

RELEASED 121240

BY THE U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Report To The Chairman, Committee On Labor And Human Resources

Information On Labor's Awards To The Opportunities Industrialization Centers Of America

From fiscal years 1974 to 1982, Labor awarded about \$27 million in sole-source contracts to the Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America, Inc. (OIC/A), so that it could provide technical assistance to help its local affiliates improve the management and operations of their training and job placement programs. The contracts were awarded without

- justifying fully the sole-source decision,
- determining the extent of assistance needed by local affiliates,
- evaluating past effectiveness in providing technical assistance, and
- detailing award objectives which could be used to measure progress.

Local OICs were generally satisfied with the technical assistance which OIC/A had provided. Documentation, however, was not available to show the extent, type, and impact of OIC/A's assistance.

Labor, in response to previous GAO reports on contract award and administration, has taken actions which should correct many of the problems discussed in this report. GAO recommends that future contracts be awarded competitively and suggests additional actions to facilitate the administration of future awards of this type.



121240

GAO/HRD-83-33
MARCH 28, 1983

524988

Request for copies of GAO reports should be sent to:

U.S. General Accounting Office
Document Handling and Information
Services Facility
P.O. Box 6015
Gaithersburg, Md. 20760

Telephone (202) 275-6241

The first five copies of individual reports are free of charge. Additional copies of bound audit reports are \$3.25 each. Additional copies of unbound report (i.e., letter reports) and most other publications are \$1.00 each. There will be a 25% discount on all orders for 100 or more copies mailed to a single address. Sales orders must be prepaid on a cash, check, or money order basis. Check should be made out to the "Superintendent of Documents".



UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

HUMAN RESOURCES
DIVISION

B-211029


The Honorable Orrin G. Hatch
Chairman, Committee on Labor
and Human Resources
United States Senate

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In response to your March 30, 1981, request, this report addresses the Department of Labor's award and administration of contracts to the Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America, Inc. (OIC/A), a national organization which provides assistance to its local affiliates on the management and operation of employment and training programs. As you requested, the report also addresses OIC/A's delivery of assistance and discusses the services provided by its local affiliates' programs and former participants' experiences. It contains recommendations for improving Labor's administration of similar awards in the future. This report is the last in a series of reports which you had requested on Labor's contract award and administration practices and selected contract recipients' operations.

As your office requested, written comments were not obtained from Labor and OIC/A. However, we discussed the contents of this report with Labor and OIC/A officials and have incorporated their views where appropriate. As agreed with your office, unless you publicly announce its contents earlier, we plan no further distribution of this report until 30 days from its issue date. At that time, we will send copies to interested parties and make copies available to others on request.

Sincerely yours,


Philip A. Bernstein
Director

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
REPORT TO THE CHAIRMAN,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND
HUMAN RESOURCES
UNITED STATES SENATE

INFORMATION ON LABOR'S AWARDS
TO THE OPPORTUNITIES INDUSTRIALIZATION CENTERS OF AMERICA

D I G E S T

From fiscal years 1974 to 1982 the Department of Labor's Office of National Programs awarded nearly \$27 million in contracts under title III of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) to the Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America, Inc. (OIC/A), to provide technical assistance to its local affiliate organizations throughout the country. The assistance was to be designed to help OIC/A's local affiliates improve the management and operations of their training and job placement programs. The local opportunities industrialization centers (OICs) received most of their funding from CETA prime sponsors¹ to provide employment and training services to the economically disadvantaged.

GAO undertook this review at the request of the Chairman, Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, to (1) assess Labor's award and administration of contracts to OIC/A, (2) determine the extent to which OIC/A provided technical assistance to its local affiliates, and (3) obtain information on services offered by local OICs and on former local program participants. Local OICs' management and operations were not reviewed. (See p. 3.)

¹CETA programs generally are implemented by individual or consortiums of employment and training agencies of State and local governments called prime sponsors. Sponsors obtained grants from Labor and in turn implemented the programs through a network of subgrantees/contractors, such as local OICs. On September 30, 1982, CETA expired and the Congress passed the "Job Training Partnership Act." The new act provides for a fiscal year of transition during which time CETA prime sponsors will still be in operations.

AWARDS MADE ON A SOLE-SOURCE
BASIS; GOOD CONTRACT MANAGE-
MENT PRACTICES SELDOM USED

Labor awarded all contracts to OIC/A for providing technical assistance on a sole-source basis without considering alternative providers and without determining the extent of local affiliates' technical assistance needs. Contract files did not contain sufficient justification to show why other potential providers were not considered.

Regarding Labor's contract award and administration practices, GAO's review showed (see p. 7) little or no

- evaluation of contract proposals;
- documentation regarding the assessment of past performance on contracts and fiscal responsibility prior to making awards;
- records of negotiation or evidence of participation or involvement in the process by Labor contracting officials;
- evidence of monitoring performance, especially regarding onsite visits; and
- written assessments at the end of the contract period to show the adequacy of OIC/A's performance achieving desired contract objectives.

However, the modification extending the fiscal year 1981 contract and the fiscal year 1982 contract showed some improvements.

GAO also determined that OIC/A's contracts did not meet Labor's criteria for procurement actions in that the documents did not contain precise objectives and specificity regarding work to be performed.

Labor did attempt to quantify the contract objectives in the fiscal year 1982 award, but it did not follow up on the extent to which OIC/A's local affiliates were benefiting from technical assistance. (See pp. 7 and 8.)

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDED
TO LOCAL OICS BUT DATA NOT
READILY AVAILABLE TO SHOW
EXTENT, TYPE, AND IMPACT

GAO's interviews with a sample of OIC/A's local affiliates showed that they needed technical assistance and it was provided to them primarily by OIC/A. Most local affiliates were satisfied with the assistance they received.

However, because the contract did not require and OIC/A did not maintain data which would have shown how the organization was meeting contract goals and providing technical assistance to local affiliates, GAO could not assess the extent and effectiveness of OIC/A's technical assistance.

GAO's interviews with a sample of CETA prime sponsors who had subcontracted with OIC/A's local affiliates showed that most locals needed technical assistance. However, most prime sponsors did not assess how OIC/A's technical assistance had improved the locals' program administration and effectiveness. Also, they had no input into OIC/A's determination of the local's technical assistance needs. (See p. 14.)

LOCAL OIC PROGRAMS' SERVICES AND
FORMER PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

GAO's analyses of interviews conducted with a sample of OIC/A local affiliates' officials indicated that most locals offered similar employment and training services but the extent of services varied depending on the nature of the subcontract with the CETA prime sponsors. Most locals' services included job development, job placement and followup, skills training, and feeder training (improvement of work habits and self-image). Most locals offered an average of four skills training courses; the most frequent course offerings were in the clerical and key-punch operator skill areas. (See p. 17.)

GAO's interviews with a sample of former participants in OIC/A's local affiliates' programs showed that most of them were women in their

mid-twenties with at least a 12th grade education. About three-fourths of the participants worked at some time before entering the program, mostly in clerical jobs which were also the major source of employment for placed participants. In GAO's sample almost half of the former participants had found jobs when leaving the locals' programs. About 26 percent of the participants reported receiving skills training while in the program. (See pp. 18 and 19.)

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE
SECRETARY OF LABOR

The problems discussed in this report are similar to those identified in GAO's August 1981 and September 1982 reports² on Labor's contract award practices. In response to those reports' recommendations, Labor revised its contract award and administration procedures and reorganized the national office; these actions should improve employment and training contract award activities if implemented properly.

The Secretary should award future technical assistance contracts competitively in accordance with revised contract award procedures. Also, to the extent possible, future contracts should contain quantifiable objectives to provide a better basis for monitoring and assessing awardees' activities. (See p. 9.)

²"Labor Needs to Better Select, Monitor, and Evaluate Its Employment and Training Awardees" (HRD-81-111, Aug. 28, 1981); "Information on Funding Commitments from Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Titles III and IV During Fiscal Year 1981" (HRD-81-145, Aug. 31, 1981); and "Award and Administration of Contracts to Recruitment and Training Program, Inc., During Fiscal Years 1978-81" (GAO/HRD-82-125, Sept. 29, 1982).

C o n t e n t s

	<u>Page</u>
DIGEST	i
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Organization and funding	1
Labor organization for contracting and oversight	3
Objectives, scope, and methodology	3
2 AWARDS WERE MADE ON A SOLE-SOURCE BASIS AND GOOD CONTRACT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES WERE SELDOM USED	5
Sole-source awards with little justification	5
Good contract management practices seldom used	6
Contracts lacked specific objectives and performance not evaluated	7
Progress made toward improving contract award and administration practices	9
Conclusions	9
Recommendations to the Secretary of Labor	9
3 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO LOCAL OICS BUT DATA NOT READILY AVAILABLE TO SHOW EXTENT, TYPE, AND IMPACT	10
Organizational structure and approach to determining and providing technical assistance	10
Available information did not adequately show type, extent, and impact of technical assistance	11
Local OIC program officials received assistance and seemed satisfied	14
Private evaluation of OIC/A's management suggested improvements	15
Conclusions	15

	<u>Page</u>	
CHAPTER		
4	LOCAL OIC PROGRAMS' SERVICES AND FORMER PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS	17
	Local program services and responsiveness to OIC/A suggestions	17
	Former program participants' characteristics and experiences	18
APPENDIX		
I	Labor's CETA awards to OIC/A, fiscal years 1974-82	20
II	Sampling methodology	21
III	CETA prime sponsors' comments regarding providers of technical assistance and local OICs' program effectiveness	25
IV	Local OIC program officials' comments on their technical assistance needs and programs	29
V	Characteristics, experiences, and employment status of participants who left local OIC programs in fiscal year 1980	34

ABBREVIATIONS

CETA	Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973
ETA	Employment and Training Administration
GAO	General Accounting Office
OIC	Opportunities Industrialization Center
OIC/A	Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America, Inc.
ONP	Office of National Programs

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 801, as amended by Pub. L. No. 95-524) was enacted to (1) establish a flexible and decentralized system of Federal, State, and local programs to provide job training and employment opportunities for economically disadvantaged, unemployed, or underemployed persons and (2) assure that training and other services lead to maximum employment opportunities and enhanced self-sufficiency. Most CETA activities were carried out by prime sponsors--generally State and local governments or consortiums of local governments--with grants from the Department of Labor under various titles of the act.¹

Labor's Office of National Programs (ONP), part of the Employment and Training Administration (ETA), administered most of the programs under authority contained in CETA title III, which provided for employment and training services to special target groups and for research, training, and evaluation. Title III specifically authorized "appropriate technical assistance with respect to programs under the act."

Under CETA, grants and contracts were awarded by ONP to several community-based organizations for providing (1) employment and training services to persons designated by the act and (2) technical assistance to local deliverers of these services. The Opportunities Industrialization Centers of America (OIC/A) has received the largest funding of any community-based organization for providing technical assistance to local organizations that were funded by CETA prime sponsors to provide employment and training services to the economically disadvantaged.

ORGANIZATION AND FUNDING

OIC/A originated in 1964, when the first center was established in Philadelphia to provide skills training and job placement services to disadvantaged people. From that time until 1974, OIC/A operated centers throughout the country to provide

¹On September 30, 1982, CETA expired and it was replaced by the "Job Training Partnership Act" (Pub. L. No. 97-300) on October 13, 1982. The new act provides for a fiscal year of transition during which time CETA prime sponsors will still be in operation. While the new act's purposes are similar to CETA's, the delivery agents for employment and training services will be selected within certain limitations by the Governors of each State.

employment and training services. With CETA's inception, OIC/A changed from operating programs to providing local organizations with technical assistance designed to improve their management and delivery of employment and training services. Local organizations that affiliate with OIC/A are referred to as local Opportunities Industrialization Centers (OICs). At the time of our review, 132 local OICs were in operation.

Labor has provided most of OIC/A's funding. During fiscal years 1974-82, OIC/A received over \$48 million in CETA funds, of which nearly \$27 million was for providing technical assistance to local OICs and the remainder was for demonstration projects and other special training programs (see app. I for detailed Labor funding information). Funding from other sources during that period totaled over \$14 million. The following table shows the sources and total funding received by OIC/A for fiscal years 1974-82.

<u>Source</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Labor	\$48,329,274
Health and Human Services	7,184,087
Commerce	2,816,228
Housing and Urban Development	146,032
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania	3,361,951
Other	<u>961,275</u>
Total	<u>\$62,798,847</u>

OIC/A reorganization in response to reduced funding

Recent funding reductions resulted in a reorganization and decrease in OIC/A staff. Before fiscal year 1982 OIC/A maintained a national office in Philadelphia and nine regional offices (one of which was collocated with the national office) throughout the country. During fiscal year 1981, OIC/A closed two regional offices because reduced funding from the prior fiscal year made it difficult to sustain the nine regional offices and national office administration. On November 30, 1981, OIC/A closed the seven remaining regional offices because of a large reduction in the fiscal year 1982 technical assistance contract. The national office operations were continued and on January 25, 1982, two area offices were established--one in Philadelphia and the other in Dallas--with a combined staff of 15 area representatives to provide technical assistance to local OICs. National office and regional office staff decreased from 104 in October 1980 to 64 in October 1981 and to 33 in January 1982.

LABOR ORGANIZATION FOR CONTRACTING AND OVERSIGHT

ONP awarded and administered the annual technical assistance contracts to OIC/A during the period of our review. ONP had four program offices, one of which was the Office of Special National Programs and Activities which had specific responsibility for the OIC/A contract. This office received procurement support services from a fifth ONP office, the Office of Contracting Services. At the time we completed fieldwork in May 1982, Labor reorganized ETA into five functional units and ONP activities became the responsibility of another office.

OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

Our objectives were to (1) assess ONP's award and administration of contracts to OIC/A for providing technical assistance to local OICs, (2) determine the extent to which OIC/A provided technical assistance to its local affiliates, and (3) obtain information on services offered by local OICs and on the characteristics and experiences of former program participants.

In assessing ONP's award and administration of technical assistance contracts to OIC/A, we discussed the contracts with ONP officials and reviewed contract files for fiscal years 1980-82 awards. In fiscal years 1980-81 OIC/A received its largest funding for providing technical assistance, while the fiscal year 1982 award was made under revised contracting procedures designed to address prior GAO reports' recommendations in this area. We examined the contract files to determine whether (1) a needs determination was made, (2) competition or sole-source justification was used to make the awards, (3) negotiations were documented, (4) contracts were monitored and evaluated, and (5) the scope of work provided sufficient detailed objectives which could be used to evaluate OIC/A's performance.

To assess OIC/A's delivery of technical assistance, we interviewed OIC/A officials at the national office and at five of their seven regional offices in operation during the early phases of our fieldwork, which was conducted from September 1981 to May 1982. We examined OIC/A's technical assistance records, technical assistance budget, management reports, contracts, and assessments. We further interviewed a sample of local OICs' program officials and prime sponsors that provided funds during fiscal year 1980 to the locals in our sample.

We also interviewed a sample of former participants in local OICs' programs to obtain characteristic data and information on locals' services. We did not review local OICs' management and operations. Our review was performed in accordance with generally accepted government audit standards.

Sampling methodology

Because the job placement function is an important part of local OICs' activities and placement data were reported more frequently to OIC/A than other program data, we used as our universe for sampling purposes locals which had reported placement statistics during fiscal year 1980 to OIC/A (1981 data were incomplete at the time we selected our sample). We determined that 116 of the 132 local OICs in operation reported job placement statistics. From the 116 locals we eliminated 15 on the West Coast to lessen our expenditures of staff and travel resources. From the other 101 locals we selected 30 using a random number table. At each of the OICs visited we randomly selected a sample of former participants and conducted interviews with them. Thirty locals provided a sufficiently large universe for projecting to the 101 OICs in our universe at the 95-percent confidence level.

For each of the 30 local OICs in our sample, we selected the prime sponsor that had provided the local with the most funding during fiscal year 1981 and interviewed cognizant officials. This approach enabled us to project the interview results at the 95-percent confidence level to the universe of prime sponsors that would have provided the most funds to the 101 local OICs in our universe.

Appendix II details further our sampling methodology and lists the local OICs we visited. Unless otherwise noted, the numbers/percents discussed in the remainder of the report regarding local OICs, prime sponsors, and former participants represent projected data. The information obtained from these groups is presented in detail in appendixes III, IV, and V and discussed summarily in chapters 3 and 4. However, we did not draw any conclusions regarding the overall effectiveness of locals' services relative to assisting participants because, to our knowledge, no standards, criteria, or similar data exist against which comparisons and/or conclusions could be drawn.

CHAPTER 2

AWARDS WERE MADE ON A SOLE-SOURCE BASIS AND GOOD CONTRACT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES WERE SELDOM USED

ONP awarded contracts to OIC/A for providing technical assistance on a sole-source basis. Contract files did not contain sufficient justification as to why other potential providers were not considered. The files also contained little evidence of evaluation of OIC/A proposals and records of contract negotiations were not complete. Moreover, the contracts did not contain quantifiable objectives or measures which would facilitate comparing planned and actual performance. For the most part, preaward activities, such as evaluating proposals, were conducted by program office staff with little assistance from contracting officials.

SOLE-SOURCE AWARDS WITH LITTLE JUSTIFICATION

The Congress has historically required that Government purchases of goods and services be accomplished using full and free competition to the maximum extent practicable. Offering all qualified individuals or organizations the opportunity to compete helps to minimize favoritism and collusion and provides greater assurance that supplies and services are obtained at the lowest prices, considering quality and other factors. Accordingly, Labor has a procurement policy that the selection of contractors shall be based on competition among responsible suppliers. Both Federal and Labor procurement regulations require that any noncompetitive contract award be fully justified and approved at a high level.

Since fiscal year 1974 Labor has awarded OIC/A technical assistance contracts each fiscal year on a sole-source basis because it interpreted certain provisions of CETA as authorization to award the contracts noncompetitively. Rather than identifying specific types and extent of the local OICs' technical assistance needs and determining who could best meet those needs, Labor continued to fund OIC/A primarily because it believed the organization had met the "demonstrated effectiveness" criteria in the legislation. Detailed discussions on Labor's processes for making discretionary awards, such as those to

OIC/A, and its explanation for exempting OIC/A awards from competition are contained in three GAO reports, two of which were issued in August 1981 and the third in September 1982.¹

After the issuance of the August 1981 reports, Labor issued revised contract award and administration procedures designed to correct award management problems, encourage competition, and require sufficient documentation to justify sole-source awards. However, the fiscal year 1982 contract file did not contain a written justification for the sole-source award even though new award procedures required such documentation.

The contracting officer told us that the decision to award OIC/A the fiscal year 1982 technical assistance contract without competition was made by the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training. Although the officer said he expected the technical assistance award to be competitive in the future, the decision to make a sole-source award was based on the fact that OIC/A was one of the early community-based organizations and fiscal year 1982 might be the last year for which technical assistance funds would be available. In the contracting officer's opinion, if the fiscal year 1982 award had been made on a competitive basis, other contractors would have responded to the request for a proposal to deliver technical assistance to local OICs.

Our discussions with prime sponsors regarding the provision of technical assistance to local OICs tended to corroborate the contracting officer's position. We were told that there were many other potential providers, such as other community-based organizations, universities, and consultants. (See app. III for prime sponsors' responses.)

GOOD CONTRACT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES SELDOM USED

Good contract procedures require that when you have awarded a contract after determining the need for a good or service and have properly evaluated proposals and negotiated the award, you should monitor and evaluate the contractor's performance.

¹"Labor Needs to Better Select, Monitor, and Evaluate Its Employment and Training Awardees" (HRD-81-111, Aug. 28, 1981); "Information on Funding Commitments from Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Titles III and IV During Fiscal Year 1981" (HRD-81-145, Aug. 31, 1981); and "Award and Administration of Contracts to Recruitment and Training Program, Inc., During Fiscal Years 1978-81" (GAO/HRD-82-125, Sept. 29, 1982).

Labor's procurement regulations (41 CFR 29-1.453), which govern its contracting practices, also state that the heads of procuring activities should take necessary measures to insure the independence of contracting offices. In this regard the regulations state that Labor's policy is to place procurement officials, to the maximum extent, outside the direct supervision of program officials.

Our review of OIC/A's fiscal years 1980 and 1981 technical assistance contracts indicated that prudent contract award and administration procedures were not always followed during the award process and throughout the contract performance periods. We found little or no

- indication of evaluation of OIC/A contract proposals;
- documentation regarding the assessment of OIC/A's past performance on contracts and fiscal responsibility prior to making awards;
- records of negotiation or evidence of participation or involvement from Labor contracting officials;
- evidence of monitoring performance, especially regarding onsite visits; and
- written assessments of performance at the end of the contract period or certifications, by the program or contracting officers, regarding the adequacy of OIC/A's performance in achieving contract objectives.

In addition, we found that most preaward activities, such as evaluating proposals and negotiations, were handled by program office staff with little assistance from Labor's contracting officials.

Our review of the modification extending the fiscal year 1981 contract and of the fiscal year 1982 contract showed improvements. For instance, a memorandum of negotiations was prepared for the extension of the fiscal year 1981 contract. However, Labor did not follow up with local OICs to determine to what extent they received technical assistance from OIC/A and how their programs benefited from the assistance.

CONTRACTS LACKED SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES
AND PERFORMANCE NOT EVALUATED

Labor's guide for initiating procurement actions states that when contracting for a good or service, the scope of work to be performed should contain, at a minimum, (1) a precise

statement of objectives, (2) identification of the work to be performed, and (3) established parameters by which the desired scope of work can be defined and by which progress can be measured. Labor's contracts with OIC/A for fiscal years 1980 and 1981 did not meet these criteria. OIC/A's technical assistance contract covered three broad areas--goals, benefits, and types of assistance--and contained no quantified objectives against which progress could be measured. The fiscal year 1982 contract file showed that attempts were made to quantify some aspects of performance but Labor did not follow up to determine the extent to which local OICs received the assistance OIC/A was to provide.

Further complicating the evaluation of OIC/A's contract performance was the lack of a clear definition of technical assistance. Labor officials told us that whatever OIC/A did "in furtherance of the Act" (CETA) constituted technical assistance. Consequently, the terms of the contracts were general and subject to OIC/A's interpretation of what technical assistance should be. OIC/A officials told us that they considered everything the organization did as technical assistance.

To illustrate, in ONP's fiscal year 1981 technical assistance contract with OIC/A, the services to be provided by the national and regional offices of OIC/A were stated in broad, nonquantified terms. Specifically, goals were stated, such as sustaining local program operations, improving the management of OIC affiliates, and developing new OICs. Examples of the benefits expected included developing new and better ways to serve poor people and solving management and programmatic problems. The types of technical assistance to be provided included such areas as general program management and fiscal systems.

The contract did not prioritize technical assistance areas or quantify the extent of assistance in terms of staff-years, cost, or any other measure. It also did not specify what was to be accomplished at which local OIC, how it was to be done, what degree of effort would be employed, or what improvements were expected. Labor did not require OIC/A to maintain data concerning its performance. Given the lack of specificity in the contract, any meaningful evaluation of accomplishments against plans or objectives would have been difficult.

PROGRESS MADE TOWARD IMPROVING
CONTRACT AWARD AND ADMIN-
ISTRATION PRACTICES

The problems we found with the award and administration of technical assistance contracts to OIC/A were similar to those discussed in our prior reports on Labor's employment and training awards.² We believe that Labor's revised procedures in response to those reports should improve its award practices if properly implemented.

In addition, Labor's May 2, 1982, reorganization of ETA's national office should also contribute to improving contract award management practices. This reorganization consolidated the responsibility of program operations formerly handled through the Offices of Youth Programs and National Programs under a new Office of Comprehensive Employment and Training. Most importantly, the reorganization centralized contracting services units, formerly dispersed throughout various offices including ONP, under the new Office of Financial Control.

CONCLUSIONS

Labor's past justification for sole-sourcing awards to OIC/A based on its interpretation of the CETA legislation was not sufficient for exemption from award competition. Furthermore, contracts did not contain specific criteria which would have provided for comparing planned against actual performance. Revised contract award and administration procedures should correct past deficiencies; however, as this chapter indicated, the fiscal year 1982 contract was awarded without competition.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE
SECRETARY OF LABOR

We recommend that the Secretary

- award future technical assistance contracts competitively in accordance with revised contract award procedures and
- require specificity in future technical assistance type contracts particularly with respect to quantifiable objectives which should provide the basis for adequate assessment of the awardees' activities.

²See note 1, p. 6.

CHAPTER 3

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO LOCAL

OICS BUT DATA NOT READILY AVAILABLE

TO SHOW EXTENT, TYPE, AND IMPACT

Labor contracted with OIC/A to provide technical assistance designed to improve the management and operations of its local affiliates' programs. Our interviews with a sample of local OIC program officials generally showed that they believed OIC/A was aware of their technical assistance needs and provided them with assistance in a satisfactory manner. Prime sponsors who had provided funding to local OICs in our sample generally did not assess how OIC/A's assistance had improved local OICs' program administration or effectiveness.

Regarding the impact of OIC/A's technical assistance relative to improving local OICs' programs, Labor could not show how effective the assistance had been because OIC/A had not been required to maintain data which would show how well the organization was fulfilling the goals as set forth in the contract. Furthermore, as was discussed in the previous chapter, Labor's contracts with OIC/A contained broad objectives which would not have provided an adequate basis for measuring progress.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND APPROACH TO DETERMINING AND PROVIDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

OIC/A's regional offices, reorganized as area offices in January 1982 due to budget reductions, were primarily responsible for providing technical assistance to local OICs and to groups interested in becoming OICs within their region. OIC/A national office administrative staff supplemented the technical assistance offered by the regional offices if the regional offices lacked the necessary staff or expertise to meet the local OICs' needs.

Each regional office was managed by a director who reported to the OIC/A national office Deputy Executive Director. The regional office's staff usually consisted of a project officer, an average of five field specialists, and clerical personnel. The field specialists were responsible for monitoring the local OICs and providing whatever assistance was requested by the locals or directed to be delivered by the OIC/A national office. The field specialists were usually assigned responsibility for one technical area, such as fiscal management, job development, training, counseling, and management information systems.

Throughout most of the period our review covered, the OIC/A organizational structure was being changed due to budget reductions. Funding under the technical assistance contract was reduced from about \$5.1 million in fiscal year 1980 to \$3.8 million in 1981 and \$1.5 million in 1982. OIC/A adjusted to the funding level reductions by first reducing the number of regions from nine to seven in 1981 and then by eliminating the regional offices entirely in 1982 and establishing two area offices with reduced staffing. Field specialists who provided technical assistance to local OICs comprised about 45 percent of the area offices' staff.

OIC/A national office staff generally used telephone and questionnaire (called a technical assistance order) surveys for determining local OICs' technical assistance needs.

The OIC/A Deputy Executive Director told us that each fiscal year a telephone survey of local OICs was conducted to determine their technical assistance needs. The survey results were incorporated into an overall written technical assistance plan for each regional office. In addition, each fiscal year the regional offices sent a technical assistance order to the locals in their region requesting them to identify their technical assistance needs for the year. The returned technical assistance orders were then analyzed by the regional offices and plans were made to provide the locals with the requested assistance.

In addition to these means for determining technical assistance needs, other less formal procedures were used. These included: oral and occasional written requests for assistance from local OICs, review of audit reports prepared by independent auditors on locals' performance, and site visits made by the field specialists.

OIC/A national and regional offices generally met local OICs' technical assistance needs through onsite visits, telephone and written communications, workshops, and an annual conference. OIC/A policy was that all instances of technical assistance provided to local OICs be documented in memorandums, referred to as "contact information reports."

AVAILABLE INFORMATION DID NOT
ADEQUATELY SHOW TYPE, EXTENT, AND
IMPACT OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

In attempting to determine the extent and type of OIC/A's technical assistance to its local affiliates and the impact of such assistance on the locals' operations, we reviewed the technical assistance plans which were based on the annual telephone

survey, technical assistance orders, and the contact information reports. Our analysis showed, however, that this documentation did not adequately reflect the type or, in most instances, when or if the assistance requested was provided to the locals. Furthermore, we were not able to link technical assistance to improved local operations because Labor had not required OIC/A to maintain information which would have related specific technical assistance to more effective local programs.

We reviewed each of the region's technical assistance plans for fiscal year 1981 and found them to be somewhat general. For example, under the contract objective "to assist affiliates in operating efficiently and effectively," the plan for one region stated how many local OICs it planned to assess and then provide assistance by quarter, but specific needs and extent of effort required for each local OIC had not been identified. The plan showed the intention to provide assistance to all local OICs in the region but it did not show that a need existed or whether the assistance was ultimately provided. Furthermore, we found no indications that the plans were used by Labor for evaluating OIC/A's effectiveness in providing technical assistance to the locals.

Similarly, the technical assistance orders did not appear to be very useful for determining the amount of technical assistance to be delivered by OIC/A. For example, we noted that in one region only 6 of 23 OICs responded to the technical assistance orders in fiscal year 1980 and none responded in fiscal year 1981.

When we asked the local OIC program officials in our sample about the usefulness of technical assistance orders, 31 percent responded they were not familiar with the orders and another 25 percent said they used other methods to request assistance.

Use of contact information reports

Regardless of the method for determining locals' technical assistance needs, OIC/A policy was that all instances of technical assistance provided be documented in contact information reports. The extent of effort noted in these reports varied from telephone conversations to onsite visits of various lengths of time. We analyzed 533 reports completed for the first 6 months of fiscal year 1981, the most recent and complete reports available at the time of our review, to estimate the extent of OIC/A's efforts directed to improving local OIC programs. The reports neither showed whether the assistance was requested or needed nor showed which method (i.e., telephone survey, technical assistance order, or other means) was used to determine a local's needs.

Our analysis showed that about 66 percent of the reports represented technical assistance given by OIC/A which was designed to improve local OICs' programs or management. Generally, the assistance was provided during onsite visits which took an average of 2 days. Other assistance mainly consisted of conducting conferences or planning sessions, working with groups to establish new local OICs, and acting as a liaison with CETA prime sponsors. The remaining 34 percent of the reports showed various other tasks were performed which did not appear to be directly related to improving local OIC programs.

Analysis of budgets

We also reviewed OIC/A's budgets for the fiscal years 1980 through 1982 technical assistance contracts to ascertain the proportion of costs which were clearly attributable to providing technical assistance for improving local OICs' operations. We found, however, that OIC/A's accounting system was comprised of broad account classifications, such as personnel, travel, services (for example, training, staff development, and forums), facilities, and others. The system did not contain specific accounting codes to identify the extent or type of assistance that may have been provided to a local OIC at a certain time. Consequently, we could not accurately determine what percent of the technical assistance budget expenditures could be considered direct assistance for improving local OICs' programs.

Lack of funds inhibited development of useful management information system

Labor's contracts did not require and OIC/A did not have a management information system which would show how well the organization was meeting contractual goals; that is, to what extent local OICs' technical assistance needs were being met effectively by OIC/A. In July 1978 OIC/A requested funds from Labor to develop and implement an automated management information system which was estimated to cost about \$800,000 annually. While Labor did not fund the system, OIC/A, using part of its technical assistance contract funds, staffed an office to manually tabulate information collected from local OICs by the OIC/A regional offices. The information collected related to local OICs' performance in program activities, such as training and placement. OIC/A closed the management information system unit in fiscal year 1982 because of budget reductions but some of the functions continued within the office of the Deputy Executive Director.

LOCAL OIC PROGRAM OFFICIALS
RECEIVED ASSISTANCE AND
SEEMED SATISFIED

Because available documentation did not adequately show that technical assistance was provided to local OICs or measure in any way the effectiveness of such assistance, we contacted local OICs and prime sponsors to provide more information on this area of concern. We interviewed a random sample of 30 local OIC program officials and the CETA prime sponsors from whom they received funds during fiscal year 1980 to determine how their technical assistance needs were being met. (See app. III for prime sponsors' and app. IV for local OIC officials' responses.)

Comments from local OIC
program officials

Ninety-seven percent of the local OIC program officials interviewed believed that they needed some type of technical assistance. While the service requested and received was usually by telephone, onsite help was requested an average of about four times each fiscal year. Generally, local OIC program officials indicated that OIC/A was aware of their technical assistance needs (27 percent said to a very great extent and 47 percent said to a great extent). Over half of the local OIC officials told us that the frequency and areas of technical assistance needed have decreased over time.

When asked who provides the technical assistance, the local OIC program officials stated the OIC/A regional offices were the main providers, but the OIC/A national office and CETA prime sponsors were also mentioned. Most of the local officials were satisfied with the assistance they received and believed OIC/A was aware of their needs. However, the local OIC officials did not maintain information which would have shown how specific types of OIC/A technical assistance had improved their operations.

Comments from CETA prime sponsors

CETA prime sponsors indicated that local OICs did need technical assistance. About 88 percent of the prime sponsors told us they had a responsibility to provide local OICs with technical assistance in areas related to services they had subcontracted with them to deliver. However, when asked to assess how OIC/A's technical assistance had improved locals' program administration and effectiveness, most prime sponsors told us they did not know or they could not respond primarily because they had not been involved when OIC/A determined the locals' assistance needs.

PRIVATE EVALUATION OF OIC/A'S
MANAGEMENT SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS

Although Labor has not conducted an evaluation of OIC/A, in late 1981 OIC/A contracted with a management consulting firm for an assessment of its organization, management information system, and financial management. The report indicated that OIC/A's ability to provide assistance in financial management and accounting was limited because the regional office staff were not fully qualified in these areas. The report also noted that regional staffs were not being fully utilized.

The report further pointed out that, because Labor paid for the OIC/A regional offices through the technical assistance contract rather than local OICs paying OIC/A for services, no accurate way existed for locals to put a value on OIC/A's services. The report also pointed out that there was no impetus for locals to choose what they needed from OIC/A or to evaluate the quality of those services.

The report further recognized the importance to the overall OIC/A organization of having data to demonstrate its effectiveness as a provider of employment and training services. The report indicated that OIC/A needed a more structured approach to assembling and reporting information. It pointed out that this information is not only needed as a basis for funding the organization but also for public relations.

CONCLUSIONS

Our analysis showed that local OICs needed technical assistance and from the locals' perspective OIC/A met most of their needs. In addition, the local OICs were generally satisfied with the assistance received from OIC/A. However, neither OIC/A nor Labor had documentation as to how effective OIC/A's technical assistance had been in improving local OICs' operations because OIC/A did not maintain information which would show the extent, type, and impact of its assistance.

Under the recently passed Job Training Partnership Act, section 455 of title IV authorizes the Secretary to provide directly or through grants, contracts, or other arrangements, appropriate preservice and inservice training for personnel and appropriate technical assistance with respect to programs under the act.¹ Future technical assistance contracts should require the awardee to maintain an information system which would show

¹See note 1, p. 1.

how technical assistance needs were determined, the extent to which these needs were met, and the cost of delivering these services. Furthermore, the primary agents for delivering employment and training services under the new act and recipients of the technical assistance should be involved when needs are being determined to help ensure that the technical assistance planned for delivery will be designed to improve the locals' operations.

CHAPTER 4

LOCAL OIC PROGRAMS' SERVICES AND FORMER PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

Other concerns we were asked to address dealt with determining (1) what program services were offered by OIC/A's local affiliate organizations and how well these were being delivered and (2) what were the characteristics of former program participants. Interviews we conducted with a sample of local program officials indicated that most OICs offered similar employment and training services but the extent of these varied depending on the nature of the subcontract with the CETA prime sponsors. Most of the CETA prime sponsors indicated that they were generally satisfied with the local OICs' performance.

The results of our interviews with a sample of former program participants showed that most of them were women in their mid-twenties with at least a 12th grade education. About three-fourths of the participants worked before entering the program, mostly in clerical jobs which were also the major source of employment for placed participants. Almost half of the former participants in our sample had found jobs when leaving the OICs' programs. About 26 percent of the participants reported receiving skills training while in the program.

LOCAL PROGRAM SERVICES AND RESPONSIVENESS TO OIC/A SUGGESTIONS

We interviewed program officials at 30 local OICs (see app. II for listing) which were statistically selected to represent 101 OICs' programs. Appendix IV contains the information we obtained by subject area and shows the projections to the 101 OICs, including the estimated response ranges of the universe at the 95-percent confidence level.

Most local OICs' services included job development, job placement and followup, skills training, and feeder training (i.e., improvement of work habits and self-image). Most local OICs offered an average of four training courses; the most frequent course offerings were in the clerical and keypunch operator skill areas. Some of the other course offerings mentioned by the program officials included bookkeeping, auto-mechanics, and welding. Almost all the OICs told us they followed up on the status of former participants who were placed in jobs. In addition, most program officials indicated that they complied with OIC/A's suggestions for improving their operations and the OIC name helped them to obtain funding.

We also interviewed the CETA prime sponsors that had sub-contracted with the local OICs in our sample during fiscal year 1980 to obtain some indication of how well OICs delivered employment and training services. Appendix III shows the projections to the universe of prime sponsors and the estimated response ranges at the 95-percent confidence level. Sixty-seven percent of the prime sponsors rated the local OICs' program administration somewhat to very good, while 17 percent rated them neither good nor poor (about average) and 17 percent responded somewhat to very poor. Regarding program effectiveness, 57 percent of the prime sponsors rated the local OICs' program effectiveness somewhat to very good, 24 percent responded neither good nor poor, and 20 percent rated them somewhat to very poor.

FORMER PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS' CHARACTERISTICS AND EXPERIENCES

We interviewed a statistically selected sample of former local OIC program participants to obtain (1) characteristic data, (2) type and extent of services received, and (3) employment status before and after leaving the local OIC program. Appendix II explains the sampling methodology and appendix V shows projections to the universe of participants served by the 101 OICs represented by our sample.

Our sample of the participants showed that the average age was 26, the majority were female, and most had at least a high school education and had worked prior to entering OIC. Only 2 percent of the participants responded that they had an 8th grade or lower education. About 12 percent of the participants indicated that their primary source of income when they started at OIC was from a job.

Regarding participants' services, about half of those in our sample were counseled and 46 percent found jobs when leaving OIC. Of those that received training (26 percent of the participant sample), the major skill areas in which the training was given were clerical and keypunch operator.

Most of the former participants received their primary income from a job and averaged about 12 months of work since leaving an OIC program. The most prevalent job placements were in clerical and keypunch operator occupations. When interviewed, the weekly gross income of the participants who had left OIC and were working averaged \$118. In comparison, before starting an OIC program the participants averaged about \$40 in weekly income from all income sources, primarily because most were out of work.

Most of the former participants expressed satisfaction with the OIC placement service. Of those that responded as being placed upon leaving an OIC program, about 45 percent indicated that the skills training they received helped their job performance to a great or very great extent and over half said the training was related to their job.

Overall our analysis showed that the former participants' status before entering and after leaving the OIC program was as follows:¹

--12 percent had a job compared to 51 percent.

--37 percent were receiving public assistance as compared to 23 percent.

--3 percent were receiving unemployment compensation both before entering and after leaving an OIC program.

--40 percent had no income as compared to 17 percent.

--7 percent cited other income in comparison to 5 percent.

¹Percents do not total 100 for each category because of rounding.

LABOR'S CETA AWARDS TO OIC/A,FISCAL YEARS 1974-82

<u>Fiscal year</u>	<u>Technical assistance contracts</u>	<u>Other contracts (note a)</u>	<u>Total</u>
1974	\$ 2,000,699	0	\$ 2,000,699
1975	2,200,000	\$ 720,000	2,920,000
1976	2,620,000	80,000	2,700,000
1977	2,896,810	1,500,000	4,396,810
1978	3,201,500	603,466	3,804,966
1979	3,545,750	9,984,748	13,530,498
1980	5,096,995	3,916,874	9,013,869
1981	3,816,000	4,646,432	8,462,432
1982	<u>1,500,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,500,000</u>
Total	<u>\$26,877,754</u>	<u>\$21,451,520</u>	<u>\$48,329,274</u>

a/Funds for demonstration projects and other special programs,
such as career exploration programs for disadvantaged youth.

SAMPLING METHODOLOGY

We developed and used structured data collection instruments to obtain information through interviews with local OIC program officials, CETA prime sponsors, and former participants in local OIC programs. The interviews were conducted from October 1981 through February 1982.

We randomly selected 30 local OICs to provide a sample large enough for projecting to the universe of 101 local OICs reporting placements to OIC/A during fiscal year 1980. We also selected the prime sponsor that had provided the most funds during fiscal year 1980 to each of the local OICs in our sample and interviewed officials at those 30 prime sponsors.

At the 30 local OICs visited we randomly selected a sample of former program participants. We developed at each local OIC a universe of participants who had left the local OIC program during fiscal year 1980. The universe consisted of three termination categories: (1) placed (those who found a job through any source), (2) positive (those who completed program objectives except for being placed, entered other training, or entered military services), and (3) nonpositive (those who left the program without completing objectives, finding a job, or continuing training; for example, dropped out, administrative separation, moved, health problems, pregnancy, or family care). We randomly selected 24 persons (if less than 24, all were selected) in each category and obtained characteristic information from the local OICs' files on each person. The characteristic data obtained from this sample allowed us to test the statistical significance of the characteristics of those in our sample which we actually interviewed (613) in comparison to those with which we could not obtain an interview. We attempted to interview by telephone up to eight persons in each of the three termination categories at the 30 local OICs. If there were fewer than eight persons in a category, we attempted to contact everyone in the category. We then performed statistical tests to determine whether significant differences existed with respect to the characteristics of those we interviewed versus those we did not interview.

The results of our interviews with former participants were projected to the universe of those served by the 101 local OICs in our sample during fiscal year 1980. The results are representative of our universe of OICs but not of any individual OIC.

The results from a statistical sample are always subject to some uncertainty (sampling error) because only part of the universe has been selected for analysis. The sampling error

consists of two parts: confidence level and range. The confidence level indicates the degree of confidence that can be placed in estimates derived from the sample. The range is the upper and lower limits between which the actual universe will be found. The projected results of our interviews with local OIC officials, CETA prime sponsor officials, and former OIC participants are shown by subject area addressed in appendixes III through V along with the estimated range of the universe at the 95-percent confidence level. The following page lists the locations of OIC/A offices, local OICs, prime sponsors, and Labor Department offices at which our work was performed.

<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
<u>OIC/A Offices</u>	
National Office	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Regional Offices	New York, New York Philadelphia, Pennsylvania Atlanta, Georgia Chicago, Illinois Dallas, Texas
<u>Local OICs</u>	
Augusta	Augusta, Georgia
Berrien	Benton Harbor, Michigan
Bexar County	San Antonio, Texas
Boston	Boston, Massachusetts
Cape Fear Area	Wilmington, North Carolina
Central New Jersey	Raritan, New Jersey
Champaign County	Champaign, Illinois
Cincinnati	Cincinnati, Ohio
Delaware County	Chester, Pennsylvania
Erie	Erie, Pennsylvania
Essex County	East Orange, New Jersey
Gold/Wayne	Goldsboro, North Carolina
Greater New Orleans	New Orleans, Louisiana
Jackson	Jackson, Mississippi
Jackson/Purchase Area	Paducah, Kentucky
Little Rock	Little Rock, Arkansas
Louisville	Louisville, Kentucky
Memphis	Memphis, Tennessee
Mobile Area	Prichard, Alabama
New York City	New York, New York
Omaha	Omaha, Nebraska
Paterson	Paterson, New Jersey
Piedmont/Spartanburg	Spartanburg, South Carolina
Philadelphia	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Springfield	Springfield, Ohio
Tri-County, Pennsylvania	Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
Tri-County, Virginia	Winchester, Virginia
Washington	Washington, D.C.
Westchester County	Port Chester, New York
Worcester	Worcester, Massachusetts

CETA Prime Sponsors

Alamo Manpower Consortium	San Antonio, Texas
State of Arkansas	Little Rock, Arkansas
Berrien County	Benton Harbor, Michigan
City of Boston	Boston, Massachusetts
Capital Area Employment and Training Consortium	Jackson, Mississippi
Central Arkansas Consortium	Little Rock, Arkansas
Central Savannah River Area Employment and Training Consortium	Augusta, Georgia
Champaign Consortium	Champaign, Illinois
City of Cincinnati	Cincinnati, Ohio
Clark County	Springfield, Ohio
Delaware County	Media, Pennsylvania
District of Columbia	Washington, D.C.
City of Erie	Erie, Pennsylvania
Essex County	East Orange, New Jersey
State of Kentucky	Frankfort, Kentucky
Louisville/Jefferson Consortium	Louisville, Kentucky
City of Memphis	Memphis, Tennessee
Mobile Consortium	Mobile, Alabama
City of New Orleans	New Orleans, Louisiana
City of New York	New York, New York
State of North Carolina	Raleigh, North Carolina
Omaha Combination of Governments	Omaha, Nebraska
City of Paterson	Paterson, New Jersey
City of Philadelphia	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Somerset County	Raritan, New Jersey
State of South Carolina	Columbia, South Carolina
Susquehanna Employment and Training Corporation	Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
State of Virginia	Harrisonburg, Virginia
Westchester County Consortium	White Plains, New York
Worcester Consortium	Worcester, Massachusetts

Department of Labor

National Office	Washington, D.C.
Regional Offices	New York, New York
	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
	Atlanta, Georgia
	Chicago, Illinois
	Dallas, Texas

CETA PRIME SPONSORS' COMMENTS REGARDING
PROVIDERS OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND
LOCAL OICS' PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

We interviewed the 30 prime sponsors that provided the most funds during fiscal year 1980 to the local OICs in our sample to obtain their comments on (1) providers and extent of local OICs' need for technical assistance and (2) effectiveness of locals' performance. The sample was drawn to permit projecting results to the 101 prime sponsors that provided funds to the universe of 101 local OICs included in our review.

The following presents the interview results by subject area discussed. The estimated range applicable to the projected number/percent is also shown for each subject area category with the exception of those which required calculations of averages. All percentages in this appendix are based on the estimated number of responses to particular subject areas.

<u>Subject area</u>	<u>Projection to universe</u>		<u>Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent level of confidence</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>		<u>Percent</u>	
Local OICs needed technical assistance to improve their operations						
Very great extent	24	25	11 to 37	12 to 38		
Great extent	13	13	3 to 23	3 to 23		
Moderate extent	27	28	14 to 40	15 to 41		
Some extent	13	13	3 to 23	3 to 23		
Little or no extent	20	21	8 to 32	9 to 33		
Did not respond	4	-	-	-		
Prime sponsor responsible for providing technical assistance						
Yes	71	88	57 to 85	71 to 100		
No	10	12	1 to 19	1 to 23		
Did not respond	20	-	-	-		
Actual providers of technical assistance (note a)						
Prime sponsor	57	43	42 to 72	32 to 54		
No provider	30	23	16 to 44	12 to 34		
OIC region	7	5	0 to 15	0 to 11		
Other	39	b/29	21 to 57	15 to 43		
Did not respond	-	-	-	-		
Best providers of technical assistance (note b)						
Prime sponsor	54	39	39 to 69	28 to 50		
Labor	7	5	0 to 15	0 to 11		
Board of Directors	10	7	1 to 19	0 to 14		
OIC/A	17	12	5 to 29	3 to 21		
Consultants	20	15	8 to 32	6 to 24		
Other	29	b/21	13 to 45	9 to 33		
Did not respond	-	-	-	-		
Prime sponsor issued directive/suggestions for improvement						
Yes	94	93	86 to 100	87 to 99		
No	7	7	0 to 15	0 to 15		
Did not respond	-	-	-	-		

<u>Subject area</u>	<u>Projection to universe</u>		<u>Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent level of confidence</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>		<u>Percent</u>	
Rating of local OICs on						
a. Administration						
Very good	30	30	16 to 44	16 to 44	16 to 44	16 to 44
Somewhat good	37	37	22 to 52	22 to 52	22 to 52	22 to 52
Neither good nor poor	17	17	6 to 28	6 to 28	6 to 28	6 to 28
Somewhat poor	10	10	1 to 19	1 to 19	1 to 19	1 to 19
Very poor	7	7	0 to 15	0 to 15	0 to 15	0 to 15
Did not respond	-	-	-	-	-	-
b. Program effectiveness						
Very good	24	24	11 to 37	11 to 37	11 to 37	11 to 37
Somewhat good	33	33	20 to 48	18 to 48	18 to 48	18 to 48
Neither good nor poor	24	24	11 to 37	11 to 37	11 to 37	11 to 37
Somewhat poor	17	17	6 to 28	6 to 28	6 to 28	6 to 28
Very poor	3	3	0 to 8	0 to 8	0 to 8	0 to 8
Did not respond	-	-	-	-	-	-
Satisfaction with local OIC performance given funds awarded						
Very satisfied	24	24	11 to 37	11 to 37	11 to 37	11 to 37
Somewhat satisfied	44	44	29 to 59	29 to 59	29 to 59	29 to 59
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	10	10	1 to 19	1 to 19	1 to 19	1 to 19
Somewhat dissatisfied	13	13	3 to 23	3 to 23	3 to 23	3 to 23
Very dissatisfied	10	10	1 to 19	1 to 19	1 to 19	1 to 19
Did not respond	-	-	-	-	-	-
Extent OIC/A technical assistance improved local OICs'						
a. Administration						
Very great extent	10	22	1 to 19	2 to 42	2 to 42	2 to 42
Great extent	3	7	0 to 8	0 to 18	0 to 18	0 to 18
Moderate extent	3	7	0 to 8	0 to 18	0 to 18	0 to 18
Some extent	10	22	1 to 19	2 to 42	2 to 42	2 to 42
Little or no extent	7	15	0 to 15	0 to 32	0 to 32	0 to 32
Do not know	13	28	3 to 23	6 to 50	6 to 50	6 to 50
Did not respond	55	-	-	-	-	-

<u>Subject area</u>	<u>Projection to universe</u>		<u>Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent level of confidence</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
b. Program effectiveness				
Very great extent	3	6	0 to 8	0 to 17
Great extent	7	15	0 to 15	0 to 32
Moderate extent	7	15	0 to 15	0 to 32
Some extent	3	6	0 to 8	0 to 17
Little or no extent	3	6	0 to 8	0 to 17
Do not know	24	51	11 to 37	23 to 79
Did not respond	54	-	-	-

a/Some respondents answered more than one category. Percent estimates reflect respondents who answered at least that category, but may have answered other categories also.

b/No more than 6 percent of the responses pertained to any one of the other technical assistance providers.

LOCAL OIC PROGRAM OFFICIALS' COMMENTSON THEIR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCENEEDS AND PROGRAMS

We interviewed program officials responsible for 30 local OIC programs to obtain information on their technical assistance needs and providers of the assistance and an overview of local OIC programs. The sample of local OICs was drawn to permit projecting the results to the universe of 101 local OIC programs included in our review.

The following presents the projected interview results by subject area discussed. The estimated range applicable to the projected number/percent is also shown for each subject area category with the exception of those which required calculations of averages. The average figures were calculated by dividing the estimated number of responses to a specific subject area category by the number of projected respondents in the universe for that subject area. All percentages in this appendix are based on the estimated number of responses to particular subject areas.

<u>Subject area</u>	<u>Projection to universe</u>		<u>Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent level of confidence</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Local OICs needed technical assistance during fiscal year 1981				
Yes	98	97	93 to 101	94 to 100
No	3	3	0 to 8	0 to 8
Methods used by local to request technical assistance from OIC/A during fiscal year 1981				
Telephone call	10 (average)		7 to 13 (average)	
In person	3 (average)		2 to 5 (average)	
Letter	1 (average)		.7 to 1 (average)	
Technical assistance order	.6 (average)		.2 to 1 (average)	
Other	.4 (average)		.1 to .8 (average)	
Major reasons cited for not submitting Technical Assistance Order (TAO) (note a)				
Did not know what a TAO was	32	51	19 to 45	30 to 72
Preferred to request by other means	25	40	12 to 38	19 to 61
Did not know needs at the time	6	9	0 to 13	0 to 20
Did not respond	38	-	-	-
Primary methods used by OIC/A to provide technical assistance during fiscal year 1981				
Telephone	18 (average)		8 to 27 (average)	
Onsite visit by OIC/A staff	5 (average)		3 to 7 (average)	
Letter	4 (average)		1 to 7 (average)	

APPENDIX IV

APPENDIX IV

<u>Subject area</u>	<u>Projection to universe</u>		<u>Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent level of confidence</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>		<u>Percent</u>	
Conferences, work-shop, etc.	3 (average)		2 to	5 (average)		
Other	.4 (average)		.01 to	.9 (average)		
Frequency of onsite assistance requested by local OICs during fiscal year 1981	4 (average)		3 to	5 (average)		
OIC/A's awareness of local OIC's technical assistance needs						
Very great extent	27	28	14 to	40	15 to	41
Great extent	47	48	32 to	62	33 to	63
Moderate extent	17	17	6 to	28	6 to	28
Some extent	7	7	0 to	15	0 to	15
Little or no extent	-	-	-	-	-	-
Did not respond	3	-	-	-	-	-
Frequency of need for technical assistance since local OIC established						
Increased	34	34	20 to	46	22 to	46
Remained about the same	13	13	3 to	23	3 to	23
Decreased	54	53	39 to	69	38 to	68
Technical assistance providers cited by local OICs (note a)						
OIC/A region	98	97	93 to	101	94 to	100
Prime sponsor	27	27	14 to	40	14 to	40
OIC/A national	30	30	16 to	44	16 to	44
Opportunities Academy of Management Training	30	30	16 to	44	16 to	44
Industry	7	7	0 to	15	0 to	15
Consultants	3	3	0 to	8	0 to	8
Universities	3	3	0 to	8	0 to	8
Other	13	13	3 to	23	3 to	23
Compliance with OIC/A suggestions						
All of the time	37	38	22 to	52	13 to	53
Most of the time	54	55	39 to	69	40 to	70

APPENDIX IV

APPENDIX IV

<u>Subject area</u>	<u>Projection to universe</u>		<u>Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent level of confidence</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
About half the time	-	-	-	-
Some of the time	7	7	0 to 15	0 to 15
Little or none of the time	-	-	-	-
Did not respond	3	-	-	-
Overall rating of technical assistance provided by OIC/A				
Very good	67	69	53 to 81	55 to 83
Somewhat good	27	28	14 to 40	15 to 41
Neither good nor poor	3	3	0 to 8	0 to 8
Somewhat poor	-	-	-	-
Very poor	-	-	-	-
Did not respond	3	-	-	-
Program elements operated by local OICs (note a)				
Recruiting	69	68	53 to 81	56 to 80
Intake	77	76	64 to 90	63 to 89
Feeder training (work habits, self-image, etc.)	88	87	78 to 98	77 to 97
Skills training	91	90	82 to 100	81 to 99
Job development	94	93	86 to 101	86 to 100
Followup	94	93	86 to 101	86 to 100
Demonstration projects	64	63	49 to 79	48 to 78
Economic development programs	24	24	11 to 37	11 to 37
Administrative processing/orientation	67	66	53 to 81	52 to 80
Assessment/counseling	74	73	61 to 87	60 to 86
Placement	91	90	82 to 100	81 to 99
Other (note b)	40	40	25 to 55	25 to 55
Skills training courses offered	4 (average)		3 to 5 (average)	
Major areas in which training was given by local OIC (note a)				
Clerical	94	93	86 to 101	86 to 100
Keypunch operator	81	80	69 to 93	68 to 92
Bookkeeping	30	30	16 to 44	16 to 44
Auto mechanics	13	13	3 to 23	3 to 23

APPENDIX IV

APPENDIX IV

<u>Subject area</u>	<u>Projection to universe</u>		<u>Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent level of confidence</u>			
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>		<u>Percent</u>	
Welding	13	13	3 to 23	3 to 23	3 to 23	3 to 23
Building maintenance	13	13	3 to 23	3 to 23	3 to 23	3 to 23
Graphic arts	13	13	3 to 23	3 to 23	3 to 23	3 to 23
Equipment operator	13	13	3 to 23	3 to 23	3 to 23	3 to 23
Other (note c)	37	37	22 to 52	22 to 52	22 to 52	22 to 52
Major reasons why OIC/A was deemed important to local OICs (note a)						
Needed general program direction	27	27	14 to 40	14 to 40	14 to 40	14 to 40
Needed OIC/A technical assistance	20	20	8 to 32	8 to 32	8 to 32	8 to 32
OIC/A influence/contacts	17	17	6 to 28	6 to 28	6 to 28	6 to 28
OIC/A policy/philosophy	17	17	6 to 28	6 to 28	6 to 28	6 to 28
OIC/A leadership	10	10	1 to 19	1 to 19	1 to 19	1 to 19
Prime sponsor would discontinue funding	10	10	1 to 19	1 to 19	1 to 19	1 to 19
Staff is inexperienced	10	10	1 to 19	1 to 19	1 to 19	1 to 19
Public relations	7	7	0 to 15	0 to 15	0 to 15	0 to 15
Other (note d)	37	37	22 to 52	22 to 52	22 to 52	22 to 52
Influence of OIC name in obtaining funds						
Helped	77	77	64 to 90	40 to 100	40 to 100	40 to 100
No effect	10	10	1 to 19	0 to 20	0 to 20	0 to 20
Hindered	3	3	0 to 8	0 to 9	0 to 9	0 to 9
Did not respond	10	-	-	-	-	-

a/In responding to this subject area, program officials were asked to cite as many conditions as applied to their particular situation.

b/No more than two OICs cited any one of the other program elements.

c/No more than three OICs cited any one of the other training areas.

d/No more than one OIC cited any one of the other reasons why OIC/A was considered important.

CHARACTERISTICS, EXPERIENCES, AND
EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF PARTICIPANTS WHO LEFT
LOCAL OIC PROGRAMS IN FISCAL YEAR 1980

We interviewed former local OIC participants to obtain (1) characteristic data, (2) type and extent of training and services received, and (3) employment status before and after leaving the local OIC program. Table 4.1 presents the projected participants' responses to questions administered to three categories of program participants. The three categories included (1) placements (found job when left OIC), (2) positive (completed a training program but not placed), and (3) nonpositive (not placed and/or training not completed). When responses among these categories of participants vary significantly, the responses are shown for each category--overall, placement, and positive/nonpositive. Table 4.2 presents the projected responses of the participants who indicated that they obtained a job (placement category) upon leaving a local OIC program.

The estimated range applicable to the projected number/percent is also shown for each subject area category with the exception of those which required calculations of averages. The average figures were calculated by dividing the estimated number of responses to a specific subject area category by the number of projected respondents in the universe for that subject area. All percentages in this appendix are based on the estimated number of responses to particular subject areas.

Table 4.1

<u>Subject area</u>	<u>Projection to universe</u>		<u>Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent level of confidence</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Age at enrollment	26 (average)			
Sex				
Female	28,681	76	26,012 to 31,350	69 to 83
Male	9,144	24	6,480 to 11,808	17 to 31
Did not respond	37	-	-	-
Highest grade completed at enrollment				
12th grade or higher				
Overall	24,366	65	21,933 to 26,799	59 to 72
Placements	12,442	80	11,315 to 13,569	73 to 87
Positive	4,376	50	2,693 to 6,059	31 to 69
Nonpositive	7,548	56	6,200 to 8,896	46 to 66
9th to 11th grade				
Overall	12,435	33	10,004 to 14,866	27 to 40
Placements	2,850	18	1,760 to 3,940	11 to 25
Positive	4,174	47	2,382 to 5,966	27 to 68
Nonpositive	5,411	40	4,183 to 6,639	31 to 49
8th grade or lower				
Overall	661	2	262 to 1,060	.7 to 3
Placements	256	2	1 to 511	.01 to 3
Positive	253	3	0 to 521	0 to 6
Nonpositive	152	1	3 to 301	.03 to 2
Did not respond	400	-	-	-
Worked before entering the OIC program				
Yes	27,974	74	25,625 to 30,323	68 to 80
No	9,888	26	7,550 to 12,226	20 to 32
Type of work performed before entering the OIC program				
Clerical	8,554	31	5,220 to 11,888	19 to 43
Keypunch operator	170	1	0 to 453	0 to 2
Retail cashier	2,816	10	1,098 to 4,534	4 to 16
Equipment operator	483	2	98 to 868	.4 to 3
Food service	2,338	8	1,276 to 3,400	5 to 12
Other	13,613	a/49	10,754 to 16,472	38 to 59

APPENDIX V

APPENDIX V

<u>Subject area</u>	<u>Projection to universe</u>		<u>Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent level of confidence</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Primary income sources when started at OIC (note b)				
Public assistance	14,069	37	11,715 to 16,423	31 to 44
Work	4,553	12	2,866 to 6,240	8 to 17
Unemployment compensation	1,074	3	420 to 1,728	1 to 5
No income	14,897	40	12,079 to 17,715	33 to 48
Other	2,435	7	1,511 to 3,359	4 to 9
Did not respond	834	-	-	-
Evidence indicating participant received counseling				
No evidence	8,483	22	5,368 to 11,598	14 to 31
Detailed notes	20,397	54	16,168 to 24,626	43 to 65
Miscellaneous notes	8,982	24	6,610 to 11,354	17 to 30
Reasons left the OIC program				
Trained and OIC placed	6,644	19	4,872 to 8,416	14 to 24
Not trained but OIC placed	3,162	9	1,866 to 4,458	5 to 13
Trained and self-placed	2,456	7	1,289 to 3,623	4 to 10
Not trained and self-placed	3,789	11	1,815 to 5,763	5 to 16
Completed program objectives	6,735	19	3,814 to 9,656	11 to 27
Refused to continue	1,995	6	652 to 3,338	2 to 9
Family care/health	3,372	10	2,101 to 4,643	6 to 13
Administrative separation	692	2	210 to 1,174	.6 to 3
Transfer to other				
CETA program	2,001	6	634 to 3,368	2 to 9
Entered school	1,165	3	175 to 2,155	.5 to 6
Other	3,478	10	1,104 to 5,852	3 to 16
Did not respond	2,373	-	-	-

<u>Subject area</u>	<u>Projection to universe</u>		<u>Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent level of confidence</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Major skill areas in which training was given				
Clerical	11,234	51	8,074 to 14,394	36 to 65
Keypunch operator	6,306	28	3,030 to 9,582	14 to 43
Retail cashier	1,319	6	0 to 4,344	0 to 20
Equipment operator	1,472	7	417 to 2,527	2 to 11
Food service	154	1	0 to 346	0 to 2
Other	1,752	c/8	612 to 2,892	3 to 13
Did not respond	15,625	-	-	-
Primary income sources when interviewed (note b)				
Work				
Overall	19,195	51	16,449 to 21,941	44 to 59
Placements	9,878	64	8,486 to 11,270	55 to 73
Positive and nonpositive	9,317	43	6,950 to 11,684	32 to 54
Public assistance				
Overall	8,647	23	6,284 to 11,010	17 to 29
Placements	2,007	13	1,102 to 2,912	7 to 19
Positive and nonpositive	6,641	31	4,458 to 8,824	20 to 41
Unemployment compensation				
Overall	1,257	3	445 to 2,069	1 to 6
Placements	1,092	7	297 to 1,887	2 to 12
Positive and nonpositive	165	1	2 to 328	.01 to 2
No income				
Overall	6,489	17	4,421 to 8,557	12 to 23
Placements	2,142	14	1,163 to 3,121	7 to 20
Positive and nonpositive	4,341	20	2,519 to 6,163	12 to 28
Other				
Overall	1,898	5	836 to 2,960	2 to 8
Placements	601	4	56 to 1,146	.4 to 7
Positive and nonpositive	1,296	6	385 to 2,207	2 to 10
Did not respond (note d)	376	-	-	-

<u>Subject area</u>	<u>Projection to universe</u>		<u>Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent level of confidence</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Number of months worked since left OIC	12 (average)		10.4 to 13.4 (average)	-
Weekly gross income when started at OIC	\$ 40 (average)		\$ 32 to \$ 48 (average)	-
Weekly gross income when interviewed				
Overall	\$118 (average)		\$102 to \$134 (average)	-
Placements	\$146 (average)		\$117 to \$175 (average)	-
Positive and nonpositive	e/\$ 97 (average)		\$ 80 to \$114 (average)	-

a/No more than 5 percent of the participants were employed in any one of the other skill areas.

b/In responding to this area, participants were asked to cite as many reasons/conditions as applied to their particular situation.

c/No more than 7 percent of the participants were trained in any other skill area.

d/Represents participants who did not respond to any income source category.

e/Figure represents income after participating in an OIC program even though the participant was not placed and/or did not complete training upon immediately leaving the program.

Table 4.2

Subject area	Projection to universe		Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent level of confidence	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Major areas in which job placement was obtained				
Clerical	7,855	44	5,189 to 10,521	29 to 59
Keypunch operator	3,690	21	1,485 to 5,895	8 to 33
Retail cashier	1,064	6	148 to 1,980	.8 to 11
Equipment operator	698	4	96 to 1,300	.5 to 7
Food service	512	3	52 to 972	.3 to 5
Other	3,986	b/22	2,152 to 5,820	12 to 33
Did not respond	a/20,057	-	-	-
Extent satisfied with OIC placement service				
Very satisfied	10,285	60	7,472 to 13,098	43 to 76
Somewhat satisfied	4,049	23	2,280 to 5,818	13 to 34
Neutral	942	5	346 to 1,538	2 to 9
Somewhat dissatisfied	1,432	8	676 to 2,188	4 to 13
Very dissatisfied	461	3	43 to 879	.3 to 5
No placement service	77	1	0 to 174	0 to 1
Did not respond	20,616	-	-	-
Major reasons cited for dissatisfaction with placement service (note c)				
Job not found by OIC	2,562	78	1,190 to 3,934	36 to 120
Limited job choices	210	6	0 to 533	0 to 16
Low pay of OIC-found job	195	6	0 to 428	0 to 13
Disliked employer	153	5	0 to 402	0 to 12
Pressured by OIC to take job	96	3	0 to 271	0 to 8
Job not in training related area	67	2	0 to 158	0 to 5
Who found the job				
OIC	9,836	55	8,376 to 11,296	47 to 63
Participant	5,466	31	3,802 to 7,130	21 to 40
Friend or relative	776	4	0 to 1,659	0 to 9
Other	1,734	10	0 to 3,677	0 to 21
Did not respond	20,050	-	-	-
Extent OIC skills training aided job performance				
Very great extent	4,632	26	1,980 to 7,284	11 to 41
Great extent	3,444	19	2,282 to 4,606	13 to 26

<u>Subject area</u>	<u>Projection to universe</u>		<u>Estimated range of adjusted universe at the 95-percent level of confidence</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Moderate extent	1,647	9	324 to 2,970	2 to 17
Some extent	359	2	0 to 731	0 to 4
Little or no extent	2,217	12	1,303 to 3,131	7 to 18
No training given	5,583	31	3,175 to 7,991	18 to 45
Did not respond	19,980	-	-	-
Extent job related to OIC training				
Highly related	7,019	39	5,281 to 8,757	30 to 49
Somewhat related	2,630	15	1,475 to 3,785	8 to 21
Not related	2,616	15	1,503 to 3,729	8 to 21
No training given	5,550	31	3,145 to 7,955	18 to 45
Did not respond	20,047	-	-	-

a/Number includes participants that were not placed as well as those that did not respond to the subject area.

b/No more than 3 percent of the participants were placed in any one of the other skill areas.

c/In responding to this area, participants were asked to cite as many reasons/conditions as applied to their particular situation.

24646

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

UNITED STATES
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE,\$300

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U S GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE



THIRD CLASS