with their heritage. These are good outcomes. However, there is no document that articulates how the encampment helps to attain project goals and clients are not sure how it helps them achieve their vocational objective. It is incumbent on project staff to take a close look at this activity to ensure that it warrants the amount of resources that are dedicated to it. It is recommended that the project: (a) evaluate encampment activities and write a clear statement about how the encampment and encampment activities relate to the goals of the CS&KT Vocational Rehabilitation Project, and (b) ensure that
encampment participants (clients, family members, and professionals) are aware of how attendance at the encampment affects them. The sessions conducted to date have been well received. What attendees heard in them is new to them. However, what they learned may not be so much due to the presentations as to the question and answer sessions afterward. The participants are told they will learn about special needs of American Indians with disabilities but what they hear during the presentations is about a person's experience and in most cases those experiences are not different from what any other American with a disability has experienced.

The sessions are not really training programs. The word train is defined in Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 1975 as: to form by instruction, discipline, or drill; to make prepared for a test of skill; or to teach so as to make fit, qualified, or proficient. This implies that there are goals to be achieved as a result of the training and that the training is structured.

It might help to think of these sessions as a classroom situation, rather than just as a presentation and incorporate the following ideas into future sessions:

1. Decide on the goal/topic of the training program.
2. After establishing a topic, determine if it can be covered in one session or if it will need more sessions.
3. Decide how the presentation(s) can be tailored to fit the audience?

4. Select panel members based on their knowledge and experience and ability to share both with the audience.

5. If the panel members are not experienced public speakers or teachers, help them prepare. Be a sounding board. Make sure there is a reason for what is said and that the desired content is included. Doing this may help panel members feel more confident. Have them read a statement if that works better for them.

6. Develop handouts. Materials might include checklists, things to remember and to do to make people feel included or comfortable, and fact sheets.

7. During the workshop's opening comments, point out that some of the things that people will hear and/or observe during the presentation are examples of Indian culture (for example, that what an anglo might consider an unusually long explanation of something is actually a form of "storytelling" and an important method in the Indian culture for passing on information).

8. When introducing speakers, discuss their topic(s). Introduce each speaker and briefly mention what each will talk about and how his or her talk relates to the topic of the session.

It is recommended that the project develop a training program related to the special needs of American Indians
with disabilities to be presented to other professional services involved in the rehabilitation of project clients.

There appears to be a discrepancy between how the project Director and the clients interviewed perceive the usefulness of the MESA. In discussing the scores on the satisfaction questionnaire and the comments made about the MESA with the project Director, he said that most of the comments he heard were positive. This is contrary to what the evaluator discovered.

It is recommended that the project's next evaluation again evaluate satisfaction with the MESA. It should also evaluate the congruence between a client's MESA results, his or her Individualized Written Rehabilitation Plan, and placement upon leaving the program, taking into account the client's interests, to determine if use of the MESA should be continued.

The project Director is aware of the management problems discussed under "Staff Interviews," above. He has acknowledged that he is overextended, but feels he cannot make a decision about the changes he will make until he knows the status of the four-year Vocational Rehabilitation proposal. It is important for this issue to receive attention as soon as possible after the Salish Kootenai College receives notification about the four-year proposal, since efficient program operation depends on close and consistent management attention.
If the four-year Vocational Rehabilitation Program is funded, it is recommended that a full-time project Coordinator be hired. If that project is not funded, it is recommended that the project Director review his workload and, perhaps, hire a part-time assistant. If hiring an assistant is not possible, it is recommended that the project Director re-evaluate his workload to see if there are some tasks that can be performed by others.

A recommendation was made as a result of last-year's evaluation to complete a personnel & policies procedures manual. Subsequently, the manual became an objective for the current year. As staff members are hired, new programs are added, and staff numbers are increased, a manual should be available to guide the projects and to refer to when questions arise. As of the date of this report, the Personnel & Policies Manual is not completed. It is recommended that it be completed.

**Theory-Driven Evaluation**

The following discussion summarizes evaluation findings of the theory-driven evaluation. Where appropriate, recommendations are made for incorporating the findings into the operation of the CS&KT Vocational Rehabilitation Project.
Summary with Recommendations

Completion of the program was not influenced by how members of each of the three program groups perceived of and valued employment. Although all three groups appeared to perceive of and value employment the same and almost everyone who participated in the survey recognized the need for employment, more than half of the respondents (61% of the females, 42% of the males) thought they should stay home and maintain a household rather than work for pay. It may be then, that all three groups perceive of and value employment in the same way, but that something else is operating, for example: for men, a struggle between past roles and incorporating the anglo culture's value of employment into current roles, or the existence of a sex bias where women think they should take care of the home rather than work outside of it for pay.

Program completion does not appear to be influenced by the educational and employment goals of members within the three program groups. However, just over one-quarter of the people in the Began/Didn't Finish group thought they had all the education they needed and that a high school diploma or GED was the maximum amount of education a person needed (61% versus 31.4% and 30% for the In/Completed Program group and the Referred group, respectively). To help ensure appropriate services for this group, the CS&KT Vocational
Rehabilitation Project should determine a person's occupational and educational goals, educational attainment, assess attitude(s) about the need for and value of education, and help clients understand and develop their own employment and/or educational goals.

People in the Referred group were less educated and more traditional than members of the other two groups. While recognizing the need for education beyond high school and saying they needed more education, they also thought that education eliminates traditional values. Although these are contradictory statements, it appears that the fear of becoming less traditional overpowers the need for more education since members of this group have not pursued further education. A primary reason for this group not becoming part of the program may be the perceived emphasis on education. In order to serve people who may have contacted the program, but did not apply, the program should emphasize that outcomes other than educational goals are encouraged and appropriate.

The personalities of the project personnel appear to influence the success of the program. Much of the program's success may be attributed to the knowledge, dedication, capability, and caring attitude of key program staff.

The initial contact method or referral process does not appear to influence a person's attitude towards the program.
The influence of the principle of non-interference on the program's success was difficult to determine from the survey questions because the survey did not delve deeply into people's attitude about non-interference. Most of the responses to this question actually contradict the theory of non-interference because respondents do not have a problem when someone suggests change to them. These results may not present a clear picture of the Indian residents of the Flathead Reservation, because only two of the 45 respondents to this question were from the more traditional Referred group and it is unclear what proportions of the Indian population on the Flathead Reservation are represented by survey respondents.

The CS&KT Project's location at the college can be viewed as either contributing to or detracting from the program's success depending on a person's sex and age and the manner these variables relate to perceived minimum levels of education and past educational attainment. For example, male respondents were less educated than females and were more likely than females to think that education should stop at high school. People 45 years and older were less educated than people under 45 but were more likely to have some vocational training or an AA degree.
Advantages and Disadvantages of the Evaluation Methodology

The methodology used for this evaluation presented the following advantages and disadvantages.

Advantages

This evaluation, incorporating both the process and outcome and a theory-driven approaches is different from the project evaluations conducted in the past. Past evaluations, following guidelines set out in the project's grant proposal, focused only on the extent to which project objectives were met, clients were not interviewed using a satisfaction scale and intervention and pretreatment factors were not explored to determine their effects on the program. The processes (satisfaction scale, qualitative interviews, culturally-sensitive mail-based questionnaire) all contributed to the evaluator's understanding of the project and subsequent conclusions and recommendations. Because the project Director was involved in all aspects of the evaluation, he now might want to incorporate them into future evaluations.

Another advantage to the project was the evaluator's interest in and willingness to learn about the vocational rehabilitation process (which is governed by laws, regulations, intuition, and tradition) and cultural issues. Without an understanding of the system, observations could be incorrectly interpreted. For example, understanding the
population served, the social definition of acceptable closures, and/or the type of services offered proved essential to evaluating the project.

Disadvantages

A threat to the validity of the results that presents difficulty for interpreting and generalizing the results to not only this project but to other Indian Vocational Rehabilitation projects is the small sample size and the return rate. The In/Completed Program group returned 35 surveys for a return rate of 74.5 percent. The Began/Didn't Finish group returned 17 surveys for a return rate of 35.3 percent and the Referred group returned ten surveys for a return rate of 34.4 percent. The small numbers in the Began/Didn't Finish and the Referred groups, in many cases, resulted in expected cell frequencies that did not meet the necessary requirements to perform a chi-square analysis (e.g., expected frequencies less than 1 and more than 25 percent of the cells with expected frequencies between 1 and 5).

Interviews conducted with people who were selected by the CS&KT project are also considered to be a disadvantage. Interview results would be more useful and generalizable if the people interviewed were selected randomly from all the people the program had contacted or who had contacted the program.

Another disadvantage of this evaluation was the correspondence between evaluation hypotheses and survey
questions. Five of the seven hypotheses were not addressed directly by questions on the survey. Consequently, questions that indirectly related to hypotheses were used for the analysis, contributing to uncertainty as to how to interpret the results.

A further disadvantage was the limitations imposed by designing and performing an evaluation for a project already in progress. For this project, the only evaluation design proposed and approved by the funding agency was determining if proposed project objectives were met. Project objectives for the current year were written only in terms of outcomes. For example, project objective 1 said that 40 clients would receive comprehensive individualized rehabilitation services. An objective of this type misses the importance of what impact the services had on the clients, whether the services were appropriate for them, and how satisfied they were with the services. Ideally, project objectives would address these client-based components and evaluation would be an ongoing project feature so that the project could be redirected if the ongoing evaluations showed that it was necessary.

Another disadvantage was the wording of three of the hypotheses that used the word success without defining it.

No attempt was made to compare CS&KT Project outcomes or client satisfaction with outcomes from or client satisfaction with the regular state vocational rehabilitation
office that operated in Ronan until 1986. A comparison of this type might help to determine whether or not the cultural aspects of CS&KT Project actually do make a difference in rehabilitation outcomes.

No cost analysis was conducted between this project and other local vocational rehabilitation programs to compare per client expenditures and closures.
Implications for Generalization to Other Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Projects

As mentioned previously, the methodology (satisfaction scale, qualitative interviews, culturally-sensitive mail-based questionnaire) used in this process is sound and can be used by other programs of this type for their evaluations.

Because of the threats to validity described in "Disadvantages" above, and because this reservation is markedly different from the others in Montana, and presumably elsewhere, because of its people's ability to "borrow and adapt--marked by progressive admixture and assimilation" (Lopach, Hunter Brown, and Clow, 1990, p. 153), only two of the results of this evaluation appear to be applicable generally to Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Projects on reservations not like the Flathead. They are:

1. A program's employees are one of the major factors contributing to the use of and acceptance by the community.

2. An Indian vocational rehabilitation program that focuses on education (which many of them do) may not serve a broad population because for many people continuing their education is not viewed as necessary or important.
Future Directions
For Understanding the
Influence of Intervention and
Client Pretreatment Factors

If the CS&KT Vocational Rehabilitation Project wishes
to further its understanding of the influence that interven­
tion and client pretreatment factors have on it, the
evaluator recommends that it:

1. Study the inter-relationships among culture, education age, and male/female differences.

2. Explore the influence that educational and employ­
ment goals have on the probability of a person completing the program.
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRES
This questionnaire was sent to people who began but did not finish the program.

CONFEDERATED SALISH & KOOTENAI TRIBES' VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION PROGRAM
1989-1990 EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire asks about your experience with the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes’ Vocational Rehabilitation Program and about your work and cultural attitudes. Your answers to these questions will help the evaluator determine if the Program is reaching the people it was set up to serve.

This section asks questions about the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes Vocational Rehabilitation Program, what you know about it, and your experience with it.

1. Did you know about the other State of Montana Vocational Rehabilitation program before applying to this tribal program? yes □ no □

2. Did you apply to the other State Vocational Rehabilitation program before applying to this tribal program? yes □ no □

3. Have you ever received services from the other State Vocational Rehabilitation program? yes □ no □
   3a. If you answered yes to question 3, what services did you receive?

   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

   3b. If you answered yes to question 3, what do you think of the Montana State Vocational Rehabilitation Program?

   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

4. When did you stop working with the other State Vocational Rehabilitation program?
   ____________________________________________________________

5. How do you think this tribal program is different from the other State Vocational Rehabilitation Program?
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
6. How did you find out about the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes' Vocational Rehabilitation Project?

7. If another person told you about the program, was the person (check one)
   □ A client of the program
   □ An employee of the program
   □ Other, please tell us ____________________________________________________________

8. Do you think that if the program manager or counsellor left the program, you would quit the program?
   □ I would definitely quit
   □ I might quit
   □ I might not quit
   □ I definitely would not quit

8a. If you might quit or definitely would quit, how come? ____________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

9. Based on your experience with the program, do you think that if the program manager or counsellor left, it would change the program in any way?
   □ It would be really good for the program
   □ It might be really good for the program
   □ I don’t think it would change the program
   □ It might be bad for the program
   □ It would be really bad for the program

9a. If you think that the program would change, how do you think it would change? _____________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
10. Why did you originally talk to people at the program? What did you think you would get out of the program?

11. Before you talked to a counsellor at the program, what did you think the purpose of the program was?

12. After talking to a counsellor, what did you think the purpose of the program was?

13. What do you think or how do you feel about a person when they suggest that you change your life?

14. There is a term that is used that is called "non-interference." It means that one person does not tell another person what to do or how to run their life. Do you think the Salish & Kootenai Vocational Rehabilitation Program follows the principle of "non-interference"? yes ☐ no ☐ I don’t know ☐

14a. If you answered yes or no, why do you say that?
15. From your point of view, does the program benefit by being located at the college?  
   yes □ no □ I don’t know □  

15a. If you answered yes or no, why is that so?  
   ____________________________________________________________  
   ____________________________________________________________  
   ____________________________________________________________  

16. What three things do you like most about the program?  
   1. ___________________________________________________________  
   2. ___________________________________________________________  
   3. ___________________________________________________________  

17. What three things do you like least about the program?  
   1. ___________________________________________________________  
   2. ___________________________________________________________  
   3. ___________________________________________________________  

18. Why didn’t you continue with the program?  
   ___________________________________________________________  
   ___________________________________________________________  

19. If you applied and, perhaps started, but did not complete the program, why didn’t you continue? (Check five reasons that are the most important to you.)  
   □ There was too much paperwork  
   □ There was too much time between when I applied and when I could start  
   □ There were too many evaluations (medical, etc.)  
   □ It was too complicated to figure out what services I would get  
   □ I got discouraged because I couldn’t get an answer right away about whether or not I could get into the program  
   □ I didn’t have any interest in the services offered  
   □ I just wanted to go to school, nothing else  

   (More choices for question 19 are on the following page.)
☐ I moved away
☐ I am not sure what my career goals are
☐ I just wanted surgery, nothing else
☐ I live too far away from the program
☐ After talking to a counsellor, I found out that the purpose of the program and my goals were different
☐ I did not like the staff
☐ I had to take care of my family
☐ Other, personal reasons
☐ Other, please tell us______________________________

In this section, the questions we ask are about your Tribal affiliation.

20. Are you enrolled in any federally-recognized tribe?  yes ☐  no ☐
20a. If yes, which tribe?  Salish ☐  Kootenai ☐  Blackfeet ☐
                  Other______________________________

21. Are you a first descendant of either the Salish or Kootenai?  yes ☐  no ☐
21a. If yes, which one?  Salish ☐  Kootenai ☐  Both ☐

In this section, we ask questions about your current job and if you are working at a job you want to do for the next several years.

22. Are you working for pay right now?  yes ☐  no ☐ (If you answered no, please skip to question 28.)

23. If you answered yes to question 22, what kind of work are you doing or what is your job title? ________________________________

24. If you work for pay, are you working at a job that you would like to do for the next several years?  yes ☐  no ☐ (If you answered yes, please skip to question 34.)

25. If you are not working at a job that you would like to do for the next several years, will your present job give you the experience you need to help you get the job you want?  yes ☐  no ☐

26. If you are not working at a job you want to do for the next several years, what kind of job would you rather be doing? ________________________________
27. If you are not working at a job you want to do for the next several years, what do you think is keeping you from getting the job you want? ____________________________

______________________________

In this section, we ask about the type of work you usually do if you currently are not working for pay.

If you are working for pay, do not answer the questions in this section. Please skip to question 34.

28. If you are not working for pay right now, are you receiving services from a Vocational Rehabilitation Program? yes □ no □ (If you answered yes, please skip to question 34.)

29. If you are not working for pay right now, what kind of work do you usually do or what is your usual job title? ____________________________

30. When you work for pay, are you usually working at a job that you would like to do for the next several years? yes □ no □ (If you answered yes, please skip to question 34.)

31. When you work for pay, if you usually do not work at a job that you would like to do for the next several years, will your job give you the experience you need to help you get the job you want? yes □ no □

32. If when you work, you usually work at a job you do not want to do for the next several years, what kind of work would you rather be doing? ____________________________

33. If when you work, you usually work at a job you do not want to do for the next several years, what do you think is keeping you from getting the job you want? ____________________________

______________________________
In this section, we would like some information about the number of people in your family, how many of them work for pay, and your attitude(s) about working.

34. Are you the principle wage earner in your family? yes □ no □

35. Do you or other members of your household receive money, food, or clothing from any public or private organization (for example food stamps, AFDC, unemployment compensation, Social Security, etc.)? yes □ no □

36. For you personally, do you think working for pay is (check one)
   □ Not Necessary
   □ Not Very Necessary
   □ Somewhat Necessary
   □ Very Necessary

37. Do you think that working for someone else for pay is something that you think people ought to do?
   □ Totally Agree
   □ Somewhat Agree
   □ Somewhat Disagree
   □ Totally Disagree

38. Do you think it is good for the tribe to have someone in each family working for pay?
   □ Totally Agree
   □ Somewhat Agree
   □ Somewhat Disagree
   □ Totally Disagree

39. Do you think that maintaining the household, rather than working for pay is something you think you ought to do?
   □ Totally Agree
   □ Somewhat Agree
   □ Somewhat Disagree
   □ Totally Disagree

40. How many people are there normally in your household? _______

40a. From time to time, do other people stay with you for several weeks?
    yes □ no □

    40a1. If so about how many people stay with you? ______ people

41. How many people in your household work for pay? ________
In this section, we would like some information on your formal education and your thoughts about education.

42. How many years of formal education have you had? _______ years

43. Do you think you have had all the schooling you need? yes □ no □

44. What is the highest grade in school you have completed? (check one)
   - grade school
   - middle or junior high school
   - GED
   - high school
   - Associate of Arts Degree
   - Vocational Training
   - Bachelor Degree
   - Advanced Graduate Degree

45. Which of the following do you think is the least amount of education a person should have? (check one)
   - grade school
   - middle or junior high school
   - GED
   - high school
   - Associate of Arts Degree
   - Vocational Training
   - Bachelor Degree
   - Advanced Graduate Degree

46. In general, do you think a degree or diploma is important? yes □ no □

47. Do you think education is important?
   - Not important at all
   - Somewhat important
   - Important
   - Extremely important
48. If you think education is important or extremely important, why do you think that?

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

49. Do you think education has increased or decreased the importance of traditional tribal values?

☐ Totally reinforced traditional values
☐ Somewhat reinforced traditional values
☐ Somewhat eliminated traditional values
☐ Totally eliminated traditional values

49a. Why do you think this is so? ____________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

50. In general, how much do you think education has increased or decreased your traditional values?

☐ Totally reinforced traditional values
☐ Somewhat reinforced traditional values
☐ Somewhat eliminated traditional values
☐ Totally eliminated traditional values

50a. Why do you think this is so? ____________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
The next set of questions asks how you define a disability and what you think about tribal goals. Questions also are asked about your cultural and traditional values.

51. What do you think are the five most important goals for the tribe?
1. ________________________________________________
2. ________________________________________________
3. ________________________________________________
4. ________________________________________________
5. ________________________________________________

52. Different people have different ways of defining or describing a disability. How would you define or describe a disability? ____________________________________________

53. Do you or others think you have a disability? yes □ no □

54. Whites often are referred to as anglos. If you put everything you do, your culture, way of life, thoughts, and feelings together where would you place yourself?

☐ Totally anglo
☐ Almost all anglo
☐ Somewhat anglo
☐ Half and half
☐ Somewhat Indian
☐ Almost all Indian
☐ Totally Indian

55. How important is it for Salish & Kootenai people to maintain a traditional way of life?

☐ Extremely important
☐ Somewhat important
☐ Not very important
☐ Not important at all
56. How important is it for you to maintain a traditional way of life?
   □ Not important at all
   □ Not very important
   □ Somewhat important
   □ Extremely important

57. Were questions 54 through 56 offensive to you?
   □ Extremely offensive
   □ Somewhat offensive
   □ Not very offensive
   □ Not offensive at all

57a. If the questions were offensive to you, how were they offensive?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

This section gives you the chance to tell us your opinion of this questionnaire.

58. What do you think of this questionnaire? (check all that apply)
   □ The questions were easy to read
   □ The questions were easy to understand
   □ The questions were hard to understand
   □ I think the information asked for will be helpful to the project
   □ I don’t think the information asked for will be helpful to the project
   □ The questionnaire was too long
   □ I thought the questions were too personal
   □ The questions were hard to answer
   □ The questions were easy to answer

59. If you have other things you want to tell us about this survey, that weren’t listed in
question 58, you can use this section to comment. __________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

This is the end of the questionnaire. Thank you for completing it!

Return the completed survey in the envelope provided to participate in the $50 drawing.
This questionnaire asks about your experience with the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes' Vocational Rehabilitation Program and about your work and cultural attitudes. Your answers to these questions will help the evaluator determine if the Program is reaching the people it was set up to serve.

This section asks questions about the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes Vocational Rehabilitation Program, what you know about it, and your experience with it.

1. Did you know about the other State of Montana Vocational Rehabilitation program before applying to this tribal program? yes □ no □

2. Did you apply to the other State Vocational Rehabilitation program before applying to this tribal program? yes □ no □

3. Have you ever received services from the other State Vocational Rehabilitation program? yes □ no □
   3a. If you answered yes to question 3, what services did you receive?

   __________________________________________

   __________________________________________

   __________________________________________

   3b. If you answered yes to question 3, what do you think of the Montana State Vocational Rehabilitation Program?

   __________________________________________

   __________________________________________

   __________________________________________

4. When did you stop working with the other State Vocational Rehabilitation program?

   __________________________________________

5. Why aren't you working with the other State Vocational Rehabilitation program instead of this tribal program?

   __________________________________________

   __________________________________________

   __________________________________________
6. How do you think this program is different from the other State Vocational Rehabilitation Program?

7. How did you find out about the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes' Vocational Rehabilitation Project?

8. If another person told you about the program, was the person (check one)
   □ A client of the program
   □ An employee of the program
   □ Other, please tell us

9. Based on your experience with the program, do you think that if the program manager or counsellor left the program you would not continue with the project?
   □ I definitely would continue
   □ I might continue
   □ I might not continue
   □ I definitely would not continue
9a. If you might not or definitely would not continue, how come?

10. Do you think that if the program manager or counsellor left the program, it would change the project in any way?
   □ It would be really good for the program
   □ It might be good for the program
   □ I am not sure if it would change the program
   □ It might be bad for the program
   □ It would be really bad for the program
10a. If you think that the program would change, how do you think it would change?
11. What do you think or how do you feel about a person when they suggest that you change your life?

12. There is a term that is used that is called "non-interference." It means that one person does not tell another person what to do or how to run their life. Do you think the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes' Vocational Rehabilitation Program follows the principle of "non-interference"?
   - yes □
   - no □
   - I don't know □

   12a. If you answered yes or no why did you say that?

13. Why did you originally talk to people at the program? What did you think you would get out of the program?

14. Before you talked to a counsellor at the program, what did you think the purpose of the program was?

15. After talking to a counsellor, what did you think the purpose of the program was?
16. From your point of view, does the program benefit by being located at the college?
   yes □  no □  I don’t know □

16a. If you answered yes or no, why is that so? ________________________________
    ________________________________
    ________________________________

17. What five things do you like most about the program?
   1. ________________________________
   2. ________________________________
   3. ________________________________
   4. ________________________________
   5. ________________________________

18. What five things do you like least about the program?
   1. ________________________________
   2. ________________________________
   3. ________________________________
   4. ________________________________
   5. ________________________________

19. Check any five of the following statements that describe what you think about or your
    experience with the program.
   □ There is too much paperwork
   □ There was too much time between when I applied and when I could start
   □ There are too many evaluations (medical, etc.)
   □ It was too complicated to figure out what services I would get
   □ I got discouraged because I couldn’t get an answer right away about whether or not I could get into the program
   □ After talking to a counsellor, I found out that the purpose of the program and my goals were different
   □ I do not like the staff
   □ Other, please tell us ________________________________
    ________________________________
20. Please tell us what you think (good and bad) about the Confederated Salish &
Kootenai Tribes' Vocational Rehabilitation Program.

In this section, the questions we ask are about your Tribal affiliation.

21. Are you enrolled in any federally-recognized tribe? yes □ no □
   21a. If yes, which tribe? Salish □ Kootenai □ Blackfeet □
       Other _______________

22. Are you a first descendant of either the Salish or Kootenai? yes □ no □
   22a. If yes, which one? Salish □ Kootenai □ Both □

In this section, we ask questions about your current job and if you are working at a job you
want to do for the next several years.

23. Are you working for pay right now? yes □ no □ (If you answered no, please skip to
    question 29.)

24. If you answered yes to question 23, what kind of work are you doing or what is your
    job title? ____________________________________________

25. If you work for pay, are you working at a job that you would like to do for the next
    several years? yes □ no □ (If you answered yes, please skip to
    question 35.)

26. If you are not working at a job that you would like to do for the next several years,
    will your present job give you the experience you need to help you get the job you
    want? yes □ no □

27. If you are not working at a job you want to do for the next several years, what kind
    of job would you rather be doing? ________________________________
    ________________________________
28. If you are not working at a job you want to do for the next several years, what do you think is keeping you from getting the job you want? __________________________________________

In this section, we ask about the type of work you usually do if you currently are not working for pay.

If you are working for pay, do not answer the questions in this section. Please skip to question 35.

29. If you are not working for pay right now, are you receiving services from a Vocational Rehabilitation Program? yes □ no □ (If you answered yes, please skip to question 35.)

30. If you are not working for pay right now, what kind of work do you usually do or what is your usual job title? ________________________________

31. When you work for pay, are you usually working at a job that you would like to do for the next several years? yes □ no □ (If you answered yes, please skip to question 35.)

32. When you work for pay, if you usually do not work at a job that you would like to do for the next several years, will your job give you the experience you need to help you get the job you want? yes □ no □

33. If when you work, you usually work at a job you do not want to do for the next several years, what kind of work would you rather be doing?

34. If when you work, you usually work at a job you do not want to do for the next several years, what do you think is keeping you from getting the job you want?

In this section, we would like some information about the number of people in your family, how many of them work for pay, and your attitude(s) about working.

35. Are you the principle wage earner in your family? yes □ no □
36. Do you or other members of your household receive money, food, or clothing from any public or private organization (for example food stamps, AFDC, unemployment compensation, Social Security, etc.)? yes □ no □

37. For you personally, do you think working for pay is (check one)
   □ Not Necessary  
   □ Not Very Necessary  
   □ Somewhat Necessary  
   □ Very Necessary

38. Do you think that working for someone else for pay is something that you think people ought to do?
   □ Totally Agree  
   □ Somewhat Agree  
   □ Somewhat Disagree  
   □ Totally Disagree

39. Do you think it is good for the tribe to have someone in each family working for pay?
   □ Totally Agree  
   □ Somewhat Agree  
   □ Somewhat Disagree  
   □ Totally Disagree

40. Do you think that maintaining the household, rather than working for pay is something you think you ought to do?
   □ Totally Agree  
   □ Somewhat Agree  
   □ Somewhat Disagree  
   □ Totally Disagree

41. How many people are there normally in your household? ________

41a. From time to time, do other people stay with you for several weeks?
    yes □ no □

41a1. If so about how many people stay with you? _______ people

42. How many people in your household work for pay? ________
In this section, we would like some information on your formal education and your thoughts about education.

43. How many years of formal education have you had? ______ years

44. Do you think you have had all the schooling you need? yes □ no □

45. What is the highest grade in school you have completed? (check one)
   - grade school
   - middle or junior high school
   - GED
   - high school
   - Associate of Arts Degree
   - Vocational Training
   - Bachelor Degree
   - Advanced Graduate Degree

46. Which of the following do you think is the least amount of education a person should have? (check one)
   - grade school
   - middle or junior high school
   - GED
   - high school
   - Associate of Arts Degree
   - Vocational Training
   - Bachelor Degree
   - Advanced Graduate Degree

47. In general, do you think a degree or diploma is important? yes □ no □

48. Do you think education is important?
   - Not important at all
   - Somewhat important
   - Important
   - Extremely important

49. If you think education is important or extremely important, why do you think that?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
50. Do you think education has increased or decreased the importance of traditional tribal values?

☐ Totally reinforced traditional values
☐ Somewhat reinforced traditional values
☐ Somewhat eliminated traditional values
☐ Totally eliminated traditional values

50a. Why do you think this is so? ____________________________________________

__________________________________________

51. In general, how much do you think education has increased or decreased your traditional values?

☐ Totally reinforced traditional values
☐ Somewhat reinforced traditional values
☐ Somewhat eliminated traditional values
☐ Totally eliminated traditional values

51a. Why do you think this is so? ____________________________________________

__________________________________________

The next set of questions asks how you define a disability and what you think about tribal goals. Questions also are asked about your cultural and traditional values.

52. What do you think are the five most important goals for the tribe?

1. ____________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________
4. ____________________________________________
5. ____________________________________________

53. Different people have different ways of defining or describing a disability. How would you define or describe a disability? ____________________________________________

__________________________________________

54. Do you or others think you have a disability? yes ☐ no ☐
55. Whites often are referred to as anglos. If you put everything you do, your culture, way of life, thoughts, and feelings together where would you place yourself?

- Totally anglo
- Almost all anglo
- Somewhat anglo
- Half and half
- Somewhat Indian
- Almost all Indian
- Totally Indian

56. How important is it for Salish & Kootenai people to maintain a traditional way of life?

- Extremely important
- Somewhat important
- Not very important
- Not important at all

57. How important is it for you to maintain a traditional way of life?

- Not important at all
- Not very important
- Somewhat important
- Extremely important

58. Were questions 55 through 57 offensive to you?

- Extremely offensive
- Somewhat offensive
- Not very offensive
- Not offensive at all

58a. If the questions were offensive to you, how were they offensive?
This section gives you the chance to tell us your opinion of this questionnaire.

59. What do you think of this questionnaire? (check all that apply)

☐ The questions were easy to read
☐ The questions were easy to understand
☐ The questions were hard to understand
☐ I think the information asked for will be helpful to the project
☐ I don't think the information asked for will be helpful to the project
☐ The questionnaire was too long
☐ I thought the questions were too personal
☐ The questions were hard to answer
☐ The questions were easy to answer

60. If you have other things you want to tell us about this survey, that weren’t listed in question 59, you can use this section to comment. _______________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

This is the end of the questionnaire. Thank you for completing it!

Return the completed survey in the envelope provided to participate in the $50 drawing.
This questionnaire asks about your knowledge of the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes' Vocational Rehabilitation Program and about your work and cultural attitudes. Your answers to these questions will help the evaluator determine if the Program is reaching the people it was set up to serve.

The purpose of this section is to find out what you know about the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes' Vocational Rehabilitation Program.

1. Do you know about the State of Montana Vocational Rehabilitation Program? yes □ no □ (If you answered no, please skip to question 5.)

2. Have you ever applied for services from the State of Montana Vocational Rehabilitation program? yes □ no □

3. Have you ever received services from the State of Montana Vocational Rehabilitation program? yes □ no □
   3a. If you answered yes to question 3, what services did you receive?

3b. If you answered yes to question 3, what do you think of the Montana State Vocational Rehabilitation Program?

4. When did you stop working with the other State Vocational Rehabilitation program?

5. Do you know about the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes' Vocational Rehabilitation Program? yes □ no □ (If you answered no, please skip to question 16.)

6. Did you talk with people from the tribal program? yes □ no □
7. How do you think this tribal program is different from the other State Vocational Rehabilitation Program? 


8. From your point of view, does the program benefit by being located at the college? 
   yes ☐  no ☐  I don’t know ☐ 

8a. If you answered yes or no, why is that so? 


9. How did you find out about the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes’ Vocational Rehabilitation Project? 


10. If another person told you about the program, was the person (check one) 
    ☐ A client of the program 
    ☐ An employee of the program 
    ☐ Other, please tell us 

11. What do you think or how do you feel about a person when they suggest that you change your life? 


12. There is a term that is used that is called "non-interference." It means that one person does not tell another person what to do or how to run their life. Do you think the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes' Vocational Rehabilitation Program follows the principle of "non-interference"?
   yes □   no □   I don't know □

12a. If you answered yes or no, why do you say that? ____________________________________________

13. Please tell us what you think the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes' Vocational Rehabilitation Program is supposed to do? ____________________________________________

14. Why don’t you apply for services from the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes' Vocational Rehabilitation Program? (Check the five reasons most important to you.)

   □ There is too much paperwork
   □ There are too many evaluations (medical, etc.)
   □ I got discouraged because I couldn’t get an answer right away about whether or not I could get into the program
   □ I don’t have any interest in the services offered
   □ I just want to go to school, nothing else
   □ I don’t need their help to get retrained and to get a job
   □ I don’t have a disability that keeps me from working for pay
   □ I don’t have a disability that keeps me from taking care of my house
   □ I have a disability but it doesn’t keep me from working for pay
   □ I have a disability but it doesn’t keep me from taking care of my house
   □ I moved away
   □ I am not sure what my career goals are
   □ I just want surgery, nothing else

(More choices for question 14 are on the following page.)
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☐ I live too far away from the program
☐ After talking to a counsellor, I found out that the purpose of the program and my goals were different
☐ I did not like the staff
☐ I have to take care of my family
☐ Other, personal reasons
☐ I was told that I was not eligible to receive services from the program
☐ Other, please tell us _________________________________

15. Please tell us what you think (good and bad) about the Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes' Vocational Rehabilitation Program. _________________________________

In this section, the questions we ask are about your Tribal affiliation.

16. Are you enrolled in any federally-recognized tribe? yes ☐ no ☐

16a. If yes, which tribe? Salish ☐ Kootenai ☐ Blackfeet ☐
Other _________________________________

17. Are you a first descendant of either the Salish or Kootenai? yes ☐ no ☐

17a. If yes, which one? Salish ☐ Kootenai ☐ Both ☐

In this section, we ask questions about your current job and if you are working at a job you want to do for the next several years.

18. Are you working for pay right now? yes ☐ no ☐ (If you answered no, please skip to question 24.)

19. If you answered yes to question 18, what kind of work are you doing or what is your job title? _________________________________

20. If you work for pay, are you working at a job that you would like to do for the next several years? yes ☐ no ☐ (If you answered yes, please skip to question 30.)
21. If you are not working at a job that you would like to do for the next several years, will your present job give you the experience you need to help you get the job you want? yes □ no □

22. If you are not working at a job you want to do for the next several years, what kind of job would you rather be doing? __________________________

23. If you are not working at a job you want to do for the next several years, what do you think is keeping you from getting the job you want? __________________________

In this section, we ask about the type of work you usually do if you currently are not working for pay.

If you are working for pay, do not answer the questions in this section. Please skip to question 30.

24. If you are not working for pay right now, are you receiving services from a Vocational Rehabilitation Program? yes □ no □ (If you answered yes, please skip to question 30.)

25. If you are not working for pay right now, what kind of work do you usually do or what is your usual job title? __________________________

26. When you work for pay, are you usually working at a job that you would like to do for the next several years? yes □ no □ (If you answered yes, please skip to question 30.)

27. When you work for pay, if you usually do not work at a job that you would like to do for the next several years, will your job give you the experience you need to help you get the job you want? yes □ no □

28. If when you work, you usually work at a job you do not want to do for the next several years, what kind of work would you rather be doing? __________________________
29. If when you work, you usually work at a job you do not want to do for the next several years, what do you think is keeping you from getting the job you want?

In this section, we would like some information about the number of people in your family, how many of them work for pay, and your attitude(s) about working.

30. Are you the principle wage earner in your family? yes □  no □

31. Do you or other members of your household receive money, food, or clothing from any public or private organization (for example food stamps, AFDC, unemployment compensation, Social Security, etc.)? yes □  no □

32. For you personally, do you think working for pay is (check one)
   □ Not Necessary
   □ Not Very Necessary
   □ Somewhat Necessary
   □ Very Necessary

33. Do you think that working for someone else for pay is something that you think people ought to do?
   □ Totally Agree
   □ Somewhat Agree
   □ Somewhat Disagree
   □ Totally Disagree

34. Do you think it is good for the tribe to have someone in each family working for pay?
   □ Totally Agree
   □ Somewhat Agree
   □ Somewhat Disagree
   □ Totally Disagree

35. Do you think that maintaining the household, rather than working for pay is something you think you ought to do?
   □ Totally Agree
   □ Somewhat Agree
   □ Somewhat Disagree
   □ Totally Disagree
36. How many people are there normally in your household? _______

36a. From time to time, do other people stay with you for several weeks?  
   yes □  no □  

36a1. If so about how many people stay with you? ______ people

37. How many people in your household work for pay? _______

In this section, we would like some information on your formal education and your thoughts about education.

38. How many years of formal education have you had? ______ years

39. Do you think you have had all the schooling you need? yes □ no □

40. What is the highest grade in school you have completed? (check one)
   □ grade school
   □ middle or junior high school
   □ GED
   □ high school
   □ Associate of Arts Degree
   □ Vocational Training
   □ Bachelor Degree
   □ Advanced Graduate Degree

41. Which of the following do you think is the least amount of education a person should have? (check one)
   □ grade school
   □ middle or junior high school
   □ GED
   □ high school
   □ Associate of Arts Degree
   □ Vocational Training
   □ Bachelor Degree
   □ Advanced Graduate Degree

42. In general, do you think a degree or diploma is important? yes □ no □

43. Do you think education is important?
   □ Not important at all
   □ Somewhat important
   □ Important
   □ Extremely important
44. If you think education is important or extremely important, why do you think that?


45. Do you think education has increased or decreased the importance of traditional tribal values?

☐ Totally reinforced traditional values
☐ Somewhat reinforced traditional values
☐ Somewhat eliminated traditional values
☐ Totally eliminated traditional values

45a. Why do you think this is so?


46. In general, how much do you think education has increased or decreased your traditional values?

☐ Totally reinforced traditional values
☐ Somewhat reinforced traditional values
☐ Somewhat eliminated traditional values
☐ Totally eliminated traditional values

46a. Why do you think this is so?


The next set of questions asks how you define a disability and what you think about tribal goals. Questions also are asked about your cultural and traditional values.

47. What do you think are the five most important goals for the tribe?
   1. 
   2. 
   3. 
   4. 
   5. 

48. Different people have different ways of defining or describing a disability. How would you define or describe a disability?

49. Do you or others think you have a disability? yes □  no □

50. Whites often are referred to as anglos. If you put everything you do, your culture, way of life, thoughts, and feelings together where would you place yourself?
   □ Totally anglo
   □ Almost all anglo
   □ Somewhat anglo
   □ Half and half
   □ Somewhat Indian
   □ Almost all Indian
   □ Totally Indian

51. How important is it for Salish & Kootenai people to maintain a traditional way of life?
   □ Extremely important
   □ Somewhat important
   □ Not very important
   □ Not important at all

52. How important is it for you to maintain a traditional way of life?
   □ Not important at all
   □ Not very important
   □ Somewhat important
   □ Extremely important
53. Were questions 50 through 52 offensive to you?
   - Extremely offensive
   - Somewhat offensive
   - Not very offensive
   - Not offensive at all

53a. If they were offensive, how were they offensive? ________________________
      ________________________
      ________________________
      ________________________

This section gives you the chance to tell us your opinion of this questionnaire.

54. What do you think of this questionnaire? (check all that apply)
   - The questions were easy to read
   - The questions were easy to understand
   - The questions were hard to understand
   - I think the information asked for will be helpful to the project
   - I don’t think the information asked for will be helpful to the project
   - The questionnaire was too long
   - I thought the questions were too personal
   - The questions were hard to answer
   - The questions were easy to answer

55. If you have other things you want to tell us about this survey, that weren’t listed in question 54, you can use this section to comment. ________________________
      ________________________
      ________________________

This is the end of the questionnaire. Thank you for completing it!

Return the completed survey in the envelope provided to participate in the $50 drawing.
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