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Mrs. Lynette Dudley  
Program Office Administrator, Office of Disability Determinations  
Ft. Knox Building #2  
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Dear Mrs. Dudley,

I am submitting to you Management and Employee Productivity: Alternatives to Current Trends in Employee Motivation and Increased Employee Productivity. This report was derived from extensive research on employee motivation, management and productivity during the summer semester 2004. Knowing the nature of the agency, productivity is a key element to the work that is done at the Office of Disability Determinations the recommendations from this report should be helpful.

After examining several policy alternatives, my recommendation for your agency would be a management video highlighting the strategies and theories used by the GOM’s who have the most productive units. Three evaluation criteria were used in order to develop the best policy alternative. Administrative feasibility, administrative cost, and employee satisfaction were the evaluation criteria used to evaluate three policy alternatives.

A management video would be an ideal starting point for discovering ways to motivate employees to produce at higher levels. By training your GOM’s with basic techniques for managing their units, levels of employee productivity should increase compared to the current levels of productivity.

The other policy options that were evaluated were management training camp and incentive program for employees in the form of bonuses. Neither of these scored high enough with in the evaluation criteria to be considered as feasible alternatives.

The recommendation could have a tremendous impact on the Tallahassee Area Office and it’s production numbers.
Respectfully,

Cheslyn M. Green
MPA Graduate Student
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

“Declining productivity in the United States has become a persistent concern of
economic and business analysts over the past five years, and, as the decline continues so does the search for solutions. Dozens of organizations have attempted to solve their productivity problems by application of various innovative management techniques” (Gold 568). Some private sector agencies have implemented incentive programs in order to influence employee motivation and increase productivity.

A number of resources were used in collecting information for this report. The most relevant media sources, educational studies, and academic literature were reviewed for background information. General operations managers and employees were contacted to provide information on management styles, employee motivation, and productivity. Lastly, Division of Disability policy was reviewed in order to develop a better understanding of the weekly, monthly, and quarterly production standards.

Three policy options were presented in this report to address the issue of employee productivity. Management video, manager training camp, and incentive program in the form of employee bonuses. All policies were evaluated according to administrative feasibility, administrative cost, and employee satisfaction.

Based on an evaluation of all the policy options using the evaluation criteria, a management video is the best option for motivating employees and increasing productivity. The other two policy options, manager training camp and incentive program did not yield results sufficient enough to be considered feasible policy options. Administrative cost and employee satisfaction presented as the least favorable policy options.

I. Problem Statement

Productivity in the public sector has been a major point of interest in government’s movement to improve public service by making it more consumer friendly and efficient. In
certain state agencies, the main objective is to have high levels of employee productivity. There are certain steps that have to be taken by management in order to foster an environment that promotes general well being, fosters employee satisfaction, and allows employees to function to the best of their abilities. There have been incentive programs introduced to increase employee productivity. The more an employee produces the more they are compensated financially. Although incentive programs are successful in the private sector, the ability to implement such a program in the public sector is virtually impossible. The lack of motivated public servants is affecting the government’s push for friendlier, more helpful, less wasteful, public agency. In a publication regarding productivity management for public sector organizations, inadequate resources, inappropriate organizational structure, and insufficient motivation were listed as major factors affecting an organization’s productivity (Hyde, 1985). Along with the above mentioned factors, I believe a simpler element is being over looked. Public managers and their individual management styles play an imperative role in how the employees view their job duties, their motivation, and ultimately, their production. The purpose of this Action Report is to access alternative management styles in relation to employee productivity in a single department.

II. Background and Literature Review

“Declining productivity in the United States has become a persistent concern of economic and business analysts over the past five years, and, as the decline continues so does the search for solutions. Dozens of organizations have attempted to solve their productivity
problems by application of various innovative management techniques” (Gold 568). Some private sector agencies have implemented incentive programs in order to influence employee motivation and increase productivity. “Many of the motivational tools used in private industry are not available to managers who work in the public sector. An employee working in the public sector knows that salaries are not individually negotiated. Employees who perform their jobs well do not receive larger salary increases than those who perform poorly” (Perry 43). Therefore the link between pay and job performance that is often present in the private sector is all but non-existent in the public sector. Unlike private agencies, public sector organizations are not profit driven; therefore, the pay is less competitive for it’s employees. Another strategy used to influence the productivity of private sector workers that is less effective with public sector employees is disciplinary action. It is difficult to discipline public employees. Disciplinary action refers to taking an action against an employee that will result in the termination of that employee. In the private sector termination is usually swift, with few if any complications. Termination in the public sector is not as simple. “Once a public employee has been lawfully retained in his/her position after completion of the probationary period the employee typically attains a permanent status. Once this permanent status is attained a public employee is protected by procedural due process rights” (Perry 44). Therefore the treat of losing one’s job because of decreased productivity is of more concern to a private sector employee than a public sector employee. Other factors have been identified as effecting the productivity of public employees, these are: inadequate resources, inappropriate organizational structure, and insufficient motivation. (Hyde 319).

This push for more productivity from public sector agencies is not a new phenomenon. These factors may be important; yet, I believe that the attitudes and management styles of mid-
level managers are what really influence employee productivity. “One of the primary tasks of the manager is to motivate people in the organization to perform at high levels” (Steers & Porter, 1987). It is generally agreed that the more accurately managers can answer the question of what motivates their employees, the more effective they will be at maximizing productivity, enhancing productivity, enhancing performance, and advancing the notion of organizational accountability (Cherniss & Kane, 1987). There have actually been a number of public sector productivity movements. The beginning of the last century was characterized by an important productivity interest that diminished as the Second World War approached. Yet, in the 1970's, nearly half a century after the productivity movement began, a number of conceptual innovations emerged. This movement towards a more productive public sector can be categorized into four periods: 1. Government by the Efficient (1900-1940), 2. Government by administrators (1940-1970), 3. Government by the managers (1970-1980), and 4. Government by the private sector (1980-1990) (Public Productivity & Management Review, 1990).

**Government by the Efficient: 1900-1940**

“A generation ago, a municipal government was considered commendable if it was honest. Today, we demand a great deal more of our public service. It must be not only honest but efficient as well” (Ridley and Simon, 1938). This kind of statement was typical thinking during the first part of the century (1900's). Government by the good turned into government by the efficient. A new emphasis was placed on economy and efficiency. Efficiency was generally defined as accomplishment of work with the least expenditure of manpower and materials (Bouckaert 1990). In 1937, under the Roosevelt administration, the President’s committee on Administrative Management, also known as the Brownlow Committee, published its report. This report stated that “The efficiency of government rests upon two factors: the consent of the
governed and good management.....Administrative efficiency is not merely a matter of paper
clips, time clocks, and standardized economies of motion. These are but minor gadgets. Real
efficiency goes much deeper down. It must be built into the structure of a government just as it is
built into a piece of machinery” (President’s Committee on Administrative Management, 1937).
During this period of the productivity movement the real objective was the improvement of
government performance (efficiency and effectiveness) (Bouckaert 1990). The next movement
was government by administrators.

**Government by Administrators: 1940-1970**

During this time there is an apparent shift from the scientific management approach to a
general management approach. The first Hoover Commission (1949) made recommendations on
performance budgets and standards. Such concepts as economy and efficiency had a major focus
as well as management improvement (Moe, 1982). The main motive for these innovations was
no so much the search for better government, as it had been in the first stage, but the wish to
control expenses. The changing environment caused the cost of government programs to grow at
an alarming rate. This explains why productivity, conceived of as doing more with less, became
and remained of interest to the political elite (Bouckaert 1990). The Bureau of the Budget
initiated a productivity project in 1962. In five different agencies, including the U.S. Postal
service, the feasibility and usefulness of productivity measurement was explored. The 1964
report concluded that “it would be feasible to develop valid productivity indexes for many
government activities” (Kull, 1978). Although numerous improvements were made in planning,
programming, budgeting, accounting, auditing, and systems analysis, the comprehensive
productivity concept remained largely unused until the 1970's (Bouckaert 1990). The third
productivity movement was government by the managers.
Government by the Managers: 1970-1980

The 1970's were supposed to be the era of public administration as public administration (Bouckaert 1990). “The distinction and separation from politics remained, and the notion that public administration was a profession took hold. The inspiration of the private sector and the eagerness to implement private sector techniques resulted in a new stage. Government by the administrators turned into government by managers. The public administrator became a public manager. This metamorphosis promoted an atmosphere and environment of professionalism, creativity, innovation, and combativity that was supposed to be typical of the private sector. Public administration turned into public management” (Perry and Kraemer 1983). The search for productivity at this time was not motivated by better government, as it was in the first stage, or expense control, as it was in the second stage, but now the search for productivity is fueled by the desire to get more for the tax payer’s money: “more bang for the public buck” (Bouckaert 1990). The final piece in the productivity life cycle of the 1970's was Washnis’s (1980) Productivity Improvement Handbook for State and Local Government. This handbook described the tools, techniques, and systems for improving productivity and applies them to the different functional operations of state and local government. (Bouckaert 1990). The final period in the history of the productivity movement is the government by the private sector.

Government by the Private Sector: 1980-1990

“There was an upswing in the productivity movement in the early 1980's at several levels: committees, reviews, and activities. In 1981, the National Productivity Advisory Committee announced that a White House Conference on Productivity would be held in September 1983 (Seidman, 1983; Mooney, 1983-1984). The National Center for Public Productivity had its conference on Putting Productivity to Work in March 1983 (Public
Productivity Review, 1984). The Bureaucrat started with a series on productivity in the Summer of 1983 (Holzer 1983). All these were indicators of a renewed interest in the productivity movement (Bouckaert 1990). Two trends were dominant during this period. One continued the approach pursued in the 1970's and the other was a “new” approach. This new approach was ideologically motivated and it advocated a private sector-inspired approach to productivity in the public sector and the privatization of many government services. The 1980's became known as the era of less government and what remained was government by the private sector.

With all these changes in the evolution of productivity, its no wonder that public agencies seem to be grasping at straws when it comes to discovering what influences employee production. Factors such as job satisfaction, pay, and contributions to the overall agency are all influential in employee productivity, but I still believe that it is the managers, the mid-level managers, that have the biggest influence over employee productivity.

III. Methodology and Evaluation Criteria

Methodology

The following resources were used in collecting information for this report:


- Unstructured interviews (n=12), approximately 45 minutes, employees from the Division of Disability Determinations and General Operations Managers

- Review of DDD (Division of Disability Determinations) Policy regarding Weekly, Monthly, and Quarterly production standards
The public organization examined in this study was the Office of Disability Determinations. The adjudicators and medical claims examiners receive case files from the local Social Security Administration offices, develop the medical portion of the claim, and make a decision as to whether or not the claimant is found to be an allowance under SSA guidelines or a denial according to the same guidelines. ODD is a division of the Social Security Administration.

Claimants apply for disability benefits either under the Title II or Title XIV programs offered by the Social Security Administration. Title II is a program that takes the number of years a person has worked and utilizes a formula that gives that worker a certain number of counted quarters of substantive gainful activity. It is essentially similar to purchasing insurance from the federal government. If you have worked and earned a certain number of counted quarters of gainful activity then you qualify for the Title II program. Title XIV is also known as SSI, which is an eligibility program, based on an applicants lack of income, assets, etc.

There is a lot of concern in this organization pertaining to the numbers. Each area office is required to make a decision on a certain number of cases per week. In order to meet the offices weekly goals each supervisor has goal set up for their particular unit. Within that unit, the individual adjudicators have specific numbers they have to meet in order to help their supervisor meet his/her goals and therefore help the area office meet its goals for the week. This is a very hand’s on, teamwork-oriented type of environment where individual greatness or lack thereof affects the entire organization. “Declining productivity in the United States has become a persistent concern of economic and business analysts over the past five years, and, as the decline continues so does the search for solutions (Gold 568). Dozens of organizations have attempted to solve their productivity problems by application of various innovative management techniques” (Gold 568). With this in mind, the General operations managers (supervisors) at the
Division of Disability Determinations were interviewed to establish their particular style of management; from there, three members of each supervisor’s unit were interviewed to establish their views on the supervisor’s management styles.

The first person, I interviewed G.O.M #1. G.O.M. #1 has a unit comprised of eight members, six of which are female with the remaining two being male. When asked about his management style G.O.M. #1 responded by saying he was a “working supervisor”. He stated that he lead by example and believed in being hands on with his unit. He stated that he encourages his unit to come and ask questions about the things they do not understand or things they are having difficulty with. He also mentioned that he could be a bit authoritative by sometimes telling his unit members exactly what it is they need to do on their cases. From his unit, I interviewed female worker #1 and male worker #1. Between the two of these employees, the numbers say it all. FW#1 has the lowest pending caseload, meaning she has the fewest number of cases in her caseload that a decision has not yet been rendered. MW #1’s pending is somewhat higher than FW #1. I began the interview by asking FW #1 how she thought G.O.M. #1 managed his unit. She stated that he could be a bit overwhelming at times and he asks a lot of his unit. She also stated that he was a hands on type of supervisor that believed in showing you what needs to be done, yet sometimes he does not fully explain why certain actions should be taken. There was one aspect of G.O.M. #1’s management style that FW #1 found refreshing. She states that “G.O.M. #1 allows you make your own decisions and gives you the opportunity to defend your point of view if he does not agree with the decision you are making and he generally tries to lead you in the right direction.”

MW #1 was asked the same question regarding G.O.M. #1’s management but had a much different view of him. MW #1 stated that his supervisor was definitely the authoritarian. He
stated that G.O.M. #1 managed by giving instruction and not encouraging much creative thought. He often dreads going down to his supervisor’s office and avoids it at all costs.

The next supervisor that was interviewed was G.O.M. #2. His unit is comprised of eight members, all of which are female. G.O.M. #2 said his management style was definitely hands off. “I do not believe in micro management, it slows down production. I like my unit to feel independent and come to me only if they truly do not know what to do on a case. It’s just that simple.”

Female worker #2 and Female worker #3 were interviewed regarding G.O.M. #2. FW #2 has a relatively low pending and states that she likes G.O.M. #2 because “he does not hover over you.” FW #2 says she works better if left to her own devices. She enjoys the independence that being in G.O.M. #2’s unit provides, although there are times when she wishes G.O.M. #2 would be a little more available.

FW # 3 however says that G.O.M. #2 is not the ideal supervisor. She states that he is a bit aloof and does not necessarily seem to be interested in providing more guidance. “He is definitely not hands on. You’ve got to really know what you’re doing in this unit.”

These two employees seem to view their supervisor’s style in the same way, only one views it as a positive while the other sees it as a negative. Consequently, later in the paper, it will be revealed that those who have similar perception of the supervisor as he/she has of himself seem to fair better with slightly lower case loads and more cases dictated on a weekly basis.

Next, I interviewed two of the female supervisors. One supervisor has an all-female unit while the other has a mix of both males and females.

G.O.M. #3 has a unit of eight, three males and five females. She states that her management style is “quite simple.” “I tend to be more of a nurturer. My employees learn from
me. I give explanation for all actions and I’m always available to them when they need guidance.” G.O.M. #3 is definitely hands on and will work right alongside with her unit as if they were a team.

From her unit, I interviewed Male worker #2 and Female worker #4. Their opinions on G.O.M. #3’s management styles were very similar to how the supervisor described her self. They both stated that she was a working supervisor and definitely hands on. Both MW #2 and FW #4 have relatively high pending caseloads and often fall short of their weekly goals.

Lastly, I interviewed G.O.M. #4. Her unit is comprised of all females. When asked to describe her management style, G.O.M. #4 had some difficulty. “I never thought of myself as having particular management style. I just rather allow my unit to work independently and come to me if they have any questions or concerns. I’m probably not what one would call a hands on supervisor and I’m definitely not an authority figure.”

Female worker #5 and Female worker #6 were interviewed regarding the management styles of their supervisor G.O.M. #4. FW#5 has a low pending and continuously meets her numbers every week. FW#6 also has a relatively low pending and meets or exceeds her numbers weekly. According to FW#5, G.O.M. #4 is an easy supervisor to please. She states that G.O.M. #4 is rather passive and allows her unit to work independently. FW#5 did point out that G.O.M. #4 has a unit that is a bit more experienced than some of the other units and this could possibly attribute to her supervisor’s management style.

FW#6 also views G.O.M. #4 to be rather passive yet she does not see this as being a good trait in a supervisor. FW#6 states that G.O.M. #4 does not always provide the guidance that she feels is necessary to perform the job effectively. FW#6 also made the point that the unit had
more experienced examiners, but also stated, “even those of us with more experience still need to be guided. We need to feel as if we can be confident in the leadership of our unit.”

After reviewing the information, many of DDD’s (division of disability determinations) general operations managers view themselves as effective supervisors although their styles are quite different. There was not very much variation in the way the supervisors viewed themselves and the way in which members of their units perceived them. The following is an overview of interviews, broken down into the most dominant supervisor trait and whether or not the employees viewed it as being positive or negative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G.O.M. #1</th>
<th>Authoritative</th>
<th>Hands On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Worker #1</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Worker #1</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G.O.M. #2</th>
<th>Independent Work</th>
<th>No Micro management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Worker #2</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Worker #3</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G.O.M. #3</th>
<th>Hands On</th>
<th>Nurturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Worker #2</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now let us look at the numbers. Every week each unit has a specific number of cases that have to be dictated (decision rendered) and on its way out of the office. These numbers are based on the number of pending cases for the unit, and a certain percentage of those pending cases are what is required of that unit to have dictated by the end of the week.

I found that many of the units were actually making of cases gotten out by the unit and the individual numbers of the people I interviewed their goals for the week although the unit members had different levels of pending and not everyone reached their personal goals. The following represents about a month’s worth of production numbers. Table 1 will be of the units and their weekly goals. Table 2 will reflect the number of cases the interviewees were able to clear. Table 3 will reflect the total number of cases cleared for the week and whether or not the supervisors met their unit goals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Number</th>
<th>Unit Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T3: G.O.M. #4; T9: G.O.M. #2; T8: G.O.M. #1; T5: G.O.M. #3

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Member</th>
<th>Cases Cleared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Worker #1 T8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Worker #1 T8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Worker #2 T9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Worker #3 T9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Worker #2 T5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Worker #4 T3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Worker #5 T3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
As you can see the supervisors with fewer negatively viewed management styles were able to meet their unit goals, while the others that had more negatively viewed management styles had difficulty reaching their weekly goals. There are a number of other factors that were not taken in to account here. Differences in motivation can also be attributed to the differences in outcomes. Other issues to consider would be employee health, employee personal life, employee stress level, and other outside factors that can affect work productivity.

Evaluation Criteria

Three criteria are to be used to evaluate the proposed policy options. These are Administrative Feasibility, Administrative Cost, and Employee Satisfaction. Each criterion will be measured by an assigned value from 1-5. 1 being most negatively ranked to 5 most favorably ranked.

- Administrative feasibility would be the measure of how accessible and executable the option is. Will administration agree to it and support this policy option as the most doable? Administration is responsible for the planning and executing the policy option, therefore it would be much easier to execute a policy that administration is in agreement with than one that presents some opposition.
· Administrative cost will rate the expense to the state agency to implement each policy option if an option is too costly it will have a low ranking. If the cost is more efficient then it will have a higher ranking. The data source for administrative cost will be the estimated cost of each policy alternative.

· Employee Satisfaction will gauge the response of employees to the policy options. It would also give insight into how well the changes will be accepted and how the employees will respond to change.

These three criteria will be selected as the most important representatives of the considerations made in the evaluation of the three proposed policy options.

There are several limitations to this study. The first is outside factors. Outside factors can influence employee production. Other issues such as family disputes or crisis, emotional instability (depression), media perception of an agency etc, all affect employee production. However, it is still believed that management style, motivation, and perception play a more compelling role in employee productivity.

Administrative feasibility may posit a few weaknesses. Differences in opinion and points of view can come into play here when administration is deciding whether it finds a particular policy option doable. It is difficult to reach a consensus in an organization where the opinions on policy are as varied as the people who make write the policies. A particular policy option may be feasible in theory but once someone takes the initiative to execute the policy that particular option may not be as attainable in actual practice. However, these are risks that all administrators are willing to take in order to achieve the goal of finding policy that works in theory as well as in practice.

Administrative cost is always an issue when it comes to the implementation of new policy. Distribution of the new policy can become a costly little detail if an organization is not equip to handle slight fluctuations in its budget. In addition to distribution, the cost of what the policy entails can also become a burden for an agency. A policy may call for an increase in
production, but with that, increase in production comes the cost of production. The materials that are needed in order to increase productivity may be more than the administration of that particular agency is willing to budget.

Employee satisfaction is a difficult concept to gauge. A number of factors can affect how employees respond to change within their environment. If the policy options are viewed negatively this could mean rejection of any new or innovative ideas that will directly affect the employee population. With that being said, employees could also offer critical insight into evaluating policy options. Since these policy options are indirectly going to affect the way in which the employees do their job, it is necessary to have their opinions on the issues that are going to affect their livelihood.

IV. Management Policy Options

There are three policy options being considered for evaluation. They include a Management Video on how to motivate employees, Management Training Camp to teach managers how to communicate effectively with their employees to achieve the desired ends of increased productivity and an Incentive Program for employees in the form of yearly bonuses. These three options are designed to encourage employee productivity and will be evaluated according to administrative feasibility, administrative cost, and employee satisfaction.

Option 1: Management Video

The first policy option would be to make a management training video and require all managers to view the video and do a project based on the information provided. Run a study much like the one in this report to discover who the best and most efficient general operations manager’s are in the agency. Next, survey the workers, general operations managers, as well as the program administrator and get their opinions about what makes a good manager that will in
turn motivate their employees to produce at high levels. From there, gather the GOM’s that are chosen as the top managers and have them to do a fifteen minute presentation on what it is they do to motivate their workers to achieve high levels of productivity. Compile the most important information from the presentations. Then make a video with those GOM’s giving their strategies, theories, and anecdotes of how they serve as primary motivators of their units. The GOM’s have full discretion in editing and creating the video. Then as a part of management training, require that all supervisors that are hired after a certain date be required to view the video as a part of his/her base training. Although the techniques described in the video may not work for all managers and employees, GOM’s should be required to develop his/her own method or strategy for motivating employees. They should also be required to present their ideas to their immediate supervisor’s in order to demonstrate that they have some understanding of what is being required of them as managers and motivators.

Instructional videos are often used in training situations. They provide clear examples of real work related situations and usually give helpful information as well as instruction.

Administrative Feasibility

It would be difficult for administration to have problems with the execution of this particular policy option. Taping a video is as simple as having someone control the camera and let the GOM’s present his or her ideas. The equipment is already in the office, and the location is ideal because the agency has two conference rooms both are equip for presentations. Yet the planning aspect could possibly be quite cumbersome. Time is a key aspect of our job. The surveys, presentations, and the taping of the instructional video are all going to be time consuming. From the standpoint of administration, this could mean that the process of developing the management video is going to take away from actual work time. Concerning
how accessible and executable this option is, administration should have few complaints. Making it easier to put in place a policy that is widely agreed upon. As far as the project after the video, requiring that the new GOM’s present a plan of action regarding employee motivation and productivity, administration would probably view this as a positive outcome from an easily executable policy option.

**Administrative Cost**

Cost is always a concern of any administration. Agencies often have strict budgets that have to be maintained. The slightest fluctuations in expenditures can cause tremendous problems. Unless the agency has someone on staff that is technically inclined and has the equipment and knowledge of how to make and edit a video this could prove to be a costly task.

**Employee Satisfaction**

Employees are likely to view this policy option positively because they where involved in the process. Often employees support changes or proposed changes in policy if they are involved in the process. On the other hand, this base level of involvement is all the employee has to look forward too. They will not be involved in the actual taping of the video although the topic and purpose of the video is to teach the GOM’s how to motivate the employees. Other than benefiting the work situation, employees may find no satisfaction in this policy option because the outcome is not personally beneficial.

**Option #2: Management Training Camp**

This policy option begins with the same premise as the previous option. Some kind of survey should be conducted to find out who the “best of the best” are in the agency when it comes to motivating their units to produce at consistently high levels. After finding those leaders, they should get together with the agencies trainers and develop a three-day camp where all managers
are required to go in order to receive training and guidance on how to motivate their employees and keep their production numbers at their highest. This camp will not only serve as a training tool, but it is also a way for the area GOM’s to come together and share their ideas and prospective on the future of the agency.

Administrative Feasibility

I am not sure how well this policy option will go over with administration. It could easily be viewed as a waste of time and resources. Travel and accommodations would take the GOM’s away from their units for three days. Leaving the question of who is holding down the fort while they are gone. Even if only half the GOM’s for an area office leave for the three-day camp, there is still work that is not being done and situations may arise that only a GOM of a particular unit can handle. The next issue would be that of accessibility. Administration would have the responsibility of making the arrangements for the camp’s location and accommodations for the GOM’s and trainers. Administration may also argue that whatever skills can be covered in the three day camp could also be covered in a business meeting or conference held within the agency for about a day and a half. This variation would take away the relaxed atmosphere and possible comrade between other area offices GOM’s. This would also limit the input from other offices; possibly even more successful offices would not be able to share their expertise and experience in public administration

Administrative Cost

This policy option could be expensive. Paying for hotel accommodations could be costly. Travel costs may also be an issue. Administration may require those participating in the training camp to pay for their own travel, hotel, and food expenses and allow the agency to reimburse them later. Administration would also have to bear the burdens of paying for all supplies,
presenters, etc that are participating in the training. Even if it were possible to get discounts because of state agency status, it is still money that was not originally intended to be spent and budgeted out.

**Employee Satisfaction**

Employees may be agreeable to training for their GOM’s. The better the GOM’s are the more they can motivate their employees. Good managers often can influence and help create responsive and productive employees. Once again, the focus is on the GOM and not the employee. This continued overlooking of employee interest may become a problem in that the employee feels that they are being overlooked and not receiving training directly. Therefore creating an atmosphere where it is perceived that GOM’s are the most important aspect of the agency and not the worker.

**Option #3: Incentive Program**

Incentive programs may be one of the most common forms of monetary compensation for productivity. A number of private sector companies use monetary compensation as a way to influence its employees to perform at a higher level. Although this practice is not commonplace in public agencies, there is a way for public agencies to utilize an incentive program in order to influence employee productivity. Bonuses can be given to those employees that perform at a consistently high level over several quarters of production. Every quarter an examiner is suppose to have made a decision and dictated 125 cases as a minimum production requirement. This means that by the end of three quarters at least 375 cases should have decisions. Bonuses will be awarded to employees who by the end of the third quarter have a minimum of 425 dictated cases (cases with decisions). Bonuses will be awarded as follows: 425 dictated cases $1000.00 bonus, 450 dictated cases $1250.00, and 475+ dictated cases $1500.00. While high
levels of productivity are important, quality is also very important. Bonuses will be affected if
good is also very important. Bonuses will be affected if quality drops below 91% accuracy.

Administrative Feasibility

Bonuses are not a new concept to the administration. Some administrators would agree to
bonuses or just about anything sensible that would promote productivity among workers. Many
would also argue that the bonuses create an environment of healthy competition. While others
may believe that the monetary incentive sends the wrong message to the employees. That
message being: get as many cases as you can out of this office at any cost. This could prove to be
disastrous for the quality standard. Employees maybe in hurry to complete cases and overlook
key elements in the decision making process.

Administrative Cost

This is by far the most expensive of the policy options. Something this extensive would
definitely have to be introduced during the beginning of the fiscal year in order to make sure the
funding sufficient to support such an incentive program. Administration may also suggest the
bonus should be of lesser monetary value. While healthy competition is a benefit to the agency,
there is no need to create a hostile work environment because of resentment and animosity.
Tension in the workplace can definitely cause employees to be less productive.

Employee Satisfaction

This policy option may be the most popular among employees. It is designed to give a direct
benefit to the employee to reward his/her hard work. Receiving a bonus could possibly
encourage feelings of self worth and accomplishment for the employee. Incentives could also
encourage those less enthusiastic employees to challenge themselves to perform at a new level.
The program could also reintroduce the idea of taking pride in one’s work.
V. Conclusion

The report has presented three alternatives to encourage employee motivation and production. All three policies were evaluated based on administrative feasibility, administrative cost, and employee satisfaction. The results are summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administrative Feasibility</th>
<th>Administrative Cost</th>
<th>Employee Satisfaction</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Video</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Training Camp</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive Program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1 to 5 with 1 being the least favorable 5 being the most favorable

These three policy options provide good alternatives to programs that are already in place in public agencies in order to motivate their employees to achieve to the best of their abilities. All three-policy options are creative and refreshing. The Office of Disability Determinations should keep in mind that the evaluation criteria a specifically tailored to fit this agency and therefore the results should be utilized in the most positive way.

Policy option number one offered a management video. In evaluating these options, it was found that both administrative feasibility and cost scored favorably while employee satisfaction had the lowest score. The total score for this policy option was 9 out of a possible 15.

Policy option number two offered a management training camp. While fairing rather well with administrative feasibility scoring a 3, the other two evaluation criterion were less favorable
scoring a 2 for both administrative cost and employee satisfaction. The total score for this policy option was 7 out of 15.

Policy option number three offered an incentive program for employees. Administrative feasibility scored a 2. Administrative cost scored a 1 being the least favorite of the evaluation criteria. While employee satisfaction scored a 4, clearly one of the highest and most favorable options among employees.

According to the numbers, the management video is the best policy option for the agency. It presented with the least discrepancies in the scoring. The management video will serve the purposes of not only the administration but it will also benefit the managers as well as the employees. Based on the research, it was found that managers have a large impact on how their employees perform. While outside factors may be apart of the equation, employees are motivated to perform for managers who they perceive to be supportive and nurturing. Taking the top producing managers and allowing them to share their knowledge and experience with other employees can only encourage other managers to want to achieve higher numbers within their units. It is my recommendation that the Office of Disability should implement a management video in order to motivate its employees to achieve higher production numbers.
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