Some conclusions reached after an interview with Mr. Herb Gardner.

The number of vacancies at each of the institutions changes day by day. It is very difficult to interpret these vacancies. For example, what is the normal rate of vacancies? How do you describe how the positions allowed by the last legislature have been filled when so many of those positions have been substituted elsewhere? In some cases these substitutions have probably been made because the jobs to which the positions were substituted were easier to fill than the original positions allocated. In other cases P.T. I positions were substituted to other categories in order to relieve Psychiatric Technicians of excessive burdens and responsibilities such as custodial work, sorting linens, food service, and so forth. In many of these situations filling the substituted positions such as Custodial Worker I, Food Service Supervisor, and Special School Counselor, is considered to be as important as filling the original P.T. I positions that they were substituted from in the first place. At any rate, it is impossible to tell which of the positions substituted elsewhere were really needed elsewhere and which were substituted just for the sake of filling up the complement because there were not any people available to hire as P.T. I's.

Mr. Gardner feels that the best way of showing the need for still more positions and higher salaries is to cite the turnover and resignation rates at the institutions. One should also cite the very tight employment situation and the lack of unemployed persons both professional and non-professional. The actual number of allocated positions filled and vacant fluctuates a great deal, and the institutions attempt to fill as many positions as possible and absorb as many vacancies as they can without regard to the classification for which those positions were originally intended. In fact, Mr. Gardner feels that the present "complement" should be done away with and each institution should be given a certain amount of money to do with as they please. This is in effect what most of them are doing now. There are practically no requirements that must be met before one can substitute one position for another. Substitutions are requested and granted with great frequency. All the institution has to show is that they can make up the difference in salaries, either from salary savings already available due to vacancies and retirements, or due to anticipated vacancies and salary savings.

There are two types of substitution: permanent and temporary. For example, the Hospital Aides hired this summer at several institutions were temporary substitutions, usually from P.T. I positions. Permanent substitutions can be left on the books at the close of the biennium and new positions requested to fill the gap from which the substitutions were taken. Or the institution can reinstate all the substituted positions and request enough personnel to fill all the jobs that were filled previously through natural and substituted positions.

Mr. Gardner said that professional positions and nursing positions are harder to fill than P.T. I positions. Good Nurse Instructors are particularly hard to obtain. He feels that Minn ARC makes a big mistake in stressing the need for P.T. I positions. There is a desperate shortage of well-qualified Nurses who are good teachers—Nurse Instructors. Also, more R.N.'s are needed to give adequate supervision to the P.T. I and II's, who do not have any professional training in the care of patients. Many P.T. I's resign or separate because there is inadequate supervision. At any rate, Mr. Gardner feels that the addition of more Nurses would cut the high turnover rates among non-professional personnel.
There are a number of reasons for these separations: Resignation, Retirement, Dismissal, Layoff, Termination of Provisional Appointment, Death, Transfer Out, Termination of Trainee, and Other. Resignation is the most common cause of separation as can be seen from this abbreviated table:

### SEPARATIONS FISCAL YEAR 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Resignation</th>
<th>Other Causes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brainerd</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faribault</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Authorized, filled, and vacant positions at Cambridge

Starting in 1963 Cambridge set out to obtain roughly 600 new positions over a period of three bienniums. Thus they requested 201 positions in 1963, 209 positions in 1965, and are requesting 210 new positions this time. They have only been allowed 102 of the 410 positions requested so far, meaning that they are already lagging by 308. This year Cambridge is requesting 210 new positions, just as in previous years they requested approximately one third of the total new positions needed at the institution. However, even if Cambridge is granted all of the positions they are requesting this year, they would still be 288 short of the original 600 positions they felt they needed. In other words, Cambridge has been allowed only 25 per cent of their request the last two bienniums, and even if this year's request is granted in full, they will have obtained only about 50 per cent of what they felt they needed back in 1963.

During the 1963-65 biennium Cambridge was authorised a complement of 608 personnel. The 1965 Legislature allowed 90 new positions, including 10 laundry workers transferred from Anoka State Hospital. This increased the personnel complement at Cambridge to a total of 698 authorized positions for 1965-67.

The 90 new positions are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Custodial Worker I</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry Worker</td>
<td>10 (from Anoka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric Tech. I</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Nurse II</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Maint. Engineer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehab. Counselor I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapist II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient Activity Leader II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapist II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This year Cambridge urges that their request for 210 new positions be granted and also that the salaries in all civil service classifications be raised 8 per cent. They feel they must have this increase in order to recruit and retain personnel. They feel that such an increase will stabilize the turnover problem among patient care personnel. But they must also have the 210 new positions requested.
COMMENTS ON FILLING OF ALLOCATED POSITIONS

Out of the one hundred and four (104) P.T. I Trainees that Cambridge hired between the summer of 1965 and this past summer, thirty-eight (38) had separated prior to August 1966, for a turnover rate of thirty-six per cent (36%). At the recent conference on staffing Mr. Gardner cited these figures on staff turnover at Cambridge:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substituted Elsewhere</td>
<td>-73</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Positions</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filled</td>
<td>-242</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIRECT PATIENT CARE PERSONNEL DATA AS OF OCTOBER 3, 1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1966</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>38.7% (Rates for P.T. I &amp; II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>N/A  (Rates for Nurses)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of vacancies listed above for October were pretty much the same as those for July and August this past summer. Each month the institutions list the number of vacancies within each category for those positions that remain after all the various substitutions have been made. Should their substitutions also be listed as vacancies? For example, Cambridge is allocated 323 P.T. I's for the current bienlum, but seventy-three (73) of those were substituted elsewhere, and eight (8) are vacant, leaving eighty-one (81) unfilled places for Psychiatric Technicians. This amounts to 25% of their total complement of P.T. I's. A few of these positions were substituted to P.T. II or to Hospital Aide positions, but most of them were substituted to positions that do not involve direct care of residents. For example, twenty-one were substituted to Special School Counselors, nineteen to custodial worker, three to Clerk I, three to Hospital Service Assistant, and so on. All of these positions are easier to fill and easier to keep filled. On the other hand, filling such positions out of the allocated number of P.T.'s does relieve the latter from such things as cleaning chores, and it leaves the remaining Technicians more time for direct care. Perhaps some P.T. I's are retained because these burdens have been lifted, but it would seem that these steps are draining the numbers of persons who have direct contact with the residents at each of the institutions.