JTPA Staffing and Staff Training At the State and SDA Levels

Research and Evaluation Report Series

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND AND STUDY OBJECTIVES

Over the past few years, the U.S. Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration has sponsored several studies that examined basic elements of the state and local system that delivers services under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), including its human infrastructure. One study examined in depth the quality of training delivered by JTPA programs. Another recent report investigated the elements that characterize successful Private Industry Councils (PICs) and provided recommendations on how to foster greater PIC effectiveness.

The study reported on here is concerned with JTPA staff at the state and local levels. Its particular focus is staff serving in the Title II-A program, which provides year-round employment and training services to economically disadvantaged adults and youth. However, at the state level, the study also encompasses any Title III (dislocated worker program) staff located within the JTPA unit, since in a number of state agencies personnel and budgetary practices make it difficult to distinguish clearly between the two sets of staff.

JTPA is a highly decentralized system, operated by a variety of organizations in more than 600 local Service Delivery Areas (SDAs). Up to this point little has been known about the educational background, experience, and skills of JTPA staff at the state and local levels. If staff training and technical assistance resources are to be invested productively, there is a need for clearer understanding about current staff capabilities, the efficacy of existing training offerings, and unmet training needs. Improving that understanding has been the underlying agenda of this study.

Identifying what staff should be capable of doing and the types of training that would be most beneficial requires an understanding of the

organizations in which the staff works. Although it has long been recognized that there is great variety among state and SDA organizations, the decentralization of the JTPA system has also meant a lack of information on the distribution of organizational characteristics -- including such aspects as size, salary structures, and extent of difficulty with recruitment and staff turnover. Thus, the design for this study was framed to answer these questions:

1. What is the range of staff structures currently in place to carry out JTPA functions at the state and SDA levels, and to what extent are there commonalities among these structures?

2. What are appropriate backgrounds for state and local staff providing administrative or direct client services under JTPA?

3. What are the backgrounds of the staff currently serving in the JTPA system at the state and local levels?

4. How have states and SDAs developed their staffs?

5. What steps can be taken to improve the training and staff development undertaken by the JTPA system?

STUDY METHODOLOGY

The research design for this study combined mail surveys of state JTPA organizations and a representative sample of SDAs with case studies of selected states, SDAs, and service providers. There were two sets of surveys. First, a director survey was distributed to all the states and a random sample of one-quarter of the nation's SDAs. Subsequently, staff survey questionnaires were distributed to all the JTPA staff in eight state JTPA units and a random 20% sample of the original 25% SDA sample (thus producing a 5% sample of SDAs).

These surveys provided the basis for the descriptive statistical profiles that this report presents on staff structures and the characteristics and backgrounds of current JTPA staff at the state and SDA (administrative entity) levels. In addition, they produced descriptive data concerning recruitment difficulties, promotions, staff turnover, current staff training practices, and staff training priorities as perceived by both agency directors and individual staff members.

Case studies in eight states and eight SDAs were designed to help interpret the descriptive profiles generated through the surveys. Structured interview guides probed the contexts and the management decision-making that have given rise to current staff configurations. Additionally, the interviews sought information that the relatively brief surveys would be ill-suited to produce, concerning recruitment and training practices and perceived effects of staff turnover. Another major function of the case studies was to investigate staffing and staff training among a limited number of contractual service providers. The case study sample was selected purposively to reflect the range of variation on such characteristics as size, unemployment rate, nature of SDA administrative entity, type of service provider organization, and type of services provided.

The overall study drew on other information sources, as well. A literature search and a number of key informant interviews both verified the absence of prior information on many of the topics reported on here and contributed to the specific design of survey instruments and samples. Both sources also supplemented the information gained through the surveys and case studies. In particular, interviews with national staff of several major organizations (Urban League, SER-Jobs for Progress, and others) that have large numbers of affiliates with staff providing JTPA services supplemented the case study information on service provider organizations.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Because our information is more complete on state and SDA administrative entity staff, and the organizations they work in, these findings are summarized separately from findings on contractual service provider organizations and their staff.

State and SDA Staff Structures

Funding Levels, Staff Size, Type of SDA Administrative Entity

From a review of the organization charts that accompanied somewhat more than half of the returned director surveys, we concluded that there was no legitimate way to categorize state and SDA staff structures into an analytically useful set of structural types. However, there are a number of individual dimensions of staff structure along which JTPA organizations can be compared and the relationship to such staffing issues as recruitment or turnover assessed. These include funding level, staff size, whether staff size has recently increased or decreased, and, at the SDA level, type of administrative entity.

State Level. Among the states participating in the director survey, mean funding for state-level administration in Program Year 1988 (PY 88) was over $1.8 million, while the median exceeded $1.2 million. Thirty-five percent of the organizations received less than $500,000, another 35% received between $500,000 and $2 million, and 30% received more than $2 million.

The mean number of state JTPA staff positions was 44, the median 38. On average, about three-quarters of the positions were located within the JTPA unit, and the rest elsewhere within the larger state agency that contained this unit. There was close correspondence between funding level and staff size. In states receiving less than $500,000, the mean number of staff was 15; in states receiving more than $2 million, the mean number of staff was 88.

States were divided fairly evenly in recent trends in staff size. Since July, 1987, 37% of the states reported that their staff size had increased, 32% that it had stayed about the same, and 32% that it had decreased.

SDA Level. PY 88 allocations for the SDAs participating in the director survey averaged $2.9 million; the median was $1.8 million. Fifteen percent of the SDAs received less than $1 million, 39% received $1 million to $1.9 million, 40% received between $2 million and $6.9 million, and 6% fell into the "giant" category of $7 million and above (up to $26 million). Sixty-two percent of the SDAs were administered by government agencies, 28% by incorporated PICs, and 10% by community-based organizations (CBOs) or other organizations, such as community colleges.

The average number of Title II-A staff in the administrative entity was 25 in PY 88, with a median of 23. Despite variability in the degree of contracting out of SDA funds, there was a close correspondence between staff size and allocation. SDAs with allocations under $1 million had a mean Title II-A staff size of 13, whereas those with allocations of at least $7 million averaged 59 positions.

Staff sizes were somewhat more likely to have remained the same among surveyed SDAs than at the state level. Twenty-six percent reported that staff positions had increased since July, 1987, 44% said staff size had remained about the same, and 30% said it had decreased.

Internal vs. External Allocation of JTPA Functions

At both the state and SDA levels, most functions were generally performed in-house or shared with outside staff or vendors. This pattern was especially prevalent at the state level. Here, the exceptions -- that is, the functions that tended to be performed exclusively outside the JTPA unit -- included legal support, auditing, and (with a bare majority) labor market research.

At the SDA level, program development and administrative functions were usually handled by internal staff. Outside staff or vendors were more often called upon for auditing, research and evaluation, legal support, staff training, and client services. Still, in half of the SDAs the majority of client-oriented functions were performed in-house, with the exception of classroom training. Only 22% of the SDAs indicated that the administrative entity or PIC staff did most of the classroom training.

The average percent of contracting out of Title II-A funds among SDAs was 56%, and the average number of outside service providers was 21. The percent of contracting out tended to vary by both type of administrative entity and staff size, with the smallest organizations contracting out the largest percentage of their allocation.

Salary and Benefit Structures

Benefits are relatively generous at both the state and local levels. Salaries are another matter, particularly at the SDA level. Seventy percent of SDA staff members participating in the staff surveys earned less than $25,000 annually, while only 8% were paid at least $35,000. Among participating state staff, the corresponding proportions were 27% and 41%, respectively. State/SDA salary differences persist even when the comparison is restricted to staff performing similar functions, such as directors, chief planners, fiscal managers, fiscal staff, and clerical staff.

Management Perceptions of Staffing Issues

Directors and managers tend to see staffing issues as less significant than such other management concerns as funding. Their top staffing concern is generally staff size, which is a function of funding. Findings on this point are not uniform, since a majority of SDA directors believed that they had enough staff to run their local program adequately. (Most state directors thought their staff too small in comparison with their organization's responsibilities. At both

vi

levels, the percentage judging staff size adequate rose as funding level increased.) However, a number of directors and managers at both levels in the case studies indicated that if given substantial additional funds, they would buy more staff, not staff training.

Among other staffing issues, the lack of advancement opportunities for qualified and experienced staff is widely acknowledged to be a problem. However, many managers and directors also seem to feel that they can rely on staff commitment to the employment and training field to overcome many disincentives. Recruitment is generally seen as a relatively minor problem, in part because so many organizations need to do so little of it; and staff turnover is generally seen as still less serious.

Additional findings are summarized below concerning the types of staff that directors would like to add, areas and sources of recruitment difficulties, and turnover experience and factors that promote staff turnover. Except where noted, these findings are drawn from survey data.

<u>Additional Staff Capacity Desired.</u> If they could add new staff, the overwhelming favorite among state directors would be policy and planning staff. The next tier includes monitors and MIS staff. PR/ marketing specialists, clerical staff, fiscal/accounting staff, and field liaisons were mentioned somewhat less frequently.

SDA directors showed a greater orientation toward client service staff. They mentioned counselors most frequently, and job developers/ placement specialists were also a common priority. However, other positions mentioned more frequently than placement staff paralleled several at the state level: planning, clerical, fiscal/accounting, and monitoring staff.

<u>Recruitment Difficulties.</u> At the state level, MIS, clerical, policy/planning, and fiscal/accounting staff was identified as the most difficult to recruit. SDA directors identified fiscal/accounting,

clerical, and planning staff as causing them the greatest difficulty in recruitment.

Among the top three factors that directors identified as creating recruitment problems, at both the state and local levels, two were inadequate salary and perceived lack of promotional opportunities. At the state level, the other reason was civil service hiring procedures, whereas at the SDA level it was perceived lack of job security.

Staff Turnover. Despite disadvantages of salary and promotional opportunities, overall staff tenure tends to be high at both the state and SDA levels, and turnover tends to be fairly low. Median turnover rates at both levels were 10% annually. One-third of the states and a quarter of the SDAs had staff turnover rates no higher than 5%. The surveys also found very low vacancy rates.

In the surveys, clerical staff was mentioned most frequently as having the highest turnover, but there was little unanimity on this point. Among case study SDAs, intake interviewers and counselors were mentioned most frequently as especially prone to turnover.

Both state and SDA directors identified salary and lack of promotional opportunities as the most important contributors to staff turnover. At the state level, the reason cited third most frequently was internal promotions (which vacated positions, and sometimes removed staff from the unit), whereas at the SDA level it was departure in search of greater job security. We found a strong relationship between turnover rates and a cut in staff size over the past few years. This suggests that much turnover is either a direct consequence of or a reaction to staff reductions.

Qualifications Recommended for State and SDA Staff

Qualifications Sought by Management

State directors and section managers consistently emphasized requiring people who were good communicators, good analysts, good with people, capable of working independently, and familiar with "program" -- meaning JTPA specifically and the employment and training field more generally. To obtain the requisite skills, these sources favored a Bachelor's degree, usually without reference to a specific major, combined with experience in the JTPA system.

For some of the more technical units, there were exceptions to this pattern. For MIS staff, managers emphasized computer programming skills; for fiscal staff, they preferred some accounting background; and some managers sought auditing experience in monitoring staff. But these more specific skill requirements did not necessarily translate into requirements of a more specialized formal education; and managers of such staff continued to emphasize reasonable working familiarity with JTPA.

For mid- and higher-level administrative positions within SDAs, similar to state-level preferences, managers emphasized analytic and communication skills and an ability to get along with people. They also strongly favored a Bachelor's degree. When it came to line staff, however, a number of respondents made the point that degrees were not as important as an appropriate attitude and approach to the participants.

Staff Perspectives on Appropriate Qualifications

The staff surveys asked respondents the skills and preparation most appropriate for their own position. At both the state and SDA levels, staff considered interpersonal skills and written and oral communication skills to be most important. Both levels also gave high rankings to computer skills, skills relating to the respondent's specific position, and organizational/time management skills. State staff gave relatively

greater emphasis to analytical skills, while SDA staff gave preference to such more locally relevant skills as counseling and teaching.

Over half of state staff and almost half of SDA staff recommended a Bachelor's degree for their own position. Generally, staff in the clerical, MIS/data processing, and fiscal areas was more likely to recommend high school, an Associate's degree, or business college/ secretarial training. State staff was more likely to recommend administration and accounting majors, while SDA staff tended to favor any of several human service majors or education.

With respect to experience, state staff generally recommended programmatic and public sector experience. SDA respondents also emphasized these areas, but gave relatively more emphasis to working with disadvantaged persons. In addition, a substantial percentage of SDA staff recommended experience in the private sector.

At both levels, staff with certain more specialized responsibilities placed comparatively greater emphasis on job-specific skills and experience than on more general analytic and interpersonal skills and program knowledge. At the state level, these categories included fiscal, data processing, MIS, and clerical staff. At the SDA level, these four groups were accompanied by another: client service staff.

Backgrounds of Staff Currently Serving in the JTPA System

Education and Professional Experience

Most JTPA staff in state agencies and SDA administrative entities has at least a Bachelor's degree. The majority is very close at the SDA level and only somewhat larger at the state level. However, the percentages are higher for staff in most professional and technical functions, especially for staff in these areas that also has supervisory responsibilities. Among supervisory staff in the professional and

technical areas, 90% of state staff and three-quarters of SDA staff has at least a Bachelor's degree.

Percentages with a four-year college degree are markedly lower for clerical and data entry staff, and tend also to be somewhat lower for fiscal staff. Overall, the survey data indicate a strong correspondence between the level of education respondents recommend for their current position and the level they actually have attained. There is also a strong similarity between the distributions of recommended and actual major field of postsecondary education.

Staff at both levels tend to have substantial experience both in their current position and within the employment and training field. A majority of both state and SDA staff respondents have been in their current position for at least three years. More than half of state staff, and 37% of SDA staff, has worked in the employment and training field for ten years or more.

Only a minority of the staff belongs to any professional associations. Thirty-one percent of state respondents and 25% of SDA respondents reported belonging to one or more professional associations. At the state level, the organization specified most frequently was the International Association of Personnel in Employment Security (IAPES), while SDA respondents most frequently specified their state or regional employment and training association.

Demographics

Most JTPA staff is white, most is at least 36 years old, and most is female. Three-quarters of state staff respondents and two-thirds of those at the SDA level reported themselves to be white. Similar proportions at each level were at least 36 years of age. Fifty-eight percent of state respondents and 70% of those at the SDA level were women. The clearest patterns of demographic differences across broad position categories are by gender. However, there is relatively

equal representation of the sexes in several professional and technical position groupings, especially at the state level.

Skills

Case study comments are our source of information on staff skills and overall qualifications, and these are generally highly positive. Managers did express some concern about written and oral communication skills and about the caliber of some clerical staff, expecially at the SDA level. Overall, however, directors and managers interviewed for the case studies said that much of their staff had qualifications and skills that exceeded those warranted by their titles, salaries, or promotional opportunities. They credited this profile and the tendency toward long tenure to staff's commitment to the employment and training field.

Staff Development Practices and Training Needs

Practices

There appears to be increasing interest in training for JTPA staff, judging by the growth of state training institutes that we encountered in the case study visits and have heard about in other states during the course of this study. In addition, two of the eight case study SDAs were taking steps to increase managerial planning and direction concerning the training their staff receives.

The staff surveys identified a considerable amount of training received by staff between July, 1987, and early 1990. During that period, staff respondents at both the state and SDA levels took an average of almost four training courses each. (The median number of courese was three, again at both the state and SDA levels.) Most of this training either covered JTPA regulations and procedures or was position-specific. Additional substantial percentages of the courses were in general management subjects or offered training in software packages. Staff survey participants rated 90% of their training courses as either very or somewhat useful for the performance of their job.

Despite these indications of training activity and interest, only a minority of state and SDA organizations regularly plan and budget for staff training, and the line items set aside for training in those organizations that have them tend to be tiny in relation to overall staff expenses. A case study respondent who had worked in both the private sector and the Federal government commented that in her experience, both the Federal government and many private sector organizations plan staff training more carefully and budget it more generously.

The main barriers to more deliberate and more widespread provision of staff training in state and local JTPA organizations are cost-related: insufficient administrative funds and excessive administrative costs. The difficulty of covering the responsibilities of absent staff is also considered a serious barrier. Other problems cited by both directors and staff include restrictions on out-of-state travel (more of a factor at the state level), inaccessible (which may translate as expensive) location, poor timing, and concerns over the quality of proposed training.

Training Priorities

The surveys have uncovered considerable consensus about overall training priorities for the state and SDA levels, as well as identified priorities specific to staff performing different types of functions. Without regard to specific rankings, state and SDA directors concur on three-quarters of the top twenty training topics for staff at each level.

As indicated in Table 1 (displayed at the end of this executive summary), state directors' top priorities for their staff include training in monitoring, liaison, and technical assistance; a number of program development/SJTCC support topics; several fiscal topics; practical applications of performance standards; and MIS development and maintenance. But their list also includes three more general management topics (supervisory skills, developing staff competencies, and time

management), and three topics concerned with analytic and evaluation skills.

Top priorities for SDA directors, displayed in Table 2, include two topics relating to expanding their funding base and another focused on increasing private sector involvement; YECs, performance standards, and EDWAA; meeting employers' needs and marketing services to them; and several topics relating to program development, including RFP development. Two topics are concerned with evaluation approaches, and a single topic is oriented to staff needs: stress management.

Staff, and especially state staff, lays relatively heavier emphasis on general skills like computer competency, stress management, and problem-solving strategies. The specific priorities for state staff (shown in Table 3) include, at the top of the list, computer competency. Three topics relate to stress and conflict management. Others include writing and oral presentation skills; several fiscal topics; problem-solving and time management; several JTPA-specific topics (performance standards, monitoring, successful technical assistance, EDWAA, and a general JTPA orientation); and three topics relating to analytical skills and evaluation methods.

Table 4 indicates that the top item for SDA staff is stress management, and dealing with other people's stress is also a priority. More than one-third of the list focuses on understanding, reaching, motivating, and helping participants, including one topic on working with hostile or resistant clients. Computer competency is the third-highest priority. Two topics are JTPA-oriented (performance standards and JTPA orientation), two are geared to the employer community (meeting their needs and marketing services to them), and two focus on learning about and building partnerships with other programs. Five more general topics close out the list: supervisory skills, problem-solving strategies, dealing with the public and effective community relations, and time management.

The staff lists can be expected to be somewhat different from those of their directors. Directors focused on the priorities they perceived for their organization as a whole. On the other hand, staff respondents were asked to indicate their own training priorities, so the composite staff lists reflect selections from the full spectrum of positions. In addition, there are differeces between the state and SDA staff levels that clearly reflect their different sets of responsibilities. With these factors in mind, it is especially impressive that state and SDA staff share a third of the twenty priorities, and that state directors and staff are in agreement on half of the top twenty priorities. SDA directors and staff tend to produce relatively distinct lists, with directors stressing overall program development and fiscal responsibilities while staff priorities are either more general or more client-oriented.

Findings Concerning Service Provider Staff

Staff Structures

In our case studies, the staff structures of contractual service providers, and especially the number of their JTPA staff, tended to be small. The norm was a director, one part-time or full-time clerical worker, and one or two program staffers. Most of the organizations had positions that were specifically designated as JTPA-related, and were known to their incumbents as such. However, several of the organizations spread their JTPA funding throughout the budget in such a way that no staff members identified themselves as "JTPA" staff.

In general, salaries among the nonprofit and for-profit organizations ranged from $18,000 to $28,000, with most staff in the area of $22,000. In the public institutions, staff salaries ranged from $22,000 to $35,000, with most salaries in the neighborhood of $25,000. Benefits were also more generous within the public agencies. Most of the organizations considered their salary and benefit structure competitive with similar organizations. They acknowledged that the availability of better salaries and benefits in other types of

organizations contributed to turnover, but most did not consider their own salary and benefit package to be a serious problem.

Staff Recruitment

Recruitment has not been a significant issue for most of the case study providers, because their staff is small and most have not experienced much turnover. Although specific recruitment practices vary, depending on the type of organization, a number of interview respondents mentioned that they make a point of recruiting amply qualified people. As they explained, this minimizes the need for staff training, which they are generally ill able to afford.

Staff Background and Tenure

The overall norm was at least a Bachelor's degree, along with a combination of experience and community familiarity. Counseling or psychology degrees were preferred for assessment and counseling staff, while private sector experience was sought for job developers. Staff in these organizations often had extensive credentials, and most of the staff had been with their organization for years.

Opportunities for Advancement

If this is a weak area at the state and SDA levels, it is even worse among service providers. Generally, advancement requires departure.

Staff Turnover

Most of the case study providers had experienced little turnover. On the other hand, representatives of several national organizations of service providers called staff turnover one of their major staffing issues. For example, one pegged turnover among local managers at around 20% annually. Generally, the staff that works most directly with clients appeared to have the highest turnover. Low salaries and

unstable funding were cited as contributing factors, along with paperwork and other "diversions" from what JTPA service staff sees as its proper functions.

Staff Training Practices

Only about half of the case study organizations had a separate budget item to cover staff training and related travel, and in most of these cases the item was no more than $3,000 annually for the entire staff. Often only the director or top management is able to participate in formal training or conferences, and often these organizations are unaware of training that may be publicized to their SDA.

Perceptions about Staffing Issues

None of the case study providers, nor any of the national service provider organizations with which we conducted interviews, considered staffing issues to be among their top management concerns. Funding, cash flow, and compliance ranked considerably higher.

Among the case study providers, the top staffing issue was declining overall JTPA staff size, an outcome of funding trends. The lack of internal opportunities for advancement was next on the list, but did not appear to be that serious a concern for most of these organizations. Among the national organizations, on the other hand, the greatest concern was expressed about staff turnover and low salaries, and the level of concern did appear to be significant.

Training Priorities

A number of organizations saw little need to provide more training to their staff. Several made the same point we heard in case study states and SDAs: if their budget were substantially expanded, they would buy more staff, not more training. The most commonly expressed need was for training or information-sharing that described innovative

and effective programs or procedures for dealing with the specific types of populations that a particular provider served.

Our surveys obtained a more comprehensive profile of the perspectives of state and SDA directors concerning service providers' primary training needs, which is displayed in Table 5. The overall similarity between the two lists is impressive, and the occasional substantial differences are generally attributable to the different experiences and working relationships that the two levels have with local contractors. At the state level, the top-ranked topics were motivating participants, assessment systems and techniques, JTPA fiscal regulations and reporting procedures, and effective outreach and recruitment. The top SDA priorities were motivating participants, effective outreach and recruitment, and orientation to JTPA and related programs.

This basic orientation to JTPA, along with training on addressing the performance standards effectively, was given relatively high support at both levels. Other topics finding common support included determining the employer community's training needs, marketing job training services to employers, and understanding the needs of specific client groups and developing service programs that meet these needs. (The groups specified most frequently were dropouts, at-risk youth, and welfare recipients.) The topics that found least support among directors at both levels were in the areas of general managerial and professional skills; MIS, computers, statistical analysis, and research and evaluation; and, to a somewhat lesser extent, policy and administration.

Training Impediments

Lack of training budgets and the press of work are serious barriers to training for service provider staff. Both make it difficult for these organizations to let staff go for extended training, or to leave the area for training. Another impediment is the perception among a number of their managers that their staff really does not require

training, or can get it without the assistance of the organization. Finally, many providers were unaware of much of the training available within or through their SDA, and most expressed no awareness of training provided through their state that was potentially available to service providers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Make Use of the "Top Twenty" Rankings of Training Priorities

DOL, national staff training providers, and state and SDA management should review the top twenty training priorities identified by state directors, SDA directors, state staff, and SDA staff. Management should take particular note of the fact that directors tend to emphasize JTPA-specific topics, whereas staff is more likely to give priority to general topics such as computer competency and written and oral communication. Directors may indeed be pinpointing overall organizational priorities. However, it may also be that improving staff competence in certain general skills (including analytic, communication, and organizational skills) would contribute substantially to overall organizational functioning.

Managers in specific units, or directors of organizations that are having either performance or turnover problems in specific areas, should also review the top-twenty lists developed for specific types of staff, such as fiscal, client service, or clerical staff. (These tables are contained in the full report).

Make More Training Available Locally and at Lower Costs

Cost considerations and coverage problems are the biggest obstacles to more widespread participation in training, although concerns about the quality of many available offerings are also a substantial factor. Both the surveys and the case studies indicate a significant need for more locally available, lower-cost training, and for training that does not remove a person from his or her job for too long a stretch. This

would help make more training available below the top managerial layers, and would increase access to training for service providers. It would also help increase participation by the lowest-funded organizations, for which cost considerations tend to be overwhelming.

We asked a number of organizations about their reaction to video-based training. Responses were not entirely enthusiastic, but the main concern appeared to be that video should not replace conferences, which for many SDAs provide an important opportunity for information-sharing. Some respondents suggested that as a supplement to conference-based training -- in effect, a tool to help conference attenders extend their training to staff that had not been able to attend (or to new staff) -- quality video training could be valuable.

Increase Management Direction over Sponsored Staff Training

Survey responses indicated that supervisors tend to initiate training for their staff (as opposed to staff asking approval for a particular course, which happens less frequently). But the surveys also revealed that there is little organization-wide planning of staff training.

Although we found some organizations that were moving to increase managerial direction of staff training, this still appears to be uncommon. Other managerial priorities and the lack of resources for training may make this difficult. Nevertheless, it would be beneficial to many organizations to manage their staff training more deliberately, especially since so much of their staff tends to have such long tenure.

Remain Open to Generalists and to Alternative Preparation Tracks

We have found little evidence through this study that argues for requiring a narrow range of educational backgrounds or experience in the effort to professionalize JTPA staff. Some types of positions do require specialized skills (for example, fiscal staff, staff that works heavily with computers, and many client service specialists). However,

managers who commented at greatest length on these positions generally emphasized leaving a variety of avenues open for obtaining the necessary qualifications even in these areas.

Assist States Interested in Hiring Experienced SDA Staff

It can benefit both a state and its SDAs for the state agency to include staff with substantial SDA experience. At present, however, state civil service procedures often inhibit hiring such staff into a mid- or high-level position. It may be worthwhile for DOL to help states prepare justifications for such hires, when opportunities occur.

Investigate Service Providers' Training Needs More Thoroughly

DOL should sponsor a more systematic investigation of the staff training needs of contractual JTPA service providers. Although our surveys indicate that SDA administrative entity staff provide much direct client service, the contractual providers are major partners in this process. The evidence in this study suggests that they are often unaware of and unable to participate in training that could help their staff do a better job of serving JTPA participants. However, it would be useful to undertake a more detailed assessment of the barriers they face, and of possible approaches to overcoming those barriers.

Table 1

Top 20[a] Training Priorities for State JTPA Staff:
State and SDA Directors' Rankings

	Rank	
Training Topic	State Directors	SDA Directors
Shared Priorities		
Effective monitoring of programs and contractors	1	13
Goal-setting at the state and local levels	2	2
Developing successful T.A. programs	3	1
JTPA fiscal regulations and reporting procedures	4	12
Effective SDA liaison and monitoring	5	3
Planning and program development	6	10
Performance standards: practical applications	7	7
Cost allocation under JTPA	9	8
Methods of program evaluation	11	15
Establishing/updating the MIS	13	5
Providing effective support for the SJTCC	14	4
Building partnerships with other agencies/programs	16	19
Target group policies	19	17
Effective use of non-78% JTPA funds	20	11
Additional State Director Priorities		
Auditing within the JTPA system	8	
Supervisory skills/motivating staff	10	
Analyzing and reporting statistical information	12	
Developing staff competencies	15	
Time management	17	
Developing the GCSSP[b]	18	
Evaluating proposals	21	
Additional SDA Director Priorities		
Establishing Youth Employment Competencies		6
Conducting post-program follow-up		9
Funding recapture policies		14
Developing and using labor market information		16
Stress management/preventing burnout		18
EDWAA		20

[a]21 for state directors due to tie.

[b]Also a top-20 choice of SDA directors for SDA staff.

Table 2

Top 20[a] Training Priorities for SDA Staff:
State and SDA Directors' Rankings

| | Rank | |
| | State | SDA |
Training Topic	Directors	Directors
Shared Priorities		
Securing diversified funding/effective grantsmanship	1	20
Establishing Youth Employment Competencies	2	7
Performance standards: practical applications	3	2
Determining training needs in the employer community	4	15
Methods of program evaluation	5	18
Planning and program development	6	8
JTPA fiscal regulations and reporting procedures	7	14
Cost allocation under JTPA	9	12
Negotiating successful contracts	10	22
Developing strategies to meet performance standards	12	4
Preparing effective RFPs	13	16
Developing performance-based contracts	14	5
Developing service programs to meet client needs	15	10
Effective monitoring of programs and contractors	16	1
Securing private sector involvement in JTPA	17	19
Marketing job training services to employers	19	23
Additional SDA Director Priorities		
Income-generating activities under JTPA	8	
Stress management/preventing burnout	11	
EDWAA	18	
Evaluating proposals[b]	20	
Additional State Director Priorities		
Goal-setting at the state and local levels		3
Providing effective support for the PIC		6
Building partnerships with other agencies/programs		9
Effective outreach and recruitment		11
Assessment systems and techniques		13
Auditing within the JTPA system		17
Effective budget management		21

[a]23 for state directors due to tie.

[b]Also a top-20 choice of state directors for state staff.

Table 3

Top 20 Training Priorities of State JTPA Staff

Training Topic	Shared with State Directors	SDA Staff
Computer competency		x
Stress management/preventing burnout		x
Writing		
Performance standards: practical applications	x	x
Cost allocation under JTPA	x	
Problem-solving strategies		x
Effective monitoring of programs and contractors	x	
JTPA fiscal regulations and reporting procedures	x	
Analytical skills and methods		
EDWAA		
Methods of program evaluation	x	
Dealing with other people's stress		x
Developing successful T.A. programs	x	
Auditing within the JTPA system	x	
Time management	x	x
Orientation to JTPA and related programs		x
Effective SDA liaison and monitoring	x	
Managing conflict		
Analyzing and reporting statistical information	x	
Oral presentation skills		

Table 4

<u>Top 20[a] Training Priorities of SDA Staff</u>

	Shared with	
Training Topic	SDA Directors	State Staff
Stress management/preventing burnout	X	X
Motivating participants		
Dealing with other people's stress		X
Computer competency		X
Performance standards: practical applications	X	X
Understanding the needs of dropouts/potential dropouts		
Working with hostile/resistant clients		
Determining training needs in the employer community	X	
Getting clients to believe in themselves		
Orientation to JTPA and related programs		X
Understanding the needs of welfare recipients/applicants		
Building partnerships with other agencies/programs		
Cross-training about related programs (K-12, AFDC, etc.)		
Developing service programs to meet client needs	X	
Effective outreach and recruitment		
Helping clients solve their own problems		
Supervisory skills/motivating staff		
Problem-solving strategies		X
Dealing with the public		
Time management		X
Marketing job training services to employers	X	
Effective public/community relations		

[a]22 due to tie.

Table 5
PERCEIVED TRAINING PRIORITIES FOR SERVICE PROVIDER STAFF

	PERSPECTIVE OF:	
	STATE DIRECTORS	SDA DIRECTORS
JTPA -- STRUCTURE AND PRINCIPLES		
Orientation to JTPA and related programs	26%*	36%*
EDWAA	21*	20*
Performance standards: practical applications	28*	29*
Other	3	0
POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION		
Providing effective support for the SJTCC	0	0
Providing effective support for the PIC	0	1
Goal-setting at the state and local levels	18	1
Planning and program development	18	18
Developing the GCSSP	3	1
Target group policies	15	12
Developing service programs to meet client needs	33*	30*
Establishing Youth Employment Competencies	18	26*
Developing strategies to meet performance standards	23*	24*
Effective use of non-78% JTPA funds	10	3
Funding recapture policies	3	0
Effective SDA liaison and monitoring	3	3
Developing successful T.A. programs	8	3
Evaluating proposals	5	5
Effective monitoring of programs and contractors	13	8
Cutback management	5	3
Other	0	0
FISCAL/CONTRACTS		
JTPA fiscal regulations and reporting procedures	44*	11
Securing diversified funding/effective grantsmanship	21*	9
Income-generating activities under JTPA	13	11
Preparing successful funding/program proposals	26*	21*
Preparing effective RFPs	8	9
Cost allocation under JTPA	28*	8
Effective budget management	26*	11
Negotiating successful contracts	15	8

	PERSPECTIVE OF:	
	STATE DIRECTORS	SDA DIRECTORS
Developing performance-based contracts for different programs/populations	10%	7%
Auditing within the JTPA system	21*	7
Other	0	0
MIS/COMPUTERS/STATISTICS/RESEARCH/EVALUATION		
Establishing/updating the MIS	10	1
Selecting computer hardware	3	1
Selecting software for program management	10	3
Selecting educational software	5	13
Developing and using labor market information	13	11
Conducting post-program follow-up	8	13
Analyzing and reporting statistical information	13	1
Methods of program evaluation	8	11
Other	0	1
PARTNERSHIPS/COMMUNITY RELATIONS		
Determining training needs in the employer community	23*	26*
Marketing job training services to employers	28*	24*
Marketing techniques (ads, video, phone, etc.)	13	20*
Effective liaison with elected officials	5	1
Effective public/community relations	8	12
Securing private sector involvement in JTPA	10	16
Building partnerships with other agencies/programs	21*	16
Cross-training about related programs (K-12, AFDC, etc.)	18	13
Other	0	0
CLIENT SERVICES		
Understanding/identifying the needs of:		
Displaced homemakers	13	9
Displaced workers	21*	17
Dropouts/potential dropouts	26*	33*
Ex-offenders	5	11
Handicapped persons	13	9

	PERSPECTIVE OF:	
	STATE DIRECTORS	SDA DIRECTORS
Homeless persons	23%*	18%
Minorities	18	12
Pregnant/parent teenagers	13	8
Refugees/immigrants	3	5
Rural workers/jobseekers	3	13
Youth	10	18
Welfare recipients/applicants	23*	32*
Effective outreach and recruitment	36*	38*
Eligibility verifications procedures	15	11
Interpreting (bilingual/ASL)	5	3
Motivating participants	46*	45*
Getting clients to believe in themselves	21*	22*
Working with hostile/resistant clients	18	16
Assessment systems and techniques	46*	25*
Functional and vocational testing	8	16
Vocational counseling - individual and group	15	9
Personal/life skills counseling	13	15
Helping clients set personal goals	18	22*
Helping clients solve their own problems	15	15
Crisis intervention	10	7
Determining supportive service needs	18	7
Developing EDPs	28*	17
Accessing client support services	21*	8
Developing/selecting vocational curricula	8	13
Developing/selecting basic/remedial skills programs	21*	20*
Effective teaching techniques	5	15
Competency-based instruction	15	21*
Computer-assisted instruction	15	12
Work maturity preparation	8	18
Dislocated worker program approaches	28*	12
Designing job clubs/job search workshops	0	3
Supervising individual job search	8	4
Helping clients manage their own job search	5	12
Preparing clients for job interviews	15	7
Job development techniques	21*	15

PERCEIVED TRAINING PRIORITIES FOR SERVICE PROVIDER STAFF (continued)

	PERSPECTIVE OF:	
	STATE DIRECTORS	SDA DIRECTORS
Developing OJT slots/contracts	23%*	13%
Effective use of work experience activities	10	5
Entrepreneurship development	15	9
Other	0	4
GENERAL MANAGERIAL AND PROFESSIONAL SKILLS		
Establishing personnel procedures	3	1
Developing staff competencies	10	11
Supervisory skills/motivating staff	15	11
Staff performance appraisals	0	1
Managing conflict	5	5
Analytical skills and methods	10	7
Problem-solving strategies	13	12
Writing	5	9
Computer competency	8	4
Oral presentation skills	8	4
Effective meetings/facilitation skills	3	5
Dealing with the public	0	8
Time management	3	8
Stress management/preventing burnout	10	18
Dealing with other people's stress	5	15
Other	3	0
	n=39	n=76

*Selected by 20% or more of responding directors.

I. INTRODUCTION

THE JTPA SYSTEM, THE "WORKFORCE 2000" CHALLENGE, AND JTPA STAFF

The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) program has been the subject of continual scrutiny since its implementation. While early studies often focused on implementation issues, later reviews and evaluations have been more concerned with the effects and policy appropriateness of characteristic design elements that distinguish JTPA from its predecessors, such as the performance standards governing programs operated under Title II-A of the Act.

Over the past few years, the U.S. Department of Labor's (DOL) Employment and Training Administration has sponsored several studies that examined basic elements of the JTPA system, including its human infrastructure. One examined in depth the quality of training delivered by JTPA programs (Kogan et al, 1989). Another recent report investigated the elements that characterize successful Private Industry Councils (PICs) and provided recommendations on how to foster greater PIC effectiveness (CSR, Inc., 1990). The study reported on here focuses on JTPA staff at the state and local levels.

JTPA is a highly decentralized system, operated by a variety of organizations in more than 600 local Service Delivery Areas (SDAs). Up to this point little has been known about the educational background, experience, and skills of JTPA staff at the state and local levels. If staff training and technical assistance resources are to be invested productively, there is a need for clearer understanding about current staff capabilities, the efficacy of existing training offerings, and unmet training needs. Improving that understanding has been the underlying agenda of this study.

Recent "Workforce 2000" projections (Johnston and Packer, 1987; National Alliance of Business, 1986) have added a note of urgency to this as well as related studies of the JTPA program. The Workforce 2000 scenario contrasts the increasingly exacting demands of the American

1

economy with disturbing developments in the American labor force, including the increasing prevalence of ill-prepared and "at risk" youth and adults.

These emerging trends pose a challenge to the personnel in the JTPA system. Those who plan and deliver client services must be aware of these trends, and able to adapt effectively to new types of clients, client needs, and employer requirements. JTPA's operating framework further requires that they be adept at drawing on, and even capable of modifying, resources elsewhere within the public and private sectors in order to equip today's JTPA participants to succeed within a fast-changing and demanding economy.

These requirements raise several questions concerning JTPA staff capacity. How well "equipped" are JTPA program personnel to play their assigned role in meeting the Workforce 2000 challenge? To what extent do organizational factors and managerial practices promote or impede the attraction and retention of state and local JTPA staffs who have suitable qualifications? To what extent can the functioning of existing staff be enhanced through targeted staff training? These are the central questions that led to this study.

PLACING JTPA STAFF IN THEIR ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

To answer these questions, it is necessary to understand the organizational framework within which JTPA staff works. The JTPA system is very complex, due in part to the great variety of functions that its operation requires and in part to its decentralization, which together produce great variety of staffing configurations. These points are addressed in turn below.

Functions Performed at the State and SDA Levels

Direct client services are provided at the local level, and are thus the province of the JTPA system's SDAs. Local programs are responsible for outreach and recruitment, intake and orientation,

eligibility determination, and enrollment. They conduct assessment, develop participant service plans, and assign or refer participants to specific service programs. They provide personal and vocational counseling, remedial education, training in appropriate workplace behavior, job search training, and occupational skills training. Beyond training, they are responsible for job development, placement, and follow-up. Though this list is long, it is also abbreviated: a number of the functions identified here -- such as occupational skills training -- can be further subdivided.

Moreover, in order to function effectively, these services must be complemented through a number of related policy-setting, administrative, and support functions. These include providing appropriate policy and logistical support to the PIC, program planning and design, and setting and managing performance goals. Fiscal support functions include contracting, contract monitoring, budgeting, and accounting. Information support includes developing and applying labor market information, maintaining the program's management information system (MIS) and reporting JASR data, and evaluating proposals and programs. Legal and clerical support and a full range of personnel functions are also necessary. Again, this list is abridged.

State-level functions involve no direct client services, but are no less critical if local programs are to serve clients successfully. State staff supports the State Job Training Coordinating Council (SJTCC) in a great number of policy and goal-setting functions. Some of these include developing policies concerning target client groups, setting performance standard policies and procedures for adjusting specific local performance standards to reflect varying local conditions, determining the uses and allocation of various special JTPA funds (such as the "three percent" funds dedicated to older worker services), and approving SDA plans.

State staff also establishes the state MIS, produces labor market information and research, and conducts or commissions program evaluations. It monitors and provides technical assistance to SDAs. It

3

establishes cooperative agreements with related state programs and agencies, and provides liaison with state elected officials and others. It performs a full range of fiscal functions. As at the local level, legal, clerical, and personnel support are also critical to the mix.

Whatever the specific number of functions identified at either level, the overall point is that in JTPA client services are part of a system, all of whose parts must be operating well to ensure delivery of quality, effective services. What client services staff can achieve is heavily influenced by those who provide labor market information and forecasts, those who set priorities among client groups, those who set priorities for occupational aims and preferred modes of service delivery, those who develop and monitor service contracts, those who establish coordination agreements with other agencies, and still others.

Variety of Staffing Configurations

With respect to organizational structure, the decentralization of JTPA administration produces three features relevant to this study. First, there is variety among the types of organizations responsible for state and local administration of JTPA. This is especially true at the SDA level where, in additional to local government agencies, other public agencies (e.g., community colleges), incorporated PICs, and other nonprofit organizations may serve as the Administrative Entity.

Second, states and SDAs vary in terms of how many, and specifically which, of the administrative agency's responsibilities are discharged directly by its staff, and how many performed by another source with less direct accountability to JTPA management. Again, this feature is especially pronounced at the SDA level, where there is great variability in the percentage of contracting out of client services.

Third, at both the state and local levels there is wide variety in specifically how the internalized functions are allocated: the structure of staff units, and the nature of the responsibilities assigned to each position. The size of a state's or SDA's allocation is

4

a major factor. Although programs with similar funding may differ considerably in how much they do in-house, a more heavily funded agency can literally afford more staff specialization. In lower-funded agencies, whose staff size is smaller than the number of functions they are called upon to perform, it is not surprising to find staff members who "wear several hats."

For example, an SDA's deputy director may also head the MIS, and possibly handle several additional responsibilities as well. While the lower level of activity in a less heavily funded SDA may justify such an arrangement, it may also be that this person, by virtue of education, training, and experience, is less well suited for one of these responsibilities, either the managerial or the technical role. This is one example of myriad situations in which well targeted training, formatted to accommodate an agency's budgetary and staff coverage constraints, might offer management an opportunity to enhance the performance of incumbent staff.

Lack of Information on Distribution of Organizational Characteristics

Though the great variability of staff sizes and structures has been widely recognized, the decentralization of JTPA administration produces yet another fact relevant to this report: until now, there has been no information on the distribution of such characteristics as staff size and the internal or external allocation of functions. Since these characteristics influence the kinds of skills, backgrounds, and training that staff in a given structure will need, it became necessary for this study to fill in the gap in information about the distribution of key organizational characteristics, and to relate the data it developed on JTPA staff to the different types of organizations in which the staff works.

The Impact of Staff Turnover

Analyzing staff capacity and setting staff training priorities requires more than a snapshot, however clear, of current organizational

profiles and current staff's skills, education, and experience. These
profiles must be complemented with information on staff turnover to
produce an accurate picture of staff capabilities and training needs.

Turnover can have a serious impact on staff functioning, and can
stem from a variety of sources. At the state level, for example, or in
any large civil service system, capable staff may be lured away to
another agency. The destination may not even offer a promotion, if the
other agency appears to be expanding or if its funding seems more
secure. This is especially applicable to staff in units like MIS, where
the skills may be less specific to employment and training; and it can
leave a hole that takes time to fill. Even an internal promotion can be
disruptive, if the person receiving it has accrued a wealth of useful
experience (and possibly training) that his or her replacement will have
to take time to accumulate.

In this context, the major issues concerning staff turnover include
the overall rate and how it varies among agencies, whether it is
concentrated in certain types of staff functions, its sources, its
impact on staff functioning, how management addresses it, and whether
there are training offerings or strategies that are particularly well
suited for minimizing its impact.

STUDY QUESTIONS

Thus, this project has evolved into a fairly comprehensive study of
who today's JTPA staffers are and the organizations that they work in.
To guide the study, we refined the three central questions posed earlier
into the following set of detailed study questions:

(1) What is the range of staff structures currently in
place to carry out JTPA functions at the state and SDA
levels, and to what extent are there commonalities
among these structures?

- What are the overall staff structures (number of staff, allocation of functions) at the state and SDA levels, including salary ranges and benefit levels? How do these differ by size of allocation, type of administrative entity, and extent of contracting out of services?

- How were these staff structures developed? Do they differ by such factors as extent of overlap with a prior CETA organization, the number of SDAs in a state or the number of jurisdictions in an SDA, or the existence of qualified service providers in an SDA?

- How much difficulty do state and local JTPA organizations experience with staff recruitment, what are the primary reasons for recruitment difficulties, and how do these vary by type of position and organizational factors?

- What is the extent of turnover among state and local JTPA staff, what are the primary reasons for staff turnover, and how do these vary by type of position and organization?

(2) What are the backgrounds of the staff currently serving in the JTPA system at the state and local levels?

- What are the educational background and experience of JTPA staff at the state and local levels?

- How do educational background and experience vary by type of position?

- How do educational background and experience vary by such organizational factors as size of state or SDA,

7

type of SDA administrative entity, or extent of contracting out of JTPA services?

(3) What are appropriate backgrounds for state and local staff providing administrative or direct client services under JTPA?

- What types of skills and backgrounds do JTPA managers seek for staff performing various functions at the state and local levels, and how does this vary by organizational characteristics?

- What types of skills and backgrounds do incumbent staff members recommend for staff who performs the same functions, and how does this vary by organizational characteristics?

- How do levels of education and experience within the JTPA system compare with those in other human service systems (e.g., vocational rehabilitation, social work, education)?

(4) How have states and SDAs developed their staffs?

- To what extent do states and SDAs routinely plan and budget for staff training and development, and how does this vary by organizational characteristics?

- What kinds of staff training and development have state and local JTPA staff received, how useful has the training been, and how does this vary by type of position and organizational factors?

- What are the major perceived training and development needs of current state and local JTPA staff, and how do these perceived needs vary by type

of position, current staff's background and
experience, and organizational factors?

● What are the impediments to participation in or
provision of staff training for state and local JTPA
staff, and how do they vary by type of position and
organizational factors?

(5) What steps can be taken to improve the training and
staff development undertaken by the JTPA system?

● What changes should be made at the Federal level?

● What changes should be made at the state level?

● What changes should be made at the local level?

For purposes of this study, we have concentrated on state and SDA
agency staff. The reasons for this focus at this time are resource
limitations and the fact that so little is known even about staff within
these organizations. This report does include some information on staff
issues and staff training needs among contractual service providers at
the local level, based largely on a set of on-site interviews conducted
in eight SDAs.

ORGANIZATION OF THIS REPORT

Chapters III through VIII address themselves to the study
questions, after Chapter II outlines the study methodology. Chapters
III through VI focus on state agency and SDA administrative entity
staff, while more limited information on service provider staff is
presented in Chapter VII.

Chapter III describes the organization of state and SDA-level JTPA
agencies, including size, distribution of functions, pay scales and
benefits provided, and other characteristics. It also discusses

recruitment, staff tenure, promotional opportunities, and staff turnover. It concludes with management perspectives on how high staffing issues rank among overall managerial concerns, and on which specific staffing issues are most significant.

Chapter IV outlines the skills and backgrounds recommended for major state and SDA staff functions, first from the management perspective and then from the perspective of staff currently performing those functions. Chapter V permits a comparison of these recommendations with the actual backgrounds of staff currently working in a number of state JTPA agencies and SDA administrative entities. It also compares these actual backgrounds with available information on the education and experience of staff working in other human service systems. It concludes with management perceptions of the relationship between staff qualifications and the performance of programs or individual units.

Chapter VI profiles current staff training practices at the state and SDA level, and describes the kinds of training received by JTPA staff and their perceptions of its quality. It then presents future training priorities for state and SDA staff as identified from a variety of perspectives -- individual staff members, state directors, and SDA directors. Identifying priority subjects is not sufficient, however, to ensure that training needs will be met. Consequently, the chapter concludes with a description of impediments to participation in staff training, again comparing the perspectives of staff directors and individual staff members.

Turning the focus to contractual service providers at the SDA level, Chapter VII offers an abbreviated discussion of the topics covered in Chapters III through VI.

Chapter VIII synthesizes the findings of Chapters III through VII, and offers recommendations for changes that can be made at the Federal, state, and SDA levels in order to enhance the qualifications and the performance of staff within the JTPA system.

Two general notes on format: first, since several chapters in this report have more pages of statistical tables than of text, we have moved each chapter's tables to the conclusion of its narrative. We believe that this is easier on the reader than trying to read a text in which each individual page of discussion is surrounded by several pages of tables. In addition, except where clarity requires otherwise, in the following pages we frequently use the term "SDA" as an abbreviation for "SDA administrative entity."

II. METHODOLOGY

OVERVIEW

The research design for this study combined mail surveys of all the states and a representative sample of SDAs with case studies of selected states, SDAs, and service providers.

The surveys provided the basis for the descriptive statistical profiles that this report presents on staff structures and the characteristics and backgrounds of current JTPA staff at the state and SDA (administrative entity) levels. In addition, they produced the descriptive data reported in subsequent chapters concerning recruitment difficulties and promotions, staff turnover, current staff training practices, and staff training priorities as perceived by both agency directors and individual staff members.

The case studies were designed to help interpret the descriptive profiles generated through the surveys. Structured interview guides probed the contexts and the management decision-making that have given rise to current staff configurations. Additionally, the interviews sought information that the relatively brief surveys would be ill suited to produce, concerning recruitment and training practices and perceived effects of staff turnover. Another major function of the case studies was to investigate staffing and staff training among a limited number of contractual service providers.

The study drew on other information sources, as well. A literature search and a number of key informant interviews both verified the absence of information on many of the topics reported on here and contributed to the specific design of survey instruments and samples. Both sources have also supplemented the information gained through the surveys and case studies.

In particular, interviews with national staff of several major organizations (Urban League, SER-Jobs for Progress, and others) that

13

have large numbers of affiliates with staff providing JTPA services supplement the case study information on service providers reported on in Chapter VII. In addition, we draw on published reports on staff and staff training needs in other human service systems -- specifically, vocational rehabilitation, social welfare, and education -- to provide a comparative perspective on the data produced through this study.

The remainder of this chapter provides more detail on the study design, starting with the surveys and proceeding to the case studies.

SURVEYS

Development of Survey Content

Initial steps in the development of the survey questionnaires included refinement of the study questions (outlined in Chapter I) and a search through available documentation and a series of expert interviews to determine whether information was already available to answer any of these questions. Among the many questions left unanswered, we then determined which were feasible to answer through surveys, and which more appropriately belonged in case study interviews. As we developed the nested sampling approach (described in the following section), a further split emerged between the types of questions that belonged on the director questionnaires and those that belonged on the staff questionnaires.

Simultaneously with this process, we obtained copies of staff training needs assessment surveys conducted by the Missouri Training Institute, the California Training Institute, and the Western Job Training Partnership Association. These questionnaires helped us refine survey questions on staff functions and on priority training topics.

We further modified the emerging draft questionnaires based on informal reviews by state and local JTPA officials with whom the study team was acquainted. Eventually, we arrived at the format that was formally pretested at the state and local level (by organizations within

the case study samples), modified the questionnaires one more time to incorporate pretest results and comments, and submitted the survey package to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for approval. OMB approved the questionnaires and the sampling plan in December 1989, requiring slight additional modifications.

The following discussion provides more information on the content of the questionnaires. Complete copies are contained in Appendix A.

Two-Stage Mail Surveys and "Nested Sampling" Approach

Employing a design aimed at reducing overall response burden, we conducted two-stage mail surveys at both the state and SDA levels.

The first-round survey, addressed to JTPA directors at the state and SDA levels, collected just over a dozen pages worth of agency-level data on staff size and structure, recruitment and hiring, turnover, training practices, and management views of priority staff training needs. There are slight differences between the state and SDA versions of this questionnaire, reflecting the different functions of the two levels. We refer to these questionnaires as the director survey.

The second round of the surveys -- which we refer to as the staff survey -- used individual staff members as its unit of analysis, asking about job functions, background, experience, training, and training needs. These questionnaires -- once again, there are slight differences between the state and SDA versions -- were only eight pages long, and took less than half an hour to complete. However, since they were to be distributed to every JTPA-funded member of the staff of participating agencies (excluding any staff funded primarily by Title II-B, the summer youth program), the cumulative burden on responding organizations would be substantial.

Therefore, we adopted a "nested sampling" strategy (adapting from Matkin, 1982) that selected only a subsample of the agencies participating in the director survey for further participation in the

15

staff survey. This procedure minimized the aggregate response burden across states and SDAs, while producing comprehensive coverage of staff within the subsample designated for participation in both rounds.

Each agency involved in this second round selected a staff liaison to coordinate with BPA on distribution and collection of the surveys, in order to enhance the response rate. BPA sent this staff member a packet of individual staff questionnaires. The number of questionnaires sent to a specific agency was determined by its director's responses concerning staff size on the director survey, which we thus had to receive before sending the staff survey packet.

In addition to the staff questionnaires, each of the packets contained enough code-numbered envelopes for each participating staff member to seal his or her completed form before returning it to the staff liaison. These envelopes were included in order to assure participants of the confidentiality of their responses. Approximately two weeks after circulating the questionnaires among staff, the liaison forwarded all returned questionnaires (in their sealed envelopes) to BPA in a prepaid return package.

Particulars of the sampling procedures for the surveys are discussed below, starting with the director survey.

Sampling Procedures for the Director Survey

We sent the director survey to the staff directors of all 52 state JTPA units (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) and all State Job Training Coordinating Councils (SJTCCs) with separate staff, and to a 25% random sample of SDA administrative entities.

The SDA sample was drawn from a list of all 622 SDAs existing in Program Year 1988 (PY 88) within the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. We stratified this list by 1988 Title II-A allocation, assuming allocation to be the best single predictor both of an SDA's number of participants and of the staff size and training

16

resources available to the administrative entity. We then drew a standard interval sample with random start, selecting every fourth case. The resulting sample numbered 155 SDAs.

This method ensured that the sample faithfully represented the distribution of all PY 88 SDAs by size, expressed in terms of dollar allocation. As shown in Table II-1, it also produced a sample that was close to the national profile along a number of other dimensions relevant to staffing. These included percentage change in allocation from PY 86 to PY 88 (a measure of expanding or contracting resources), type of administrative entity, percentage of staff who were former CETA employees, and population density (an urban/rural measure).

Sampling Procedures for the Staff Survey

Eight states were chosen for participation in the staff survey -- the same eight selected for case study site visits. The purposive sampling strategy through which these states were selected, and characteristics of the resulting state sample, are described further below, in the section of this chapter that focuses on the case studies.

The SDA sample for the staff survey was designed as a 20% interval sample of the SDAs chosen for the director survey. Like the director sample, it was stratified by allocation. Thus, it represented a 5% stratified random sample of all SDAs existing in PY 88 (20% of 25%), producing a subgroup of 31 SDAs.

We actually drew five mutually exclusive 5% samples from the 25% sample, starting with a different SDA in every case, then compared the five subsamples on two criteria in order to select the one used for the staff survey. The first criterion was their degree of representativeness, according to the summary indicators and a tally of their distribution across Federal regions. The second was the degree to which they included SDAs or states that we knew to have been case study sites in recent studies concerning JTPA; we gave preference to samples that minimized the number of such SDAs.

The final column in Table II-1 displays the characteristics of the 5% staff survey sample that resulted from these procedures. The table also permits a comparison of these characteristics with those of the PY 88 SDA universe and the 25% SDA director survey sample. The staff survey sample included relatively more SDAs with PIC administrative entities than either the universe or the director survey sample, but otherwise the correspondence was quite close.

Response Rates and Representativeness of Survey Data

The surveys were conducted during the first three months of 1990. Director surveys were sent out at the beginning of January. As surveys were returned from organizations designated for participation in the staff survey, packets were put together and mailed to those organizations, starting at the end of January and running through early March.

Forty-five of the 57 state JTPA directors and separate SJTCC staff directors returned the director survey, for a response rate of 79%. Among the 155 SDAs selected for this first round, 82 returned the survey, for a response rate of 53%. Summary characteristics of the resulting state and SDA respondent samples for the director survey are displayed in Tables II-2 and II-3, respectively. In terms of the characteristics summarized in these tables, the correspondence of the two director samples to their respective universes is very satisfactory.

On the staff survey, all the eight designated states returned packets of completed staff questionnaires. Overall, 71% of the individual staff questionnaires distributed to these states were returned in time for data processing. (We also received a handful of questionnaires that were marked as vacancies and not completed.) Within individual state agencies, the response rate ranged from a low of 47% to 91%. It should be emphasized that because the eight states were chosen through purposive sampling (as described in the section on case study sample selection), readers should use caution in drawing inferences about JTPA staff among the universe of state agencies.

Among SDAs designated for the staff survey, we had to make a number of substitutions due to nonresponse on the director survey (even after repeated follow-up efforts). Where this was necessary, our procedure was to replace each nonresponding SDA with an adjacent SDA on the stratified director survey sampling list that had returned its director survey, alternating between next-highest and next-lowest replacements.

Table II-4 compares the characteristics of the resulting sample with those of all SDAs and the original SDA staff survey sample. As the table indicates, the final sample is actually closer to the universe than the initial staff survey sample on every indicator except mean PY 88 allocation. The number of SDAs included in the ultimate sample is 30, one less than intended, because one SDA's return packet was lost en route and could not be traced. Overall among the 30 SDAs, the staff response rate was 88%. (Again, an additional handful of blank forms marked "Vacancy" was also returned.) The lowest response rate within an individual agency was 60%, but in half of the SDAs all the designated staff returned completed forms.

In addition to comparing the characteristics of the states and SDAs that participating in the surveys with their respective universes, we reviewed available organization charts for staff survey states and SDAs to check whether the returned staff questionnaires systematically missed any categories of positions or units. Although the director survey had requested a copy of the organization chart to be returned with the completed questionnaire, only about half of the responding states and SDAs provided such a chart. However, we repeated the request for the organization chart, where necessary, when conducting the staff survey. As a result, we have these charts for all the state agencies and most of the SDAs represented in the staff survey; and this enabled us to verify that there is no systematic pattern to the missing staff questionnaires, in terms of either positions or units.

CASE STUDIES

Case Study Respondents and Interview Topics

At the state level, case study interview respondents included the head of the JTPA unit within the state agency, managers of each of the major subunits within the JTPA unit, and the staff director (if there was one) or chair of the SJTCC. For the pretest, we also interviewed several state staff members, who took a trial run on the staff questionnaires. After this point, however, we reached staff only through the questionnaires, which permitted more comprehensive coverage of agency staff and a greater sense of confidentiality for participating staff.

We used structured topic guides with all interview respondents. These topic guides promote comparability of information gathered across interviews. At the same time, they permit flexibility in the sequence of the discussion and in probing for information or opinions that may be more relevant in one organization than in another.

State JTPA directors were asked about the nature of their staff structure and how it had evolved since the implementation of JTPA, the degree of staff specialization, recruitment channels and procedures, the competitiveness of the organization's salary and benefit package, the qualifications required of state staff and their assessment of the caliber of their current staff, staff retention and turnover, agency practices concerning staff training and professional development, the needs they perceived for future staff training at both the state and SDA levels, and their perceptions of the most important staffing issues and how these affected their organization. As in all the interviews, the focus was on how existing structures and practices had come about, and on such specific issues as the degree of control that the person to whom a position reported had over hiring when that position was vacant.

Unit managers were asked similar questions, but the discussion was focused on their particular unit. The SJTCC representative was asked

20

similar questions concerning any separate SJTCC staff, and was also asked to give the SJTCC perspective on staffing issues, staff qualifications, and training needs within the state JTPA unit.

At the SDA level, we spoke with the director of the administrative entity, the managers of its major units, and a PIC representative. Questions were generally similar to those at the state level. Additionally, SDA respondents were asked to offer the perceptions from their vantage point of the training needs of both state staff and the staff of contractual service providers.

In service provider organizations, we spoke with either the staff director or a high-level manager of JTPA staff. The questions for these respondents included the "fit" of JTPA activities within their overall organization, the degree of accommodation of the organization's staff structure to the needs and objectives of the JTPA program, recruitment and hiring practices, the salaries and benefits of JTPA staff and their perceived competitiveness, the qualifications sought among JTPA staff and those of current incumbents, tenure and turnover among JTPA staff, staff training and professional development practices, and unmet training needs among the organization's JTPA staff. We also asked for perspectives on the training needs of state and SDA staff.

Selection Criteria for the Case Study Samples

Instead of the random selection procedures used to draw the mail survey samples, for the case studies of states, SDAs, and service providers we selected samples purposively, as outlined below.

States

We applied several selection criteria to the choice of case study states. The first was size, in terms of PY 88 Title II-A allocation, an approximate indicator of caseload volume. We also sought a mix in number of SDAs per state, in the expectation that this number would

affect the size of a state's field operations staff and, to some extent, the overall complexity of the state agency's staff structure.

The third criterion was the statewide unemployment rate. Although unemployment rates affect II-A allocations, absolute size of allocation (our first criterion) is not a satisfactory indicator of the state unemployment rate. Unemployment rates bear a relationship to the types of clients served, and can affect the types of specific services offered; both of these effects might in turn have implications for the qualifications required of JTPA sought (although the relationships would probably be stronger at the SDA level). Consequently, we were interested in obtaining a mix along this dimension.

The fourth and fifth criteria were state wage rates and state government salary structures, in anticipation that the relative competitiveness of a state agency's salary structure might affect its ability to attract and retain qualified staff. Finally, we sought to maximize geographic coverage, within the constraints of a sample of eight. Although it was not a rigid criterion, we also tried to avoid selecting states that BPA/Macro or other JTPA researchers had recently studied in depth.

The resulting sample of case study states is displayed in Table II-5. Table II-6 compares the distribution of these states along the dimensions of the selection criteria with the distribution for all states.

SDAs

The case study SDAs were to be located within the case study states -- one SDA per state. Beyond this criterion, we considered several factors in selecting SDAs for the case study sample. These included size (allocation), nature of SDA organization, local unemployment rate, population concentration (urban/suburban/rural), and performance (on four adult standards, using data available at the time of sample

selection). The resulting sample and its spread across these indicators are displayed in Table II-7.

Some of this information was not readily available during the early phases of the study. This was true for the nature of the SDA organization, and to a lesser extent for the description of population concentration. This information was obtained with the assistance of the associated states, as the study team made initial preparations for site visits. Another indicator that we had hoped to apply in choosing case study SDAs -- degree of contracting out of SDA services -- proved still more elusive, and impractical as an a priori selection criterion. We did manage to obtain a mix along this dimension as well, however -- somewhat to the disadvantage of our sample of service providers, as explained below.

Service Providers

The study design called for an average of three JTPA contractors to be interviewed per case study SDA, resulting in a total of 24 case study contractors. There were four selection criteria to apply in choosing these organizations.

The first criterion was type of organization: the sample was to provide variety among public educational institutions, community-based organizations (CBOs), other nonprofit organizations, and proprietary organizations. The second was type of service. An effort was made to visit organizations offering a varying mix of services, such as intake and assessment, basic education, classroom occupational skills training, or supportive services.

The other two criteria concerned funding. We sought a mix of contract size. There were two reasons for not confining these case studies to organizations receiving the largest contracts in an SDA. First, we judged that on a nationwide basis smaller contracts are likely to be a significant source of service to JTPA participants, so it was important to reflect such organizations in this study. Secondly, the

staff in organizations receiving smaller JTPA contracts might not be in as favorable position as staff in larger organizations in terms of access to staff training.

But the percentage of an organization's total budget derived from JTPA was also important. Some service providers, such as community colleges, may serve sizable numbers of JTPA participants every year yet receive only a small percentage of their total funding from the JTPA program. Such organizations might turn out to be less likely to have staff qualified to meet the specific needs of JTPA and its participants, or less amenable to making JTPA-specific training available to their staff. Thus, it was desirable to include a mix in terms of financial dependence on JTPA.

As we had intended, some of the case study SDAs did no contracting out and some did very little. Unfortunately, however, among the other SDAs in our case study sample various logistical difficulties prevented scheduling visits to the planned number of contracting organizations. Consequently, we were able to complete site visits with only one dozen contractors. The resulting sample is described in Chapter VII, which focuses on staffing issues and staff training needs among the JTPA system's contractual service providers. To help compensate for the reduced size of the provider sample, we interviewed representatives of several nationwide networks of organizations that contract with SDAs to provide JTPA services. Information from these interviews is merged into the discussion within Chapter VII.

Table II-1

Comparison of Characteristics:
SDA Universe and the Two SDA Mail Survey Samples

Indicator	All SDAs (n = 622)	Director Survey Sample SDAs (n = 155)	Staff Survey Sample SDAs (n = 31)
PY 88 II-A allocation ($ thousand)			
Mean	$2,264	$2,175	$2,305
Median	1,486	1,486	1,513
% change in allocation, PY 86 to PY88[a]			
Mean	4%	10%	19%[a]
Median	-5%	-1%	6%[a]
Administrative entity			
PIC[b]	19%	20%	30%
Government[b]	49%	44%	37%
CBO[b]	15%	17%	15%
Other[b]	17%	19%	19%
% former CETA staff[c]			
Mean[b]	2.36	2.35	2.19
Median[b]	2.00	2.00	2.00
Population density			
Mean	0.76	0.90	1.03
Median	0.12	0.06	0.21
Number of states/territories represented	52	40	20

Data Sources: For allocations, the Partnership for Training and Employment Careers. For type of administrative entity and percent of former CETA staff, 1987 mail survey concerning Title II-A performance standards conducted by SRI International and BPA for the National Commission for Employment Policy. For population density, 1980 Census data.

[a]Not weighted by size of allocation. Removal of a single fast-growing but smaller SDA reduces the second-round sample's mean to 10% and its median to 2%.

[b]Adjusted for missing data produced by nonresponses on the 1987 SRI/BPA survey concerning Title II-A performance standards plus the creation of new SDAs after that survey.

[c]Coded in quartiles: 4 stands for at least 75%, 3 for 50-74%, etc.

Table II-2
Comparison of Characteristics: All States[a]
And the States Responding to Director Survey

	Number of States[a] in Category	Number of States Responding to Director Survey[b]
PY 88 Title II-A allocation		
Over $50 million	10	8
$15-50 million	24	16
Less than $15 million	18	16
Number of SDAs in PY 88		
20 or more	10	7
10-19	17	14
1-9	25	19
Unemployment rate[c]		
8.0% and over	4	3
6.0% - 7.9%	12	7
4.0% - 5.9%	19	17
Less than 4.0%	16	13
Federal Region		
I	6	5
II	3	3
III	6	6
IV	8	4
V	6	5
VI	5	3
VII	4	2
VIII	6	6
IX	4	4
X	4	2

[a]Includes 50 states, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico for allocation, number of SDAs, and Federal region; 50 states plus D.C. for unemployment rate.

[b]Omitting separate SJTCC respondents, so as not to double-count states.

[c]As reported by State Employment Security Agencies for May 1988 (Employment and Training Reporter, July 27, 1988).

Table II-3

Comparison of Characteristics: SDA Universe, SDA Director Survey Sample, and SDAs Responding to Director Survey

Indicator	All SDAs (n = 622)	Director Survey Sample SDAs (n = 155)	Responding SDAs (n = 82)
PY 88 II-A allocation ($ thousand)			
Mean	$2,264	$2,175	$2,557
Median	1,486	1,486	1,652
% change in allocation, PY 86 to PY 88			
Mean	4%	10%	10%
Median	-5%	-1%	0%
Administrative entity			
PIC[a]	19%	20%	19%
Government[a]	49%	44%	46%
CBO[a]	15%	17%	18%
Other[a]	17%	19%	17%
% former CETA staff[b]			
Mean[a]	2.36	2.35	2.56
Median[a]	2.00	2.00	3.00
Population density			
Mean	0.76	0.90	0.89
Median	0.12	0.06	0.19
Number of states/territories represented	52	40	31

Data Sources: For allocations, the Partnership for Training and Employment Careers. For type of administrative entity and percent of former CETA staff, 1987 mail survey concerning Title II-A performance standards conducted by SRI International and BPA for the National Commission for Employment Policy. For population density, 1980 Census data.

[a]Adjusted for missing data produced by nonresponses on the 1987 SRI/BPA survey concerning Title II-A performance standards plus the creation of new SDAs after that survey.

[b]Coded in quartiles: 4 stands for at least 75%, 3 for 50-74%, etc.

Table II-4

Comparison of Characteristics:
SDA Universe, Initial SDA Survey Sample,
And SDAs from Which Staff Survey Packets Were Received

Indicator	All SDAs (n = 622)	Initial Sample of Staff Survey SDAs (n = 31)	Modified Sample of Staff Survey SDAs (n = 30)
PY 88 II-A allocation ($ thousand)			
Mean	$2,264	$2,305	$1,686
Median	1,486	1,513	1,476
% change in allocation, PY 86 to PY88[a]			
Mean	4%	19%[a]	6%
Median	-5%	6%[a]	3%
Administrative entity			
PIC[b]	19%	30%	19%
Government[b]	49%	37%	46%
CBO[b]	15%	15%	15%
Other[b]	17%	19%	19%
% former CETA staff[c]			
Mean[b]	2.36	2.19	2.42
Median[b]	2.00	2.00	2.00
Population density			
Mean	0.76	1.03	0.70
Median	0.12	0.21	0.11
Number of states/territories represented	52	20	22

Data Sources: For allocations, the Partnership for Training and Employment Careers. For type of administrative entity and percent of former CETA staff, 1987 mail survey concerning Title II-A performance standards conducted by SRI International and BPA for the National Commission for Employment Policy. For population density, 1980 Census data.

[a]Not weighted by size of allocation. Removal of a single fast-growing but smaller SDA reduces the second-round sample's mean to 10% and its median to 2%.

[b]Adjusted for missing data produced by nonresponses on the 1987 SRI/BPA survey concerning Title II-A performance standards plus the creation of new SDAs after that survey.

[c]Coded in quartiles: 4 stands for at least 75%, 3 for 50-74%, etc.

Table II-5
Selected Characteristics of the Case Study States

State	PY 88 Title II-A Allocation ($ Million)	No. of SDAs	Unem- ployment Rate	Average Pay for Covered Workers[a]	State/Local Government Average Pay[b]	Federal Region
California	$181	51	5.8%	$19,873	$26,952	IX
Colorado	29	10	6.4	18,774	21,048	VIII
Kansas	10	5	4.0	16,665	18,336	VII
Louisiana	66	17	10.5	17,769	16,656	VI
Maine	6	3	2.1	16,163	17,544	I
Michigan	82	26	6.5	20,940	24,756	V
New Jersey	33	17	3.8	19,889	22,284	II
Virginia	28	14	3.6	17,271	19,044	III

[a]1984 average annual pay by state for workers covered by state unemployment laws and Federal civilian workers covered by unemployment for Federal employees. USDOL News Release 85-320, Average Annual Pay by State and Industry, 1984.

[b]State and local government full-time equivalent average earnings by state for October 1984 (annualized). U.S. Bureau of the Census, Public Employment, Series GE, No. 1.

Table II-6
Comparison of Characteristics: All States[a]
and the Case Study States

	Number of States[a] in Category	Number of States Selected
PY 88 Title II-A allocation		
Over $50 million	10	3
$15-50 million	24	3
Less than $15 million	18	2
Number of SDAs in PY 88		
20 or more	9	2
10-19	17	4
1-9	24	2
Unemployment rate[b]		
8.0% and over	4	1
6.0% - 7.9%	12	2
4.0% - 5.9%	19	2
Less than 4.0%	16	3
Average pay for covered workers[c]		
.$18,350 and over	13	4
Less than $18,350	36	4
State/local government average pay[d]		
$21,108 and over	18	3
Less than $21,108	31	5
Federal Region	[10 Regions]	[8 Regions represented]

[a]Except as otherwise noted, includes 50 states, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

[b]Includes 50 states plus District of Columbia. Data reported by State Employment Security Agencies for May 1988 (*Employment and Training Reporter*, July 27, 1988).

[c]Includes 49 jurisdictions within the continental U.S. 1984 average annual pay by state for workers covered by state unemployment insurance laws and federal civilian workers covered by unemployment compensation for federal employees. U.S. average equals $18,350. USDOL News Release 85-320, Average Annual Pay by State and Industry, 1984.

[d]Includes 49 jurisdictions within the continental U.S. State and local government full-time equivalent average earnings by state for October 1984 (annualized). U.S. average equals $21,108. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Public Employment, series GE, No. 1.

Table II-7
Selected Characteristics of the Case Study SDAs

State	SDA Title (and Service Area)	PY 88 Title II-A Allocation	Nature of SDA Organization	Population Concentration	Substate Area Unemployment Rate (June 1988)	PY 86 Performance
CA	City of Oakland	$2,919,329	Single jurisdiction; city agency administrative entity (AE) plus a separate PIC staff	Urban/large metro-politan area	4.9%	3 of 4
CO	Jefferson County Consortium (Lakewood and 3-county area	$1,753,140	Consortium; county agency AE	Small urban area and rural mix	6.2%	4 of 4
KS	SDA II (Topeka and 17-county area)	$1,537,805	Consortium; PIC is AE	Small urban areas and rural mix	4.0%	3 of 4
LA	East Baton Rouge Parish (Baton Rouge city and suburbs)	$3,258,329	Single jurisdiction; public agency AE	Urban/suburban	9.2%	3 of 4
ME	Cumberland County (Portland area)	$259,280	Single jurisdiction; nonprofit AE	Mostly rural around small city	2.1%	4 of 4
MI	Genessee and Shiawassee Counties (Flint area)	$4,579,903	Consortium; incorporated PIC is AE	Urban/suburban	14.6%	1 of 4
NJ	Union County (Elizabeth)	$1,707,657	Single jurisdiction; county agency AE	Urban/large metro-politan area	3.8%	4 of 4
VA	South Central PIC (Petersburg and 15-county area)	$2,259,999	15-county consortium; PIC is AE	Mostly rural	3.3%	2 of 4

III. JTPA STAFF STRUCTURES AT THE STATE AND SDA LEVELS

INTRODUCTION

We began this study with the hope of being able to decipher a reasonably small set of structural types among state and local JTPA organizations -- common patterns in terms of how the varying staff functions were organized into units. We then intended to examine how such variables as staff size, staff backgrounds, training priorities, and turnover rates varied among these structural types.

However, we have been disabused of this notion by the survey results, and particularly by the organization charts that, at our request, accompanied a number of the completed surveys. We received 30 state charts and 43 from SDAs, fewer than expected. But in a sense they were plenty: more than sufficient to let us know that we would not be able to derive four, or eight, or even fourteen coherent categories of structural types.

To illustrate the tremendous variability among organizational structures, we tallied the location of several support functions common to both the state and SDA levels. For example, in four of the state charts, MIS was a separate major unit, in four it came under administration, in four under fiscal or finance, in three under planning, in one under data processing, and in one under performance analysis. In two it was attached to the director's office. We were unable to locate the responsible staff or unit in eleven of the state charts, and ran into the same problem on nine of the SDA charts.

Among the other SDA charts, five located MIS under planning, four apiece under administration or fiscal/finance, and three under operations. In another three MIS was itself a major unit, and in nine it was attached to the director's office. In the remaining SDA charts, MIS was located either outside the JTPA portion of the administrative entity, both inside and outside, under monitoring, under client

33

services, under EEO/personnel, or under an undesignated major unit (one chart for each of these).

We found a similar variety for such functions as fiscal. And whereas in some charts, MIS was located under a fiscal unit, in others the fiscal staff formed a subunit within the MIS unit. Consider still other functions, and the fact that some organizations are structured around geography rather than function (and still others combine the two principles), and the multiplicity of combinations can be imagined. We found no way to tame this variety into a manageable set of structural categories, and eventually conceded.

As a result, the discussion in this chapter is somewhat simpler than we had originally intended. The most consistently useful structural characteristics for the analysis turn out to be funding, staff size, and, for SDAs, type of administrative entity. Even with this limitation, however, a great deal remains to be described about the staffing of JTPA organizations, and that is the subject of this chapter.

Organization of This Chapter

The next section sets JTPA organizations in context, presenting data on their funding, size, and various other characteristics. The section proceeds to a summary of which functions state and SDA organizations perform in-house, and which are primarily performed by or shared with outside organizations. It then presents staff directors' perceptions of the adequacy of the size of their current staff, and their responses on a question that asked them to specify which three new positions they would establish if they could expand their staff at this time. This last item has implications for the types of training that may be useful to organizations.

Subsequent sections summarize pay and benefit structures, recruitment practices and problems, the frequency of opportunities for advancement, the extent of turnover and vacancies, and management perceptions about the key staffing issues.

34

STRUCTURAL CHARACTERISTICS OF JTPA STAFF ORGANIZATIONS

Contextual Characteristics

State Level

The 40 states responding to the director survey represented a wide variety of sizes. In terms of PY 88 funding for state administration, the minimum received was $237,000 and the maximum over $10 million. The group mean was over $1.8 million, and the median in excess of $1.2 million. For purposes of subsequent analysis, we divided these organizations into three roughly equal groups, as follows: 14 (35%) received less than $500,000, another 14 received between $500,000 and $2 million, and the remaining 12 (30%) received more than $2 million.

The number of SDAs in PY 88 ranged from 1 to 51, with a mean of 12 and a median of 10. Six states had only one SDA. By PY 89, the maximum number had grown to 52, but the other parameters remained the same.

Table III-1 shows that the size of the state agency containing the JTPA units varied considerably. In a quarter of the states, the state agency had 100 or fewer staff positions. On the other end of the spectrum, one-third had more than 1,000 positions.

Only 11% of the state agencies (containing the state JTPA unit) performed no functions other than JTPA. As Table III-2 shows, these states were clustered in the smallest agency size stratum. In about three-quarters of the states, the agency containing the JTPA unit also ran state employment programs. Sixty-three percent ran unemployment insurance, and 61% ran the Job Service. Other labor-related programs included apprenticeships, labor standards, and OSHA or industrial safety functions. A smaller number of state agencies -- about a quarter of them -- also ran WIN or welfare reform employment programs. A few state agencies ran vocational rehabilitation programs, community development programs, or economic development programs. In no states responding to

the survey did the agency containing the JTPA unit also run education programs.

SDA Level

SDAs participating in the survey also varied widely in their funding. Their Title II-A allocations for PY 88 ranged from a low of $158,000 to a high of more than $26 million, with a mean of $2.9 million and a median of $1.8 million. (These figures are based on SDA self-reports and include 6% funds, so the mean and median are slightly different from the corresponding figures in Chapter II.) For cross-tabulation purposes, we divided them into four funding categories, as follows: below $1 million (15% of participating SDAs), $1 million to $1.9 million (39%), $2 million to $6.9 million (40%), and $7 million and above (6%).

Thirty-eight percent of participating SDAs administered the local JTPA program for a single jurisdiction, while the other 62% were multijurisdictional. Among the latter group, the number of jurisdictions ranged from 2 to 32, producing a mean of 6 and a median of 5.

Among responding SDAs, 62% were administered by government agencies, 28% by incorporated PICs, and 10% by community-based organizations (CBOs) or miscellaneous other organizations, such as community colleges. (Because so few administrative entities were either CBOs or other nongovernmental, non-PIC organizations, we consolidated what had been two organizational categories on the SDA director questionnaire into the single category, "CBO/Other"). As shown in Tables III-3 and III-4, SDAs with PICs as their administrative entities tended to have above-average funding, while those with CBO/other administrative entities tended to have below-average allocations. CBO/other administrative entities were also more likely to operate multijurisdictional SDAs, as shown in Tables III-5 and III-6.

36

Sixty percent of the SDAs participating in the survey had been prime sponsors under CETA. As shown in Table III-7, SDAs with governmental administrative entities were slightly more likely to have been prime sponsors, while SDAs administered by CBO/other entities were least likely to have been prime sponsors.

Civil Service and Collective Bargaining Status

Four-fifths of the state directors reported that their staff was included in a civil service system, as can be seen in Table III-8. The table also shows that half of the directors reported that members of their staff were represented by collective bargaining organizations. The mean percentage of representation among the organizations responding affirmatively was 75%.

Corresponding information for the SDA level is summarized in Table III-9. The percentage reporting civil service status reversed the state proportion, at 21%. The percentage reporting collective bargaining representation was also much lower, at 16%. Among the organizations that did have staff represented by collective bargaining units, the mean percent of staff represented was 78%.

Staff Size

State Level

The mean number of state JTPA staff was 44, with an average of 36 serving within the state JTPA unit and 12 elsewhere within the state agency containing that unit. (The numbers do not add up because of varying response rates on individual survey items.) The combined median was 38.

As Table III-10 indicates, there was close correspondence between funding level and staff size. In states with less than $500,000 in state funds, the mean number of staff was 15, whereas in the states receiving more than $2 million, the mean number of staff was 88.

37

States were divided fairly evenly in recent trends in staff size. When asked whether the number of staff positions funded by Title II-A had increased or decreased since July 1987, 37% of participating agencies responded that it had increased, 32% that it had stayed about the same, and 32% that it had decreased.

Table III-11 shows that in 30 states, or four-fifths of those responding, there was a single staff for both the SJTCC and the state JTPA unit. In the states that had separate staffs, the mean size of the separate SJTCC staff was 7.8 positions, while the median size was 8.5 positions.

SDA Level

Tables III-12 and III-13 summarize the number of administrative entity staff divided among Title II-A, II-B, and non-JTPA funding in PYs 88 and 89. The average number of II-A staff was 25 in PY 88, growing to 26 in PY 89. The corresponding medians declined, however, from 23 to 22.

As at the state level, and despite variability in degree of contracting out, there tended to be a close correspondence between staff size and allocation. The relationship is displayed in Table III-14. SDAs with allocations under $1 million had a mean Title II-A staff size of 13, while SDAs receiving $7 million or more averaged 59 Title II-A staff positions.

Staff sizes were somewhat more likely to have remained the same among participating SDAs than at the state level. Twenty-six percent of responding SDA directors reported that their staff (excluding temporary Title II-B staff) had increased since July 1987, 44% said staff size had remained about the same, and 30% said it had decreased.

Separate PIC staffs were less common than separate SJTCC staffs, as can be seen by comparing Table III-15 with Table III-11: only 12% of the SDAs had separate staffs for the administrative entity and the PIC.

38

Of course, the fact that 28% of the administrative were PICs influences this result. The mean staff size for separate PICs was was four positions, while the median was 3.5 positions.

Tables III-16 and III-17 show the split of SDA staff positions between the funding categories of administration and service provision, and their distribution among the administrative entity, separate PIC staff (where one exists), and outside staff (e.g., in a county personnel or fiscal unit). Due to lower response rates on these items, the data are not directly comparable with the figures reported earlier on overall staff size.

Internal vs. External Performance of JTPA Functions

State Level

The state JTPA unit directors were asked who had primary or shared responsibility for each of a list of state-level JTPA functions: the state JTPA unit, separate SJTCC staff, or outside staff or a contractor. As can be seen in Table III-18, for the vast majority of functions, the function was performed by internal staff, either the JTPA unit staff or SJTCC staff. This was true for such functions as preparing the Governor's Coordination and Special Services Plan, developing target group policies, or designating SDAs. For instance, in 92% of the cases, liaison with and technical assistance to SDAs was performed by internal staff.

There were only a few functions that more than half of the states indicated were performed by outside staff or a contractor. The function most commonly performed by outside personnel was legal support, with 89% of the states reporting that outside staff or a contractor discharged this responsibility. Auditing was performed outside the unit in 66% of the states and labor market research in 51%.

An additional function that some state JTPA units are responsible for is the administration of SDA programs. In almost 40% of the

39

responding states, the state JTPA unit also administered one or more SDA programs, as indicated in Table III-19. (The director survey asked JTPA directors in such states to base their responses -- on staff, funding, and so on -- solely on the state-level program and its staff. Staff surveys in such states were distributed only to staff members who primarily performed state-level functions.)

SDA Level

Table III-20 shows who performs which functions in SDAs. The first column indicates the percentages of SDAs that responded that the administrative entity or separate PIC staff handled most of the function. The second column indicates the percentage of SDAs in which outside staff or a vendor performed most of the function, and the third column indicates those SDAs in which the function is shared by staff and outsiders.

Program management and program development are usually reserved for administrative entity or PIC staff. In addition, functions such as developing RFPs and contracts and contract monitoring are usually handled by internal staff.

In contrast, outside staff or vendors are often used for auditing, for research and evaluation, for legal support, for staff training, and for client-oriented services such as outreach and intake, on-the-job training, or classroom training. While vendors are more likely to perform client-oriented functions than other kinds of SDA functions, it should be noted that in half of the SDAs the majority of client-oriented functions were performed by internal staff, with the exception of classroom training. Only 22% of the SDAs indicated that the administrative entity or PIC staff did most of the classroom training.

Among the 72 SDAs that responded concerning their use of outside contractors for service provision, there were, on average, 21 outside service providers in PY 88. As shown in Table III-21, among responding SDAs, average SDA expenditures came to $1.9 million, while the average

percent of contracting out (not weighted by funding) was 56%. The table also shows that the percentage of II-A funds spent on outside contracting varied by type of administrative entity. Additionally, it varied by staff size, as indicated in Table III-22: the smallest organizations contracted out more than two-thirds of their allocation, on average, while the largest organizations contracted out less than half of their funding.

Perceived Adequacy of Staff Size

As indicated in Table III-23, over 60% of the state directors perceived that the size of their staff is too small in relation to its responsibilities, whereas only a quarter of SDA directors expressed dissatisfaction with their staff size. At both levels, however, funding level influenced the response.

Among the state agencies where the director believed staff size is inadequate, almost half received less than $500,000 in Title II-A funding. In contrast, among states claiming a sufficient staff, half received over $2 million.

Although SDA directors generally expressed greater satisfaction with the size of their staff, directors with allocations above $1 million were considerably more likely to feel that their staff size is sufficient. These results are displayed in Table III-24. At allocations below $1 million, only half of the local agencies claimed adequate staffing.

The table also indicates how SDA responses varied by type of administrative entity. Although a substantial majority in each category considered staff size adequate, the proportion was markedly lower among government agencies than among PICs or CBO/other types of administrative entities.

The director survey gave state and SDA directors the hypothetical option of adding three new positions to their current staff and asked

41

them to specify the functions they would have the new staff perform. Among state directors, the overwhelming favorite was policy and planning staff, mentioned 35 times (sometimes twice by a single agency). This was more than three times the frequency of mention for the second choice, monitors, nominated ten times. MIS staff was mentioned nine times. There were six mentions apiece for PR/marketing specialists and clerical staff, and five apiece for fiscal/accounting staff and field/SDA liaisons.

Among SDA directors, naturally enough, there was greater orientation toward client service staff. Among the top half dozen positions selected, the greatest number of mentions, 26, was for counselors. Job developers/placement specialists were mentioned 11 times. Between these two, however, the SDA directors mentioned support staff specialties that parallel most of the state directors' choices. Planning staff received 17 mentions, clerical staff 15, and there were 12 mentions each for fiscal/accounting staff and monitors.

Factors Influencing Staff Structures in Case Study States and SDAs

There was considerable variety among the state and SDA organizations visited for our case studies, and somewhat different reasons producing the various configurations at the state and SDA levels.

State Level

At the state level, three primary dimensions differentiating the eight organizations were the location of the state JTPA unit, the presence or absence of a separate SJTCC staff, and the location of the state's Dislocated Worker Unit (DWU). In five of the eight states, the JTPA unit was part of the state employment (or labor) department. In two states, however, it was a separate entity within the Governor's office, and in one state there was no separate JTPA unit. In this state, JTPA functions were spread among several divisions in the state

human resources department, and only a couple staff members spent all or nearly all of their time on JTPA.

Three of the states had a separate SJTCC staff, while in the other five states the same staff management directed provision of SJTCC staff support and administration of all other state JTPA functions. In two of the three states with a separate SJTCC staff, that staff was located in the Governor's office, while in the third state it formed a separate unit of the state employment department (where the state JTPA unit was also located).

In four of the states, the DWU was located within the JTPA unit. In two others, it was located within the state employment department, but was separate from other JTPA staff. It was also a separate unit within the human resources department in the state that did not have a JTPA unit per se. In the remaining state, the DWU was located in the Governor's office; this was one of the states where a separate SJTCC staff is also located within the Governor's office.

Several of the state organizations had undergone one or more substantial reorganizations since the start of JTPA. The structures that had evolved to this point reflected the interplay of the legacy of state CETA unit ("four percent" office and/or balance of state prime sponsor) location and organization, situation within a larger civil service structure, partisan politics, and considerable staff continuity (especially at the middle management and professional levels).

Most of the state JTPA units had evolved from previous state CETA offices, and retained much staff from the CETA era. This continuity is promoted by civil service systems. However, there was substantial staff continuity even within the one state where JTPA employees were not part of a civil service structure (here, they served at the pleasure of the Governor).

In several of the states the governorship had changed parties since the implementation of JTPA, leading to changes either within the overall

JTPA staff structure or among high-level personnel. In a couple of the states, the advent of a Governor of a new party was associated with the creation of a separate SJTCC staff. In another state, the new Governor's reorganization of state staff had led to the abolition of the previous separate JTPA unit and the merging of JTPA functions among state staff who also had responsibility for other employment and training responsibilities. As part of this reorganization, a number of jobs were eliminated, and a number of the remaining jobs were assigned additional responsibilities and/or assigned a lower civil service status (with associated lower salary).

Changes in other states were less dramatic. Although election of a new Governor usually resulted in a new JTPA director, and sometimes new division directors, changes among other staff tended to be minimal. Although being part of a civil service was a major factor in this continuity, staff remained essentially unchanged even in the state where JTPA staff was not part of a civil service system.

SDA Level

The key factors affecting the organization of staff in the case study SDAs were the local availability of contractual service providers, the degree of influence by local politics, and (related to the second factor) whether the PIC served as the administrative entity.

Four of the eight SDAs were administered by incorporated PICs, two by agencies of county government, and two by city agencies. One of the SDAs formally administered by a city agency also had a sizable separate PIC staff that played a major role in program administration and operation.

SDAs in areas that offered multiple qualified service providers, or a core of organizations that had a long history of service to JTPA (and CETA) participants, were more likely to contract out most or all services than those where outside resources were less rich or less accessible to the area's eligible population. In practice, this tended

44

to favor a higher degree of contracting out by larger urban SDAs or those fortunate enough to contain or be located near "proven" service organizations. Where local politics more strongly influenced programming, there was also a greater tendency for a substantial portion of direct client services to be contracted out, leaving administrative entity staff with more strictly policy-setting and administrative functions to perform.

PAY AND BENEFITS

Salaries

The director surveys asked the annual salaries of each of seven typical state staff positions and eight SDA positions. The generic state positions were director, chief planner, fiscal manager, MIS manager, head grant administrator, performance policy manager, and field representative. At the SDA level, the first four positions were the same as for the state levels, and the remaining four were training director, job developer, intake worker, and vocational counselor. Salaries were reported across five ranges: under $15,000; $15,000 to $24,999; $25,000 to $34,999; $35,000 to $44,999; and $45,000 and over. The results are displayed in Tables III-25 and III-26.

In general, salary scales at the state level are higher than at the local level. The great majority of state staff in the positions specified have annual salaries in the top three ranges, whereas most of the SDA salaries are concentrated in the three middle categories. Even among the four position categories common to both the state and SDA levels, state salaries are higher.

Nearly all state directors receive salaries of at least $35,000, with a substantial majority (71%) making $45,000 or more. Among local agencies, the modal category, at 38%, is also $45,000 or more. However, nearly a third of SDA directors have salaries between $25,000 and $34,999.

45

Among chief planners and fiscal managers at the state level, most have salaries of $35,000 or more, while most SDA-level chief planners and fiscal managers cluster in the $25,000 to $44,999 range. MIS managers' salaries tend to be lower at both levels, but the state scale remains higher: 78% of state MIS managers are paid from $25,000 to $44,999 per year, whereas 85% of their SDA counterparts receive from $15,000 to $34,999 annually.

As to staff positions specific to state agencies, all head grant administrators have salaries of $25,000 or more, with greater than two-thirds receiving at least $35,000. Half of the performance policy managers and state field representatives have salaries between $25,000 and $34,999, while an additional 35% are paid more.

Among staff positions specific to SDAs, half of the training directors receive $25,000 to $34,999 per year, with the remainder split evenly above and below that range. Intake workers, vocational counselors, and job developers are the least well paid of all the positions compared here. On the order of two-thirds of these workers are paid between $15,000 and $24,999 annually, with additional percentages making less than $15,000.

Additional information on salaries, based on the staff surveys, is summarized in Chapter V. There, it is used to help describe current JTPA staff; the chapter also investigates how salaries vary by personal characteristics as well as type of position. Here, the focus has been on summarizing organizations' salary scales.

Benefits

The director surveys asked which types of benefits are received by most staff. As shown in the right-hand columns in Tables III-27 and III-28, the benefit profiles are very similar, and relatively generous at both the state and local levels.

All state agencies responding reported that they provide paid vacation, paid sick leave, and retirement plans, and 88% of state agencies also provide employer-paid health insurance. Among SDAs, all or virtually all provide vacation, sick leave, and health insurance, and nine of every ten provide retirement benefits. Two-thirds of both state and local agencies also include employer-paid dental insurance in their benefits package. A minority of state and local-level staff receive additional benefits, including life insurance, disability insurance, and vision care.

Perceived Competitiveness of Salary and Benefit Packages

In the site visits, we asked directors and managers about the relative attractiveness of the salaries and benefits they were able to offer. Their responses tend to corroborate survey data presented in the following sections on the significance of salary scales and benefits as sources of difficulty with recruitment or turnover. Essentially, salaries are relatively attractive at the state level (somewhat less so for upper professional and management staff), but less so at the SDA level. Benefits are generally very attractive -- with the key exception of some PIC administrative entities -- but more significant with respect to turnover than to recruitment, and often not that significant in influencing either recruitment or turnover.

In only one state did top management consider salary levels a problem. This was the state where JTPA employees served at the pleasure of the Governor, instead of belonging to the civil service. Here, JTPA positions paid considerably less than comparable positions in other agencies. This had been confirmed by a recent desk audit conducted by the state personnel agency, which had recommended raising annual salaries of JTPA staff by an average of $2,200, and as much as $6,000 in one case. However, the fact that the Governor directly controlled this JTPA organization made it subject to more intense public scrutiny, resulting in political pressure to keep salaries low. So even though the funds were available, management had been instructed to keep any increases to less than 5%.

Pay scales among case study SDAs were generally tightly clustered, although directors' salaries ranged from a low of $37,800 in one largely rural SDA to $60,000 within a high-cost urban area. Unit manager salaries ranged from $35,000 to $41,000, and those of other staff from $20,000 to $35,000. Salaries were considered a problem for both recruitment and retention in some of the SDAs, especially (and not surprisingly) the more high-cost, low-unemployment areas. Professional, technical, and skilled clerical positions were all mentioned as being at a disadvantage due to uncompetitive salary offerings.

The SDAs' benefit structures were generally more attractive -- two PIC staffs excepted -- but were not seen as successfully overcoming salary disincentives, especially on the recruitment end. Except for one rural SDA whose benefits cost only 14 percent of payroll, SDA benefits ranged from 23% to 36% of payroll. A fairly standard package included full medical and dental coverage, partial orthodonture and partial vision coverage, noncontributory retirement and life insurance, ten days of sick leave accrued annually, ten holidays per year, and paid vacation starting at two weeks for each of the first three years of tenure.

RECRUITMENT AND HIRING

Practices

The study design called for information on recruitment and hiring practices to be drawn almost exclusively from the case studies. (The surveys addressed only the question of hiring from within, through internal promotions. Survey findings on this topic are presented below, in the section "Opportunities for Advancement.") This source turned out to be problematic, however, because most of the case study organizations have been doing relatively little hiring in recent years. One SDA administrative entity had had only one new hire during the year prior to the site visit. Thus, descriptions of recruitment channels and hiring criteria and procedures tended to be rather general.

There are two reasons for this inactivity. First, staff sizes have generally been decreasing rather than increasing. In one state, the staff had declined from 100 to 72 since the inception of JTPA; in another, it had declined from 126 to 71 between 1985 and 1990. Although states were establishing and staffing DWUs during the period covered by the site visits, as noted earlier, in some of the states the DWU is separate from "JTPA" staff. In other states, reorganizations and staff shifts were being undertaken to staff up the DWU, so new hiring was still minimized. The other major reason for the low level of hiring is the low level of turnover that characterized most of the case study organizations.

Some general comments can be offered. In most of the organizations, hiring was controlled by civil service rules. Within those constraints, most of the unit managers felt that they had great discretion over the hiring decision -- but the constraints were sometimes considerable. Except for entry-level and, to a lesser extent, clerical positions, most hiring was done from within the agency containing JTPA staff, even from within a different JTPA unit in some of the larger organizations. This was especially true at the SDA level.

Since managers tended to stress familiarity with the employment and training field as an asset for most positions -- and still better, at least one or two years' experience with the JTPA system specifically -- they often did not perceive this confined recruiting sphere as a problem. However, when civil service rigidity made it difficult or impossible to hire a qualified person from outside, the situation could be frustrating.

In some of the state organizations, managers mentioned specific instances of wanting to hire highly qualified individuals who had several years' experience in local JTPA programming, and running into state civil service roadblocks. Some managed to hire the person anyway (often after considerable effort, paperwork, and time), while others turned to other state agencies for new staff.

49

Sometimes this staff was an excellent match. In one state, in particular, it was not unknown for state JTPA staff to take a transfer or promotion to a related state agency (such as social services or education) for one or two years, with the personal intent of returning and management's blessings on their plans, since on their return they would enrich the JTPA unit's awareness of the goals and operations of related programs. In other states, however, managers complained that while persons coming from other agencies might have the appropriate technical skills, their lack of experience with JTPA ("green as grass," as one state JTPA director phrased it) meant that it could take them as much as a year or two to get up to full speed.

Three of the state agencies mentioned computer programmers and analysts as particularly difficult to hire, and the civil service as increasing their difficulties in this area. One agency went to considerable effort to create a separate advancement track for such staff, while another found a rather tenuous solution to this problem by "borrowing" and "lending" staff positions on a long-term basis, so as to let computer specialists formally stay within a track located within another organization.

SDAs, and especially incorporated PICs, were more likely to cast a wide net in hiring, even for mid-level technical and managerial positions. Since the local civil service systems generally had fewer members (and thus fewer internal candidates potentially suitable for any opening), they seemed to be somewhat less restrictive than the state systems. Some SDA managers mentioned hiring entry-level technical and clerical staff from among the graduates of the training programs that they funded, and some of these same managers had been recruited from contractor organizations.

At the same time, as indicated earlier, SDAs also tended to offer lower salaries. Incorporated PICs had the greatest autonomy in hiring, but in most cases their salaries were on the modest side of competitive. Possibly as a result, several PIC managers mentioned instances where they had been disappointed in the outcome of a hiring process.

Recruitment Difficulties and Primary Reasons

Management Perceptions of Overall Difficulty

In the director surveys, respondents were asked several questions concerning their recruitment experience. The first was a simple rating of the overall difficulty they have in recruiting JTPA staff, along a scale of 1 (no problem) to 5 (serious problem). Agency ratings were averaged, resulting in a mean rating of 2.7 for states and 2.2 for SDAs. Thus, overall, state directors rate their recruiting difficulties on the low side of moderate, whereas SDA directors generally perceive that they have only minor difficulty with recruitment.

Types of Positions Affected

Of 37 state directors answering a question on whether recruitment was more difficult for certain types of staff positions, 15 (41%) said that it was. Asked to specify the positions that posed above-average recruitment challenges, among these 15 directors, four apiece specified MIS, clerical, policy/planning, and fiscal/accounting staff. No more than two of these directors specified any other single staff position. Thus, these four staff functions created the greatest difficulty in recruiting -- but only among a minority of state JTPA organizations.

At the SDA level, 24 of 79 directors responding to this question (or 30% of the respondents) indicated that some positions were more difficult to recruit for than others. Among these 24 directors, seven specified fiscal/accounting positions, five cited clerical positions, thee mentioned planning positions, and no more than two cited any other single staff category. As at the state level, then, there are some staff positions that seem to pose more recruitment difficulty than others (and all three are also among the top state mentions) -- but only a minority of SDA organizations encounter unusual recruitment difficulty with any positions.

51

Factors Contributing to Recruitment Difficulties

Directors' Perceptions. Asked to identify the three most common reasons for the recruitment difficulties they encountered, state and SDA directors produced a fairly similar response pattern. However, as displayed in Tables III-29 and III-30, there were three noteworthy differences.

First, at the state level, civil service hiring procedures were cited most frequently as a source of recruitment difficulty. The 61% state selection rate for this item contrasts dramatically with the 11% rate at the local level. For SDAs, instead, inadequate salary was seen as the primary obstacle, selected by 71% of the respondents. It was also perceived as a significant factor at the state level -- the second most frequent source of difficulty -- but the percentage was substantially lower, at 52%. Third, there was a significant difference in identification of lack of sure job tenure as a cause of recruitment difficulty. It was seen as far more serious at the local level, where it was chosen by 40% of the SDA directors; in contrast, only 12% of state directors cited this reason.

Otherwise, however, rankings and percentages were similar. Thirty-six percent of state directors and 40% of local directors selected a perceived lack of promotional opportunities as a factor. Approximately one-third of the directors at both levels reported that recruitment is difficult because necessary skills are rare in the labor market, and slightly over one-fifth cited high demand for the necessary skills within the surrounding labor market as a factor. Only a handful of directors selected poor benefits or working conditions; in fact, none of the states cited poor benefits. A couple of states identified a low state unemployment rate (implying strong competition from the private sector) as a write-in response.

Positions Affected by Specific Reasons. Directors were invited to indicate whether the individual reasons that they cited affected any particular staff positions more strongly than others. Response rates on

these items (i.e., the specifications of positions most strongly affected by a given reason) were quite low at both the state and SDA levels, and few positions were connected with a single reason by as many as two directors.

Recruitment of fiscal/accounting staff was reported to be impeded by low salary by five state directors; by rarity of the necessary skills by two state directors and two SDA directors; and by high demand for the skills by three state directors. While no SDA directors cited MIS/computer positions in this area of the questionnaire, two state directors cited them in connection with low salary, rare skills, and high demand for skills, and three mentioned them in connection with perceived limitations on promotional opportunities.

At the SDA level, inadequate salary was mentioned as impeding recruitment for clerical positions by five directors; for counselors, by four directors; and by three directors each for program specialists and planners. Three SDA directors also cited planners as unusually difficult to recruit because of the rarity of the required skills, and five reported that clerical positions were unusually difficult to fill due to high demand for skilled clerical workers within the local labor market.

Associated Factors. In analyzing the surveys, we investigated the relationship of organizational characteristics to management perceptions about recruitment difficulty.

The results for funding level and staff size are shown in Tables III-31 and III-32. Across funding levels, there is virtually no variation in mean ratings among states. Means for SDAs do vary somewhat; the highest mean rating, 2.5, occurs among SDAs having medium allocations (from $1 million to $1.9 million).

With respect to staff size, at the state level, a slightly higher mean (3.0) was found among medium-sized organizations (those with 21 to 60 staff positions). At the SDA level, organizations in the middle

staff size category also produced the highest difficulty rating among SDAs (2.5), followed by the largest organizations (2.1) and the smallest (1.7).

Funding and staff size do make some difference in the reasons most commonly selected as making recruitment more difficult. The funding breakouts are displayed in Tables III-29 and III-30. (Distributions by staff size category are very similar to those for funding category, and are not displayed here.)

At the state level, for example, the highest-funded organizations are far more likely to identify civil service procedures as a source of difficulty. Conversely, the proportion selecting lack of promotional opportunities declines with funding size. The same pattern is evident at the SDA level. In addition, at the SDA level there is a clear trend for selection of uncertain job tenure to decrease as funding size increases. (A similar tendency is apparent at the state level, but all the numbers involved are very small.)

Tables III-33 and III-34 present the breakouts of ratings by whether staff size had grown, decreased, or remained essentially the same over the two year prior to the survey. At the state level, organizations whose staff size had increased rated their recruitment difficulty almost one point higher, at 3.2, than the other categories, both of whose mean rating was 2.3. At the SDA level, it was the organizations whose staff size had decreased that accorded recruitment an elevated difficulty rating (2.4), but the difference was not as dramatic as at the state level.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR ADVANCEMENT

In the site visits, advancement opportunities came up repeatedly as a weak area, particularly beyond the associate professional/technical level. Staff sizes that have been steadily shrinking for several years, combined with low turnover, mean that advancement generally requires departure. Yet many staff members who feel personal commitment to the

employment and training field are reluctant to leave, even (at the state level) for a position within the larger employment agency. Similarly, several directors and managers at the SDA level made the point that many JTPA professionals are not interested in administrative jobs -- any more than many teachers have an intrinsic interest in school administration, as one said. So, despite the lack of advancement opportunities, many of them stay.

At both the state and SDA levels, managers called the lack of promotional opportunities "the major drawback" of their organization. They also said that it had a greater impact on recruitment than on turnover. But some also made the point that many current JTPA professionals recognized that they would not have much opportunity for promotion when they joined the state or SDA organization, so that this was not a major problem for them. This was not a unanimous perspective, however. Some managers feels strongly that a kind of elite professional classification -- above whatever ranks currently exist -- should be created to reflect the demands of certain staff positions and recognize the skills of the staff that fills them; but civil service structures and personnel staff have tended to be unyielding.

One advancement problem was shared between the two levels (at the state level, it is also a recruitment problem), and caused some frustration at both levels. When openings occurred in mid- or high-level state positions, it was typically very difficult to fill them with persons who had accumulated substantial experience and skills in local JTPA programs. If local staff was interested in moving to the state level, or a state manager knew of a well qualified local person, state civil service rules often made it difficult to bring that pers n in above the entry level (which could preclude filling a particular position from the outside).

We came across one or two instances where such a move had been possible, but both had been near-flukes. Given the value of understanding local programs at the state level, it might be useful for DOL to provide technical assistance to the states in preparing

justifications for exemptions to civil service restrictions in this area.

On the director surveys, states reported an average of 2.5 promotions during PY 88, while SDAs reported an average of 3.5. (The surveys defined "promotion" as an advancement to a higher position or staff classification, excluding "step increases" within a given classification and lateral transfers into equivalent staff classifications.) These data are shown in Tables III-35 and III-36, along with breakouts by funding and, for SDAs, type of administrative entity. Higher funding was clearly associated with a greater number of promotions, especially among the top funding categories. States with more than $2 million in funding averaged 3.8 promotions, and SDAs with allocations of at least $7 million averaged 10.8. Promotions were also more frequent in PIC administrative entities, which had a mean of 5.4 promotions.

TURNOVER AND VACANCIES

Management Perceptions of Extent and Seriousness

The director surveys asked a set of questions concerning staff turnover that were similar to the questions asked about recruitment. First, directors were asked to rate the overall seriousness of staff turnover within their organization on a scale of 1 (no problem) to 5 (serious problem). As displayed in Tables III-37 and III-38, the mean rating among states was 2.1, while among SDAs the mean was 1.7.

Overall, then, staff turnover is not seen as an especially serious problem, and is of somewhat less concern to directors than recruitment. This is consistent with the picture derived from the case studies. If anything, site visit directors and unit managers expressed less concern about staff turnover than suggested by the average survey ratings.

Calculation of Turnover Rates from Survey Data

The surveys also asked directors to indicate both the number of JTPA staff positions within their organization in PY 88 and the number of employees who left their organization during that year. As indicated in Tables III-39, III-40, and III-41, the mean number of employees leaving state organizations was 3.3 (with a range from 0 to 13), while for SDAs the mean was 3.4 (with a range from 0 to 26).

Converting the number of departing staff to annual turnover rates, we found that the mean turnover rate was 12% among state organizations, and 14% at the SDA level. Because the means are affected by a single high outlier at the state level, and several extraordinarily high individual rates at the SDA level (one as high as 91%), the medians are somewhat more reassuring: 10% at both levels. In fact, one-third of the state organizations and a quarter of the SDAs had staff turnover rates no higher than 5% annually.

Overall, then, staff turnover seems to warrant the directors' average perceptions of it as a relatively minor concern. It is of some interest, however, that state directors, whose organizations tend to have lower turnover rates than those at the local level, ranked staff turnover as a somewhat more serious problem than the SDA directors.

This raised a question about how closely directors' perceptions of turnover corresponded to their organization's actual turnover rate. There is a correspondence, as indicated in Tables III-42 and III-43; but the mean ratings among the organizations with the highest turnover rates seem fairly modest. At the state level, the mean in this category is actually slightly lower than among organizations with medium turnover rates.

Types of Positions Affected

Thirty-eight state directors responded to a question asking whether some positions experienced unusually high turnover within their

organization. Of the 38, 13 (34%) said that there were such positions. Among these 13, five specified clerical; but no other single category was mentioned by more than two directors.

Results were very similar at the SDA level. Of 77 directors responding on this item, 19 (25%) indicated that turnover was more of a problem with some positions than with others. Of this group, as at the state level, five specified clerical, but this was the only category mentioned by more than two directors. Within the case study SDAs, turnover was mentioned most frequently in connection with intake interviewers and counselors, who were typically among the lowest-paid staff. Some of this turnover took the form of upward promotion within the organization, which may be taken to be less disruptive than departures for other organizations.

Factors Contributing to Staff Turnover

Directors' Perceptions

As with recruitment difficulties, directors were asked to select the three most frequent reasons for staff turnover within their organization. These frequencies are displayed in Tables III-44, III-45, and III-46. (The tables also break frequencies out by funding and, for SDAs, type of administrative entity. These results are discussed below, under "Associated Factors.")

At both the state and local levels, lack of promotional opportunities and inadequate salary were cited as the most common reasons. Among state directors, 57% cited lack of promotional opportunities and 43% cited low salary. Among SDA directors, the percentages were 40% and 58%, respectively. While internal promotions (which vacated positions) were cited third most frequently as a cause of turnover at the state level, at 41%, they were selected by only 15% of the SDAs. Conversely, while departure in search of greater job security was the reason chosen third most often among SDAs, at 39%, it was selected by only 17% of the state agencies.

At the state and local levels, search for greater job responsibility, retirement, personal or family reasons, burnout, and reduction due to declining funds were specified by one-fifth to one-third of the directors. Less than one-fifth of the SDAs and only 5% of state agencies cited firing as a reason. A few local organizations cited poor benefits and inconvenient location as turnover reasons; at the state level, none of the directors cited these reasons. The "Other" causes of turnover that were specified included going back to school and moving, which overlap with personal and family reasons.

Positions Affected by Specific Reasons

As was done in the recruitment section of the surveys, directors were again invited to indicate whether any particular staff positions were affected particularly strongly by the individual reasons that they selected as contributing to staff turnover. Once again, response rates were low.

Seven state directors and six SDA directors reported that inadequate salary led to above-average turnover among clerical positions. Other reasons singled out more than twice for promoting clerical turnover included, at the state level, internal promotions and perceived lack of advancement opportunities (three mentions each); and at the SDA level, desire for greater job security and personal/family reasons (again three mentions apiece). Four state directors specified managers in connection with retirement, while four SDA directors reported that program or employment specialist positions had been affected by retirement. The only other position mentioned more than twice as being unusually subject to a specific reason was counselor/client specialist, connected with burnout by three SDA directors.

Associated Factors

As with our investigation of recruitment difficulty, in analyzing the survey data we explored the relationships between the extent of turnover and organizational characteristics.

The distribution of mean turnover rates broken out by funding and staff size category and, at the SDA level, type of administrative entity is displayed in Tables III-47 and III-48. At the state level, turnover rates clearly decline as staff size increases, which sounds natural enough (since one departing staff member represents a higher percentage of turnover in a smaller organization than in a larger one). The strong relationship between funding and staff size probably accounts for the clear tendency for the turnover rate also to decline with increasing funding. At the SDA level, however, the relationship between staff size and turnover rates is less clear-cut, and the differences among funding categories are less dramatic.

The relationship between turnover rates and trends in staff size appears to be more straightforward, as indicated in Tables III-49 and III-50. At both levels, turnover rates were substantially higher in organizations whose staff size had decreased over the past two years. This suggests that much turnover, and especially excessively high turnover, is either a consequence of or a reaction to staff reductions. This in turn suggests that management's ability to control such turnover may be very limited.

Funding levels bear a relationship to the specific reasons that directors cited as contributing to turnover, as well as to overall turnover rates, as can be seen in Tables III-44 and III-45. (Note, however, that column denominators tend to be small. As we did concerning sources of recruitment difficulty, we cross-tabulated turnover factors with staff size as well as funding size. Once again, the distributions for staff size are generally very similar to those for funding size, so tables on staff size are not displayed here.)

60

At the state level, internal promotions were cited as a top cause of turnover nearly twice as often in the highest-funded organizations as in either other category. Poor salary, on the other hand, was cited much more frequently in the lowest-funded organizations, as was personal/family reasons. The bottom category also selected both burnout and declining funding substantially less frequently than either other category. The middle group was much more likely to select seeking greater job security as a reason.

At the SDA level, among the lowest-funded organizations, concern over job security was nearly a unanimous choice as a top contributor to turnover, whereas in the other three funding categories the frequency of selection ranged between 25% and 35%. Staff reduction due to declining funding was also selected especially often (63%) in the bottom funding category, and the percentage clearly declined as funding level increased. The smallest organizations were also most likely to select seeking greater job responsibility. Both the lowest- and the highest-funded organizations were more likely than the middle categories to select either inadequate salary or lack of promotional opportunities as top contributors to turnover.

Table III-46 shows the distribution of reasons by type of administrative entity. Since the denominator in the CBO/other column is so low, it would be hazardous to make too much of those frequencies. The distribution is quite similar between PIC and government administrative entities. The most notable differences are that PIC directors are more likely to select seeking greater job responsibility and firing for cause, and less likely to select staff reduction due to declining funding, than their government counterparts.

Vacancies

Directors were asked to indicate the number of currently vacant positions in each of four broad staff categories: management/administrative; senior professional; junior professional; and support/clerical. As shown in Tables III-39 and III-40, the average number of

61

vacant state positions was higher than for SDA positions in every staff category.

Most vacancies in both state and local agencies existed at the junior professional level, at 2.4 and 0.7, respectively. Among state organizations, the senior professional level had the second highest vacancy mean, at 1.8, followed by management/administrative and support/clerical (1.2 each). For SDAs, the second largest vacancy mean occurred among support/clerical staff (0.5), followed by senior professional (0.3) and management/administrative (0.2).

Tenure of Existing Staff

Our information on staff tenure comes from the staff surveys, which covered a more limited number of organizations, and the case studies. Staff survey data on tenure, reported in greater detail in Chapter V, suggest that most staff members have considerable stability both within their current position and within the employment and training field as a whole. A majority of both state and SDA staff respondents had been in their present position for at least three years. In addition, most state staff had spent at least ten years working in the employment and training field, while the corresponding proportion of SDA staff was 37%.

Of course, organizations can have high proportions of staff with substantial seniority and still have turnover problems. However, in combination with the data reported earlier on the minor to modest turnover rates that characterize most states and SDAs, the staff tenure data suggest that most organizations sustain limited turnover, and possess a substantial core of very experienced staff.

Tenure was also very high among the case study states and SDAs, especially from the associate professional ranks to the assistant director level. Most of this staff -- as high as 85% or 90% in some organizations -- had CETA experience, and some had careers reaching back to MDTA.

At the SDA level, several directors had spent a number of years in their current position, and twelve or thirteen years with the organization was not unusual. State JTPA director positions were somewhat more subject to political turnover, but many of the current incumbents had long experience in the employment and training field, if not long tenure in their current position. Several had long careers in varying capacities within the state employment agency, and two had directed CETA prime sponsor programs. Several had varied backgrounds that included years within some combination of state finance and education as well as employment or labor departments.

Management Perceptions of Impact of Turnover and Vacancies

Our evidence on this topic is from the site visits, where (to repeat) we found very little turnover. Some organizations were having problems with long-term vacancies, however. One had been unable to staff up its planning and analysis unit in nearly a year. The manager of this unit felt that the organization was "just covering the basics" and had been noticeably hampered in its capacity to meet the increasingly demanding needs of participants and area employers.

MANAGEMENT PERCEPTIONS OF KEY STAFFING ISSUES

Staff size was generally the number one staffing issue, and the only one that ranked anywhere near the top of the list of managerial concerns in most of the state and SDA organizations. Not everyone shared this concern, particularly at the state level. Political appointees in particular tended to say that they had enough staff to carry out the mission of the agency. One SDA director stood out as taking pride in the SDA's low administrative costs, which ran below budget -- the result of a lean staff.

Other directors, and most unit managers, were more likely to feel that they could only minimally carry out their assigned jobs, and that quality and dynamism were slipping, due to inadequate staff size. Directors and managers in the smallest states and in most of the SDAs

63

expressed a need for additional staff. Most of these respondents said that if they were given additional funds, they would hire additional staff rather than use the money for training for existing staff.

Recruitment was the next highest staffing concern, but ranked well below staff size since there was relatively little call for it. It was taken seriously, however, since most staff members tended to stay with the organization for a long time once hired. Another reason for emphasizing recruitment, previewing later chapters, is that management places a premium on finding candidates who are already amply qualified, in preference to having to expend substantial time and resources on training after the hire.

Two of the biggest constraints on successful hiring, especially within the professional ranks, were civil service rules and inadequate salary, although salary was less of a disincentive at the state level. Poor opportunities for advancement within the JTPA system were another hiring impediment, and were seen as a significant problem in a number of the state and SDA organizations.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON STAFF STRUCTURES

There is tremendous variability among staff organizations at both the state and SDA levels, in terms of funding, number of staff, the structure of staff units, and other characteristics. Most states, but only one-fifth of the SDAs, are part of a civil service system.

At the state level, most JTPA functions are performed wholly or largely in-house. Almost two-fifths of the states directly administer one or more SDA programs. Among SDAs, most administrative functions tend to be discharged internally, although some specialized functions (such as legal support and auditing) are more likely to be handled by outside staff or vendors. Half of the SDAs perform most client functions in-house, but only about a fifth use in-house staff to deliver classroom training. In PY 88, among SDAs participating in our director

64

survey, the mean percent of contracting out was 56%, and the average number of outside contractors was 21.

Average state staff size was 44 in PY 88 (36 positions within the JTPA unit), while the average number of SDA staff was 25. Sixty percent of state JTPA directors, but only 25% of SDA directors, believe that their staff size is insufficient. The proportions are higher among lower-funded organizations, and lower among the organizations with the highest funding.

When asked which three positions they would add if additional funding were to become available, the overwhelming first choice of state directors was policy and planning staff. Other top choices at the state level included monitors and MIS staff. There were also multiple votes for public relations/marketing specialists, clerical staff, fiscal/ accounting staff, and field liaisons. At the SDA level, the top choice was counselors. Other frequent selections included planning staff, clerical support, fiscal/accounting staff, and monitors, followed by job developer/placement specialists.

State salaries are generally considered relatively attractive, though less so at the upper professional and management levels. Pay scales are lower at the SDA level, and tend to be more of a problem in both recruiting and retaining staff. More details on salary distributions are provided in Chapter V. Benefits tend to be very good at both levels, but are not that influential in recruitment and retention of staff.

Most state and SDA directors rate recruitment as only a minor to modest problem, but the ratings are higher than for staff turnover. A substantial minority of directors indicated that recruitment difficulties are concentrated in certain positions, but there was little unity on the types of positions. At the state level, the top reasons for recruitment difficulties are perceived to be civil service rules, salary, and perceived lack of promotional opportunities. At the SDA

65

level, the top reasons cited are inadequate salary, lack of promotional opportunities, and uncertainty over of job stability.

Some states have run into problems hiring qualified, experienced SDA staff into mid- or higher-level positions within their state organizations. Since familiarity with local programming can be a substantial asset at the state level, it may be worth it for DOL to explore how it could be helpful to states in justifying such hires.

Opportunities for advancement are generally considered one of the weakest aspects in JTPA organizations. According to our director survey, in PY 88 there were, on average, 2.5 promotions within state JTPA organizations and 3.5 at the SDA level. Directors and managers in the case studies reported that highly qualified staff members often stay with an organization despite poor promotional opportunities due to their commitment to the employment and training field.

In fact, tenure tends to be quite high, and turnover generally low. A majority of staff survey respondents have been in their present position for three years or more; a majority of state staff, and 37% of SDA staff, has at least ten years' experience working in the employment and training field.

While the median turnover rate is 10% at both the state and SDA levels, one-third of the states and a quarter of the SDAs had turnover of no more than 5% in PY 88. About a third of the directors said that turnover tends to be concentrated among certain positions or occupations, and several specified clerical staff -- but the number of respondents on these items was very low.

Turnover rates tend to decline as funding and staff size increases, more clearly so at the state level. Much turnover appears to be the result of or a reaction to declining staff size. Other prominent factors include dissatisfaction with promotional opportunities or salary, actual promotions that vacate a position or even take staff out

66

of the unit (at the state level), and (at the SDA level) departures in search of greater job security.

Vacancy rates were also generally very low. We did run into instances of long-term vacancies in some of the case study organizations, but these problems, though significant where they occurred, appeared to be rare.

Directors and managers tend to see staffing issues as less significant than such other management concerns as funding. Indeed, their top staffing concern is generally staff size, which is a function of funding. Among other staffing issues, the lack of advancement opportunities for qualified and experienced staff is acknowledged to be a problem, although many managers and directors also seem to feel that they can rely on staff commitment to the employment and training field to overcome many other disincentives. Recruitment is generally seen as a relatively minor problem, in part because so many organizations need to do so little of it, and turnover is generally seen as still less serious.

Table III-1

SIZE OF STATE AGENCY CONTAINING JTPA UNIT

	PERCENT	N
STATE AGENCY SIZE		
0-100	25%	(10)
101-250	8%	(3)
251-500	13%	(5)
501-1,000	23%	(9)
1,001-5,000	25%	(10)
ABOVE 5,000	8%	(3)
ALL STATES	100%	(40)

STATE AGENCY SIZE IN STAFF POSITIONS

Table III-2

NON-JTPA FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY STATE AGENCY CONTAINING JTPA UNIT
BY SIZE OF STATE AGENCY

	SIZE OF STATE AGENCY			ALL STATES	
	0 - 250		251 - 1,000		1,000 +		
NON-JTPA FUNCTIONS								
STATE EMPLOY PROGS	18%	(2)	86%	(12)	100%	(13)	71%	(27)
UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE	9%	(1)	79%	(11)	92%	(12)	63%	(24)
JOB SERVICE	9%	(1)	71%	(10)	92%	(12)	61%	(23)
APPRENTICESHIPS	9%	(1)	36%	(5)	46%	(6)	32%	(12)
LABOR STANDARDS	0%	(0)	57%	(8)	23%	(3)	29%	(11)
OSHA/INDUSTRIAL SAFETY	0%	(0)	43%	(6)	31%	(4)	26%	(10)
WIN/WELFARE REFORM	9%	(1)	29%	(4)	38%	(5)	26%	(10)
VOCATIONAL REHAB	9%	(1)	7%	(1)	23%	(3)	13%	(5)
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	27%	(3)	0%	(0)	8%	(1)	11%	(4)
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	9%	(1)	7%	(1)	8%	(1)	8%	(3)
PUBLIC ASSISTANCE	0%	(0)	0%	(0)	8%	(1)	3%	(1)
OTHER	64%	(7)	21%	(3)	23%	(3)	34%	(13)
NONE BESIDE JTPA	36%	(4)	0%	(0)	0%	(0)	11%	(4)
ALL STATES	100%	(11)	100%	(14)	100%	(13)	100%	(38)

STATE AGENCY SIZE IN STAFF POSITIONS

70

Table III-3

SDA ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE AND MEAN ALLOCATION IN PY 88

	PY 88 TITLE II-A ALLOCATION	
	PERCENT	MEAN PY 88 ALLOCATION
ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE		
PIC	28%	$4,412,351
GOVERNMENT	62%	$2,340,994
CBO/OTHER	10%	$1,634,332
ALL SDAS (n=82)	100%	$2,853,042

Table III-4

SDA ALLOCATION AND TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY

| | ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE | | | | | | ALL SDAS | |
	PIC		GOVERNMENT		CBO/OTHER			
PY 88 II-A ALLOCATION								
BELOW $1 MILLION	4%	(1)	20%	(10)	13%	(1)	15%	(12)
$1-1.9 MILLION	39%	(9)	35%	(18)	63%	(5)	39%	(32)
$2-6.9 MILLION	43%	(10)	41%	(21)	25%	(2)	40%	(33)
$7 MILLION & ABOVE	13%	(3)	4%	(2)	0%	(0)	6%	(5)
ALL SDAS	100%	(23)	100%	(51)	100%	(8)	100%	(82)

Table III-5

**WHETHER SDA HAS MORE THAN ONE JURISDICTION
BY TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY**

| | MULTIJURISDICTIONAL SDA? | | | | ALL SDAS | |
	YES		NO			
ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE						
PIC	57%	(13)	43%	(10)	100%	(23)
GOVERNMENT	59%	(29)	41%	(20)	100%	(49)
CBO/OTHER	86%	(6)	14%	(1)	100%	(7)
ALL SDAS	61%	(48)	39%	(31)	100%	(79)

Table III-6

SDA ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE AND MEAN NUMBER OF JURISDICTIONS

	NUMBER	PERCENT	MEAN NUMBER OF JURISDICTIONS
ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE			
PIC	23	28%	3.9
GOVERNMENT	51	62%	4.1
CBO/OTHER	8	10%	5.1
ALL SDAS	82	100%	4.1

Table III-7

WHETHER SDA WAS A CETA PRIME SPONSOR
BY TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY

	SDA PRIME SPONSOR UNDER CETA				ALL SDAS	
	YES		NO			
ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE						
PIC	57%	(13)	43%	(10)	100%	(23)
GOVERNMENT	66%	(33)	34%	(17)	100%	(50)
CBO/OTHER	38%	(3)	63%	(5)	100%	(8)
ALL SDAS	60%	(49)	40%	(32)	100%	(81)

Table III-8

WHETHER STATE STAFF REPRESENTED BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
BY WHETHER INCLUDED IN A CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM

| | STAFF REPRESENTED BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING | | ALL STATES |
	YES	NO	
WHETHER CIVIL SERVICE			
YES	38% (15)	41% (16)	79% (31)
NO	8% (3)	13% (5)	21% (8)
ALL STATES	46% (18)	54% (21)	100% (39)

Table III-9

WHETHER SDA STAFF REPRESENTED BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
BY WHETHER INCLUDED IN A CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM

| | STAFF REPRESENTED BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING | | ALL SDAS | |
	YES	NO		
WHETHER CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM				
YES	5% (4)	16% (13)	21% (17)	
NO	11% (9)	68% (55)	79% (64)	
ALL SDAS	16% (13)	84% (68)	100% (81)	

Table III-10

MEAN NUMBER OF STATE JTPA STAFF
BY TOTAL STATE FUNDS IN PY 88

	MEAN NUMBER OF STAFF	PERCENT
PY 88 STATE FUNDS LESS THAN $500,000	15	35%
$500,000 TO $2 MILLION	39	35%
MORE THAN $2 MILLION	88	30%
ALL STATES (n=40)	44	100%

TABLE INCLUDES STAFF BOTH WITHIN AND OUTSIDE JTPA UNIT

Table III-11

WHETHER SINGLE STAFF FOR SJTCC AND JTPA UNIT

	PERCENT	N
SINGLE STAFF FOR SJTCC/JTPA		
YES	79%	(30)
NO	21%	(8)
ALL STATES	100%	(38)

79

Table III-12

MEAN NUMBER OF SDA STAFF POSITIONS IN PY 88

	NUMBER OF II-A AE STAFF	NUMBER OF II-B AE STAFF	NUMBER OF NON-JTPA AE STAFF
Mean	24.9	13.1	6.2
Median	23.1	4.5	.0
Standard Deviation	19.4	25.7	13.9
Minimum	2.0	.0	.0
Maximum	96.0	168.0	76.0
Number of SDAs Responding	68	51	35

STAFF POSITIONS EXPRESSED IN FTEs

Table III-13

MEAN NUMBER OF SDA STAFF POSITIONS IN PY 89

	NUMBER OF II-A AE STAFF	NUMBER OF II-B AE STAFF	NUMBER OF NON-JTPA AE STAFF
Mean	26.3	14.8	11.9
Median	22.0	8.0	5.0
Standard Deviation	21.4	28.7	18.2
Minimum	2.0	1.0	.3
Maximum	96.0	185.0	80.0
Number of SDAs Responding	79	45	19

STAFF POSITIONS EXPRESSED IN FTEs

Table III-14

MEAN NUMBER OF SDA STAFF BY ALLOCATION IN PY 88

	NUMBER OF II-A AE STAFF	
	MEAN NUMBER OF STAFF	PERCENT
PY 88 II-A ALLOCATION		
BELOW $1 MILLION	13	15%
$1-1.9 MILLION	21	39%
$2-6.9 MILLION	28	40%
$7 MILLION & ABOVE	59	6%
ALL SDAS (n=82)	25	100%

81

Table III-15

WHETHER SINGLE STAFF FOR AE AND PIC
BY TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY

| | SINGLE STAFF FOR AE & PIC | | | | ALL SDAS | |
	YES		NO			
ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE						
PIC	100%	(23)	0%	(0)	100%	(23)
GOVERNMENT	82%	(42)	18%	(9)	100%	(51)
CBO/OTHER	88%	(7)	13%	(1)	100%	(8)
ALL SDAS	88%	(72)	12%	(10)	100%	(82)

Table III-16

NUMBER OF SDA STAFF SUPPORTED BY ADMIN FUNDS IN PY 89

	STAFF POSITIONS IN THE AE	STAFF POSITIONS ON THE PIC	STAFF POSITIONS OUTSIDE THE AE/PIC
Mean	12.8	2.2	4.2
Standard Deviation	13.6	1.1	4.4
Median	8.5	2.0	2.0
Minimum	1.5	1.0	.3
Maximum	70.0	4.0	11.0
Number of SDAs Responding	63	7	5

MEAN DOLLARS FOR SDA ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF POSITIONS IN PY 89

	DOLLARS WITHIN THE AE	DOLLARS FOR SEPARATE PIC STAFF	DOLLARS FOR OUTSIDE STAFF
Mean	$445,060	$49,986	$80,746
Standard Deviation	$630,534	$27,752	$80,373
Median	$255,000	$52,801	$51,449
Minimum	$37,300	$18,435	$8,000
Maximum	$3,757,994	$85,200	$224,740
Number of SDAs Responding	69	8	8

MEAN DOLLARS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF POSITIONS IN PY 88

	DOLLARS WITHIN THE AE	DOLLARS FOR SEPARATE PIC STAFF	DOLLARS FOR OUTSIDE STAFF
Mean	$397,881	$56,581	$78,205
Standard Deviation	$485,009	$30,068	$79,704
Median	$252,612	$62,716	$49,949
Minimum	$38,350	$20,134	$8,000
Maximum	$2,384,000	$100,000	$224,740
Number of SDAs Responding	67	7	8

Table III-17

NUMBER OF SDA STAFF SUPPORTED BY SERVICE FUNDS IN PY 89

	STAFF POSITIONS IN THE AE	STAFF POSITIONS ON THE PIC
Mean	18.5	3.3
Standard Deviation	14.9	4.5
Median	15.0	1.0
Minimum	.5	1.0
Maximum	70.0	10.0
Number of SDAs Responding	45	4

MEAN DOLLARS FOR SDA SERVICE STAFF POSITIONS IN PY 89

	DOLLARS WITHIN THE AE	DOLLARS FOR SEPARATE PIC STAFF
Mean	$388,018	$88,713
Standard Deviation	$346,146	$140,979
Median	$317,000	$20,741
Minimum	$12,000	$13,371
Maximum	$1,434,000	$300,000
Number of SDAs Responding	52	4

MEAN DOLLARS FOR SDA SERVICE STAFF POSITIONS IN PY 88

	DOLLARS WITHIN THE AE	DOLLARS FOR SEPARATE PIC STAFF
Mean	$384,008	$24,141
Standard Deviation	$313,214	$11,140
Median	$354,136	$24,141
Minimum	$11,100	$16,263
Maximum	$1,264,968	$32,018
Number of SDAs Responding	48	2

Table III-18
WHO PERFORMS VARIOUS STATE JTPA FUNCTIONS

	JTPA OR SJTCC STAFF DOES MOST	OUTSIDE STAFF OR CONTRACTOR DOES MOST	FUNCTION SHARED
SJTCC SUPPORT	84%	8%	8%
DEVELOPING THE GCSSP	95%	3%	3%
TARGET GROUP POLICIES	82%	3%	16%
DESIGNATING SDAS	89%	6%	6%
APPROVING SDA PLANS	86%	6%	9%
ALLOCATION OF NON-78% FUNDS	84%	5%	11%
DEVELOPING RECAPTURE POLICIES	89%	3%	9%
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS POLICIES	84%	3%	13%
PLANNING & PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	89%	3%	8%
LIAISON WITH & TA TO SDAS	92%	6%	3%
LIAISON WITH ELECTED OFFICIALS	78%	11%	11%
INTERAGENCY COORDINATION	79%	5%	16%
LABOR MARKET RESEARCH	30%	51%	19%
MIS	87%	10%	3%
COMPUTER OPERATIONS	50%	40%	10%
EVALUATION	81%	8%	11%
PERSONNEL & LABOR RELATIONS	37%	46%	17%
STAFF TRAINING	60%	20%	20%
BUDGETING	82%	10%	8%
ACCOUNTING	53%	28%	20%
CONTRACT MONITORING	95%	3%	3%
AUDITING	24%	66%	11%
AUDIT RESOLUTIONS	74%	18%	8%
OTHER FISCAL SERVICES	46%	49%	5%
LEGAL SUPPORT	8%	89%	3%

PERCENTAGES MAY NOT ADD TO 100 DUE TO ROUNDING

Table III-19

WHETHER STATE JTPA AGENCY ADMINISTERS SDA PROGRAMS

	PERCENT	N
JTPA ADMINISTERS SDA PROGRAMS		
YES	39%	(15)
NO	61%	(23)
ALL STATES	100%	(38)

Table III-20
WHO PERFORMS WHICH FUNCTIONS IN SDAS

	AE OR PIC STAFF DOES MOST	OUTSIDE STAFF OR VENDOR DOES MOST	FUNCTION SHARED
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	88%	1%	11%
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	93%	3%	5%
PUBLIC/PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT	78%	5%	17%
EMPLOYER RELATIONS	73%	8%	20%
DEVELOPING RFPS AND CONTRACTS	95%	1%	4%
CONTRACT MONITORING	96%	3%	1%
BUDGETING	98%	0%	2%
ACCOUNTING	95%	1%	4%
AUDITING	52%	36%	12%
PROCUREMENT	89%	2%	9%
MIS	93%	1%	6%
COMPUTER OPERATIONS	86%	5%	9%
RESEARCH & EVALUATION	60%	17%	23%
PERSONNEL	82%	8%	9%
STAFF TRAINING	51%	20%	29%
LEGAL SUPPORT	43%	43%	14%
OUTREACH & INTAKE	53%	27%	20%
ASSESSMENT & COUNSELING	54%	27%	19%
JOB DEVELOPMENT & PLACMENT	50%	36%	14%
ON-THE-JOB TRAINING	54%	35%	12%
CLASSROOM TRAINING	22%	55%	22%

PERCENTAGES MAY NOT ADD TO 100 DUE TO ROUNDING

Table III-21

MEAN ALLOCATION AND AMOUNT SPENT ON OUTSIDE SERVICE PROVIDERS
BY TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY

	PY 88 TITLE II-A ALLOCATION	$ SPENT ON OUTSIDE CONTRACTING	PERCENT SPENT ON OUTSIDE CONTRACTING
	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN
ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE			
PIC	$4,412,351	$3,092,978	50
GOVERNMENT	$2,340,994	$1,524,236	58
CBO/OTHER	$1,634,332	$984,986	67
ALL SDAS	$2,853,042	$1,922,550	56

Table III-22

**PERCENT OF SDA ALLOCATION SPENT ON OUTSIDE CONTRACTING
BY STAFF SIZE**

	MEAN PERCENT
II-A STAFF SIZE IN PY 88	
0 - 10	68
11 - 30	56
31 +	47
ALL SDAS	56

Table III-23

PERCEIVED STATE STAFF SIZE ADEQUACY
BY TOTAL STATE FUNDS IN PY 88

	SUFFICIENT NUMBER OF STAFF				ALL STATES	
	YES		NO			
PY 88 STATE FUNDS						
LESS THAN $500,000	21%	(3)	79%	(11)	100%	(14)
$500,000 TO $2 MILLION	36%	(5)	64%	(9)	100%	(14)
GREATER THAN $2 MILLION	58%	(7)	42%	(5)	100%	(12)
ALL STATES	38%	(15)	63%	(25)	100%	(40)

Table III-24

PERCEIVED SDA STAFF SIZE ADEQUACY
BY PY 88 II-A ALLOCATION AND TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY

| | SUFFICIENT NUMBER OF STAFF | | | | ALL SDAS | |
	YES		NO			
PY 88 II-A ALLOCATION BELOW $1						
MILLION	55%	(6)	45%	(5)	100%	(11)
$1-1.9 MILLION	77%	(24)	23%	(7)	100%	(31)
$2-6.9 MILLION	79%	(26)	21%	(7)	100%	(33)
$7 MILLION & ABOVE	75%	(3)	25%	(1)	100%	(4)
ALL SDAS	75%	(59)	25%	(20)	100%	(79)
ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE						
PIC	86%	(19)	14%	(3)	100%	(22)
GOVERNMENT	67%	(33)	33%	(16)	100%	(49)
CBO/OTHER	88%	(7)	13%	(1)	100%	(8)
ALL SDAS	75%	(59)	25%	(20)	100%	(79)

Table III-25

ANNUAL SALARY RANGE FOR SELECTED STATE STAFF POSITIONS

	UNDER $15,000	$15,000-$24,999	$25,000-$34,999	$35,000-$44,999	$45,000 OR MORE
STATE JTPA DIRECTOR SALARY	0%	0%	5%	24%	71%
CHIEF PLANNER'S SALARY	0%	4%	26%	44%	26%
FISCAL MANAGER'S SALARY	0%	8%	31%	33%	28%
MIS MANAGER'S SALARY	3%	6%	42%	36%	14%
HEAD GRANT ADMINSTRATOR'S SALARY	0%	0%	30%	48%	21%
PERF POLICY MANAGER'S SALARY	0%	4%	48%	35%	13%
FIELD REP/SDA MON/LIAISON SALARY	3%	13%	50%	24%	11%

Table III-26

ANNUAL SALARY RANGE FOR SELECTED SDA STAFF POSITIONS

	UNDER $15,000	$15,000-$24,999	$25,000-$34,999	$35,000-$44,999	$45,000 OR MORE
SDA DIRECTOR SALARY	0%	1%	29%	31%	38%
CHIEF PLANNER'S SALARY	0%	29%	33%	30%	8%
FISCAL MANAGER'S SALARY	1%	27%	40%	27%	4%
MIS MANAGER'S SALARY	6%	54%	31%	8%	1%
DIRECTOR OF OJT/CRT'S SALARY	0%	24%	50%	18%	8%
JOB DEVELOPER'S SALARY	6%	63%	23%	8%	0%
INTAKE WORKER'S SALARY	16%	71%	14%	0%	0%
VOCATIONAL COUNSELOR'S SALARY	4%	65%	29%	2%	0%

Table III-27

BENEFITS RECEIVED BY STATE STAFF
BY AMOUNT OF STATE FUNDING

	PY 88 STATE FUNDS			ALL STATES	
	LESS THAN $500,000		$500,000 TO $2 MILLION		GREATER THAN $2 MILLION		
STAFF BENEFITS								
PAID VACATION	100%	(14)	100%	(14)	100%	(12)	100%	(40)
PAID SICK LEAVE	100%	(14)	100%	(14)	100%	(12)	100%	(40)
RETIREMENT PLAN	100%	(14)	100%	(14)	100%	(12)	100%	(40)
EMPLOYER-PAID								
HEALTH INS	93%	(13)	100%	(14)	67%	(8)	88%	(35)
EMPLOYER-PAID								
DENTAL INS	71%	(10)	71%	(10)	50%	(6)	65%	(26)
OTHER	43%	(6)	21%	(3)	33%	(4)	33%	(13)
ALL STATES	100%	(14)	100%	(14)	100%	(12)	100%	(40)

Table III-28

BENEFITS RECEIVED BY SDA STAFF
BY ALLOCATION AND TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY

| | PY 88 II-A ALLOCATION | | | | ALL SDAS | |
	BELOW $1 MILLION		$1-1.9 MILLION		$2-6.9 MILLION		$7 MILLION & ABOVE			
BENEFITS										
PAID VACATION	100%	(12)	100%	(32)	100%	(32)	100%	(5)	100%	(81)
PAID SICK LEAVE	100%	(12)	97%	(31)	97%	(31)	80%	(4)	96%	(78)
RETIREMENT PLAN	92%	(11)	84%	(27)	97%	(31)	100%	(5)	91%	(74)
EMPLOYER-PAID HEALTH INS	100%	(12)	94%	(30)	97%	(31)	80%	(4)	95%	(77)
EMPLOYER-PAID DENTAL INS	67%	(8)	53%	(17)	81%	(26)	80%	(4)	68%	(55)
OTHER	0%	(0)	25%	(8)	25%	(8)	40%	(2)	22%	(18)
ALL SDAS	100%	(12)	100%	(32)	100%	(32)	100%	(5)	100%	(81)

| | ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE | | | | | | ALL SDAS | |
	PIC		GOVERNMENT		CBO/OTHER			
BENEFITS								
PAID VACATION	100%	(23)	100%	(50)	100%	(8)	100%	(81)
PAID SICK LEAVE	96%	(22)	98%	(49)	88%	(7)	96%	(78)
RETIREMENT PLAN	83%	(19)	96%	(48)	88%	(7)	91%	(74)
EMPLOYER-PAID HEALTH INS	96%	(22)	96%	(48)	88%	(7)	95%	(77)
EMPLOYER-PAID DENTAL INS	70%	(16)	70%	(35)	50%	(4)	68%	(55)
OTHER	30%	(7)	18%	(9)	25%	(2)	22%	(18)
ALL SDAS	100%	(23)	100%	(50)	100%	(8)	100%	(81)

Table III-29

MOST COMMON RECRUITMENT DIFFICULTIES IN STATES
BY AMOUNT OF STATE FUNDING

	PY 88 STATE FUNDS			ALL STATES	
	LESS THAN $500,000		$500,000 TO $2 MILLION		GREATER THAN $2 MILLION			
RECRUITMENT DIFFICULTIES										
CIVIL SERVICE HIRING PROCEDURES	42%	(5)	50%	(5)	91%	(10)	61%	(20)
SALARY TOO LOW	50%	(6)	60%	(6)	45%	(5)	52%	(17)
LACK OF PROMOTIONAL OPPORTUNITIES	50%	(6)	40%	(4)	18%	(2)	36%	(12)
SKILLS RARE IN LABOR MARKET	25%	(3)	40%	(4)	36%	(4)	33%	(11)
SKILLS IN DEMAND IN LABOR MARKET	25%	(3)	20%	(2)	18%	(2)	21%	(7)
JOB TENURE TOO UNSURE	17%	(2)	20%	(2)	0%	(0)	12%	(4)
WORKING CONDITIONS	0%	(0)	10%	(1)	9%	(1)	6%	(2)
POOR BENEFITS	0%	(0)	0%	(0)	0%	(0)	0%	(0)
OTHER	17%	(2)	0%	(0)	27%	(3)	15%	(5)
ALL STATES	100%	(12)	100%	(10)	100%	(11)	100%	(33)

STATE DIRECTORS WERE ASKED TO SPECIFY THREE MOST COMMON REASONS;
DATA INDICATE TOTAL NUMBER CHECKING EACH REASON

96

Table III-30

MOST COMMON RECRUITMENT DIFFICULTIES IN SDAS
BY ALLOCATION

	PY 88 II-A ALLOCATION								ALL SDAS	
	BELOW $1 MILLION		$1-1.9 MILLION		$2-6.9 MILLION		$7 MILLION & ABOVE			
SALARY TOO LOW	71%	(5)	83%	(19)	60%	(12)	60%	(3)	71%	(39)
LACK OF PROMOTIONAL OPPORTUNITIES	100%	(7)	43%	(10)	30%	(6)	20%	(1)	44%	(24)
JOB TENURE TOO UNSURE	57%	(4)	57%	(13)	25%	(5)	0%	(0)	40%	(22)
SKILLS RARE IN LABOR MARKET AREA	0%	(0)	17%	(4)	45%	(9)	40%	(2)	27%	(15)
SKILLS GREAT DEMAND LABOR MARKET AREA	14%	(1)	17%	(4)	30%	(6)	40%	(2)	24%	(13)
CIVIL SERVICE HIRING PROCEDURES	14%	(1)	4%	(1)	10%	(2)	40%	(2)	11%	(6)
POOR BENEFITS	14%	(1)	13%	(3)	0%	(0)	0%	(0)	7%	(4)
WORKING CONDITIONS	0%	(0)	9%	(2)	0%	(0)	0%	(0)	4%	(2)
ALL SDAS	100%	(7)	100%	(23)	100%	(20)	100%	(5)	100%	(55)

SDA DIRECTORS WERE ASKED TO SPECIFY THREE MOST COMMON REASONS;
DATA INDICATE TOTAL NUMBER CHECKING EACH REASON;
27 DIRECTORS CHECKED NO REASONS

97

Table III-31

STATE DIRECTORS' RATINGS OF DIFFICULTY OF STAFF RECRUITMENT
BY AMOUNT OF STATE FUNDING AND SIZE OF STATE STAFF

	MEAN RATING	NUMBER OF STATES
PY 88 STATE FUNDS		
LESS THAN $500,000	2.6	(14)
$500,000 TO $2 MILLION	2.7	(14)
GREATER THAN $2 MILLION	2.8	(12)
ALL STATES	2.7	(40)
TOTAL STAFF IN PY 88		
1 - 20	2.4	(12)
21 - 60	3.0	(15)
61 +	2.4	(8)
ALL STATES	2.6	(35)

RECRUITMENT DIFFICULTY SCORED ON A 1-5 SCALE
1 = NO PROBLEM, 5 = SERIOUS PROBLEM

Table III-32

SDA DIRECTORS' RATINGS OF DIFFICULTY OF STAFF RECRUITMENT
BY ALLOCATION, STAFF SIZE, AND TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY

	MEAN RATING	NUMBER OF SDAS
PY 88 II-A ALLOCATION		
BELOW $1 MILLION	1.8	(12)
$1-1.9 MILLION	2.5	(32)
$2-6.9 MILLION	2.1	(33)
$7 MILLION & ABOVE	2.0	(5)
ALL SDAS	2.2	(82)
II-A STAFF SIZE IN PY 88		
0 - 10	1.7	(18)
11 - 30	2.5	(28)
31 +	2.1	(22)
ALL SDAS	2.2	(68)
ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE		
PIC	2.3	(23)
GOVERNMENT	2.2	(51)
CBO/OTHER	1.9	(8)
ALL SDAS	2.2	(82)

RECRUITMENT DIFFICULTY SCORED ON A 1-5 SCALE
1 - NO PROBLEM, 5 - SERIOUS PROBLEM

Table III-33

STATE DIRECTORS' RATINGS OF DIFFICULTY OF STAFF RECRUITMENT
BY WHETHER TITLE II-A STAFF POSITIONS INCREASED OR DECREASED SINCE PY 88

	DIFFICULTY RECRUITING STAFF	
	MEAN RATING	Number of states
CHANGE IN II-A POSITIONS		
INCREASED	3.2	(14)
REMAINED SAME	2.3	(12)
DECREASED	2.3	(12)
ALL STATES	2.6	(38)

RECRUITMENT DIFFICULTY SCORED ON A 1-5 SCALE
1 - NO PROBLEM, 5 - SERIOUS PROBLEM

Table III-34

**SDA DIRECTORS' RATINGS OF DIFFICULTY OF STAFF RECRUITMENT
BY WHETHER TITLE II-A STAFF POSITIONS INCREASED OR DECREASED SINCE PY 88**

	DIFFICULTY RECRUITING STAFF	
	MEAN RATING	Number of SDAs
CHANGE IN II-A POSITIONS		
INCREASED	2.1	(21)
REMAINED SAME	2.1	(36)
DECREASED	2.4	(25)
ALL SDAS	2.2	(82)

RECRUITMENT DIFFICULTY SCORED ON A 1-5 SCALE
1 — NO PROBLEM, 5 — SERIOUS PROBLEM

101

Table III-35

MEAN NUMBER OF STATE STAFF PROMOTED IN PY 88
BY AMOUNT OF JTPA FUNDS

	PY 88 STATE FUNDS			ALL STATES
	LESS THAN $500,000	$500,000 TO $2 MILLION	GREATER THAN $2 MILLION	
EMPLOYEES PROMOTED MEAN	2.2	2.0	3.8	2.5
Number of States	(11)	(11)	(6)	(28)

Table III-36

MEAN NUMBER OF SDA STAFF PROMOTED IN PY 88
BY ALLOCATION AND TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY

| | PY 88 II-A ALLOCATION | | | | ALL SDAS |
	BELOW $1 MILLION	$1-1.9 MILLION	$2-6.9 MILLION	$7 MILLION & ABOVE	
EMPLOYEES PROMOTED MEAN Number of SDAs	1.4 (5)	2.6 (21)	3.3 (27)	10.8 (5)	3.5 (58)

| | ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE | | | ALL SDAS |
	PIC	GOVERNMENT	CBO/OTHER	
EMPLOYEES PROMOTED MEAN Number of SDAs	5.4 (20)	2.6 (34)	2.5 (4)	3.5 (58)

103

Table III-37

STATE DIRECTORS' RATINGS OF SERIOUSNESS OF STAFF TURNOVER
BY AMOUNT OF STATE FUNDING AND SIZE OF STATE STAFF

	MEAN RATING	NUMBER OF STATES
PY 88 STATE FUNDS		
LESS THAN $500,000	1.7	(14)
$500,000 TO $2 MILLION	2.4	(14)
GREATER THAN $2 MILLION	2.1	(12)
ALL STATES	2.1	(40)
TOTAL STAFF IN PY 88		
1 - 20	1.7	(12)
21 - 60	2.3	(15)
61 +	2.4	(8)
ALL STATES	2.1	(35)

TURNOVER PROBLEMS SCORED ON A 1-5 SCALE
1 – NO PROBLEM, 5 – SERIOUS PROBLEM

Table III-38

SDA DIRECTORS' RATINGS OF SERIOUSNESS OF STAFF TURNOVER BY ALLOCATION, STAFF SIZE, AND TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY

	MEAN RATING	NUMBER OF SDAS
PY 88 II-A ALLOCATION		
BELOW $1 MILLION	1.6	(12)
$1-1.9 MILLION	1.9	(32)
$2-6.9 MILLION	1.7	(33)
$7 MILLION & ABOVE	1.4	(5)
ALL SDAS	1.7	(82)
II-A STAFF SIZE IN PY 88		
0 - 10	1.3	(18)
11 - 30	1.9	(28)
31 +	1.9	(22)
ALL SDAS	1.7	(68)
ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE		
PIC	2.0	(23)
GOVERNMENT	1.6	(51)
CBO/OTHER	1.5	(8)
ALL SDAS	1.7	(82)

TURNOVER PROBLEMS SCORED ON A 1-5 SCALE
1 — NO PROBLEM, 5 — SERIOUS PROBLEM

Table III-39

MEAN NUMBER OF STATE STAFF WHO LEFT IN PY 88
AND CURRENT POSITIONS VACANT
BY AMOUNT OF JTPA FUNDS

	PY 88 STATE FUNDS			ALL STATES
	LESS THAN $500,000	$500,000 TO $2 MILLION	GREATER THAN $2 MILLION	
EMPLOYEES WHO LEFT				
MEAN	2.9	3.4	3.7	3.3
Number of States	(11)	(10)	(9)	(30)
MANAGEMENT POSITIONS VACANT				
MEAN	1.0	1.0	2.5	1.2
Number of States	(6)	(5)	(2)	(13)
SENIOR PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS VACANT				
MEAN	1.8	2.2	1.5	1.8
Number of States	(8)	(6)	(4)	(18)
JUNIOR PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS VACANT				
MEAN	2.3	.8	3.8	2.4
Number of States	(4)	(4)	(5)	(13)
CLERICAL POSTIONS VACANT				
MEAN	1.8	.7	1.0	1.2
Number of States	(5)	(6)	(2)	(13)

Table III-40

MEAN NUMBER OF SDA STAFF WHO LEFT IN PY 88
AND CURRENT POSITIONS VACANT
BY ALLOCATION

	PY 88 II-A ALLOCATION				ALL SDAS
	BELOW $1 MILLION	$1-1.9 MILLION	$2-6.9 MILLION	$7 MILLION & ABOVE	
EMPLOYEES WHO LEFT					
MEAN	2.6	2.8	3.2	10.4	3.4
Number of SDAs	(11)	(32)	(33)	(5)	(81)
MANAGEMENT POSITIONS VACANT					
MEAN	.3	.1	.2	.3	.2
Number of SDAs	(9)	(21)	(27)	(3)	(60)
SENIOR PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS VACANT					
MEAN	.5	.2	.2	1.0	.3
Number of SDAs	(10)	(20)	(23)	(4)	(57)
JUNIOR PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS VACANT					
MEAN	.4	.5	.8	2.0	.7
Number of SDAs	(8)	(23)	(25)	(5)	(61)
CLERICAL POSITIONS VACANT					
MEAN	.3	.3	.6	1.4	.5
Number of SDAs	(9)	(20)	(27)	(5)	(61)

Table III-41

MEAN NUMBER OF SDA STAFF WHO LEFT IN PY 88
AND CURRENT POSITIONS VACANT
BY TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY

	ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE			ALL SDAS
	PIC	GOVERNMENT	CBO/OTHER	
EMPLOYEES WHO LEFT				
MEAN	5.4	2.7	1.9	3.4
Number of SDAs	(23)	(50)	(8)	(81)
MANAGEMENT POSITIONS VACANT				
MEAN	.1	.3	.0	.2
Number of SDAs	(16)	(39)	(5)	(60)
SENIOR PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS VACANT				
MEAN	.2	.3	.3	.3
Number of SDAs	(16)	(35)	(6)	(57)
JUNIOR PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS VACANT				
MEAN	.8	.7	.4	.7
Number of SDAs	(17)	(39)	(5)	(61)
CLERICAL POSITIONS VACANT				
MEAN	.8	.4	.2	.5
Number of SDAs	(18)	(37)	(6)	(61)

108

Table III-42

**STATE DIRECTORS' RATINGS OF SERIOUSNESS OF STAFF TURNOVER
BY RATE OF STAFF TURNOVER IN PY 88**

	STAFF TURNOVER PROBLEM	
	MEAN RATING	Number of states
PERCENT WHO LEFT		
LESS THAN 10%	1.7	(13)
10 - 19%	2.4	(8)
MORE THAN 20%	2.3	(4)
ALL STATES	2.0	(25)

TURNOVER PROBLEMS SCORED ON A 1-5 SCALE
1 = NO PROBLEM, 5 = SERIOUS PROBLEM

Table III-43

SDA DIRECTORS' RATINGS OF SERIOUSNESS OF STAFF TURNOVER
BY RATE OF STAFF TURNOVER IN PY 88

	STAFF TURNOVER PROBLEM	
	MEAN RATING	Number of SDAs
PERCENT WHO LEFT		
LESS THAN 10%	1.3	(32)
10 - 19%	2.0	(20)
MORE THAN 20%	2.3	(15)
ALL SDAS	1.7	(67)

TURNOVER PROBLEMS SCORED ON A 1-5 SCALE
1 = NO PROBLEM, 5 = SERIOUS PROBLEM

Table III-44

MOST COMMON REASONS FOR TURNOVER IN STATES
BY AMOUNT OF STATE FUNDING

	PY 88 STATE FUNDS			ALL STATES	
	LESS THAN $500,000		$500,000 TO $2 MILLION		GREATER THAN $2 MILLION			
TURNOVER REASONS								
LACK OF PROMOTIONAL OPPORTUNITIES	50%	(6)	62%	(8)	58%	(7)	57%	(21)
INTERNAL PROMOTIONS	33%	(4)	31%	(4)	58%	(7)	41%	(15)
SALARY TOO LOW	58%	(7)	38%	(5)	33%	(4)	43%	(16)
SOUGHT GREATER JOB RESPONSIBILITY	33%	(4)	46%	(6)	25%	(3)	35%	(13)
RETIRED	25%	(3)	38%	(5)	25%	(3)	30%	(11)
PERSONAL/FAMILY REASONS	50%	(6)	23%	(3)	25%	(3)	32%	(12)
BURNOUT	8%	(1)	38%	(5)	25%	(3)	24%	(9)
REDUCTION DUE TO DECLINING FUNDS	8%	(1)	23%	(3)	25%	(3)	19%	(7)
SOUGHT GREATER JOB SECURITY	8%	(1)	38%	(5)	8%	(1)	19%	(7)
FIRED FOR CAUSE	0%	(0)	15%	(2)	0%	(0)	5%	(2)
POOR BENEFITS	0%	(0)	0%	(0)	0%	(0)	0%	(0)
LOCATION NOT CONVENIENT	0%	(0)	0%	(0)	0%	(0)	0%	(0)
OTHER	25%	(3)	23%	(3)	17%	(2)	22%	(8)
ALL STATES	100%	(12)	100%	(13)	100%	(12)	100%	(37)

STATE DIRECTORS WERE ASKED TO SPECIFY FIVE MOST COMMON REASONS;
DATA INDICATE TOTAL NUMBER CHECKING EACH REASON

Table III-45

MOST COMMON REASONS FOR TURNOVER IN SDAS
BY ALLOCATION

	PY 88 II-A ALLOCATION				ALL SDAS	
	BELOW $1 MILLION		$1-1.9 MILLION		$2-6.9 MILLION	$7 MILLION & ABOVE
SALARY TOO LOW	75% (6)	58% (18)	48% (14)	100% (4)	58% (42)
LACK OF PROMOTIONAL OPPORTUNITIES	63% (5)	42% (13)	31% (9)	50% (2)	40% (29)
STAFFER SOUGHT GREATER JOB SECURITY	88% (7)	35% (11)	31% (9)	25% (1)	39% (28)
PERSONAL/FAMILY REASONS	38% (3)	32% (10)	38% (11)	50% (2)	36% (26)
STAFFER SOUGHT GREATER JOB RESPONSIBILITY	50% (4)	29% (9)	34% (10)	25% (1)	33% (24)
STAFF REDUCTION DUE TO LESS $	63% (5)	42% (13)	17% (5)	0% (0)	32% (23)
BURNOUT	13% (1)	26% (8)	24% (7)	0% (0)	22% (16)
FIRED FOR CAUSE	0% (0)	19% (6)	17% (5)	25% (1)	17% (12)
RETIRED	0% (0)	23% (7)	17% (5)	50% (2)	19% (14)
INTERNAL PROMOTIONS	0% (0)	23% (7)	14% (4)	0% (0)	15% (11)
POOR BENEFITS	0% (0)	13% (4)	7% (2)	0% (0)	8% (6)
LOCATION NOT CONVENIENT	0% (0)	3% (1)	3% (1)	0% (0)	3% (2)
OTHER	13% (1)	10% (3)	21% (6)	0% (0)	14% (10)
ALL SDAS	100% (8)	100% (31)	100% (29)	100% (4)	100% (72)

SDA DIRECTORS WERE ASKED TO SPECIFY FIVE MOST COMMON REASONS;
DATA INDICATE TOTAL NUMBER CHECKING EACH REASON;
10 DIRECTORS CHECKED NO REASONS

112

Table III-46

MOST COMMON REASONS FOR TURNOVER IN SDAS
BY TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY

	ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE						ALL SDAS	
	PIC		GOVERNMENT		CBO/OTHER			
SALARY TOO LOW	68%	(13)	60%	(27)	25%	(2)	58%	(42)
LACK OF PROMOTIONAL OPPORTUNITIES	47%	(9)	44%	(20)	0%	(0)	40%	(29)
STAFFER SOUGHT GREATER JOB SECURITY	37%	(7)	38%	(17)	50%	(4)	39%	(28)
PERSONAL/FAMILY REASONS	42%	(8)	33%	(15)	38%	(3)	36%	(26)
STAFFER SOUGHT GREATER JOB RESPONSIBILITY	47%	(9)	27%	(12)	38%	(3)	33%	(24)
STAFF REDUCTION DUE TO LESS $	21%	(4)	38%	(17)	25%	(2)	32%	(23)
BURNOUT	5%	(1)	29%	(13)	25%	(2)	22%	(16)
FIRED FOR CAUSE	32%	(6)	13%	(6)	0%	(0)	17%	(12)
RETIRED	16%	(3)	20%	(9)	25%	(2)	19%	(14)
INTERNAL PROMOTIONS	16%	(3)	18%	(8)	0%	(0)	15%	(11)
POOR BENEFITS	11%	(2)	7%	(3)	13%	(1)	8%	(6)
LOCATION NOT CONVENIENT	0%	(0)	4%	(2)	0%	(0)	3%	(2)
OTHER	11%	(2)	13%	(6)	25%	(2)	14%	(10)
ALL SDAS	100%	(19)	100%	(45)	100%	(8)	100%	(72)

SDA DIRECTORS WERE ASKED TO SPECIFY FIVE MOST COMMON REASONS;
DATA INDICATE TOTAL NUMBER CHECKING EACH REASON;
10 DIRECTORS CHECKED NO REASONS

113

Table III-47

RATE OF TURNOVER OF STATE STAFF IN PY 88
BY AMOUNT OF STATE FUNDING AND SIZE OF STATE STAFF

	PERCENT WHO LEFT	
	MEAN	Number of States
PY 88 STATE FUNDS		
LESS THAN $500,000	17.9	(14)
$500,000 TO $2 MILLION	10.9	(14)
GREATER THAN $2 MILLION	6.0	(12)
ALL STATES	12.3	(40)
TOTAL STAFF IN PY 88		
1 - 20	19.1	(12)
21 - 60	10.7	(15)
61 +	5.6	(8)
ALL STATES	12.3	(35)

Table III-48

RATE OF TURNOVER OF SDA STAFF IN PY 88
BY ALLOCATION, STAFF SIZE, AND TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY

	PERCENT WHO LEFT	
	MEAN	Number of SDAS
PY 88 II-A ALLOCATION		
BELOW $1 MILLION	17.1	(12)
$1-1.9 MILLION	13.7	(32)
$2-6.9 MILLION	13.4	(33)
$7 MILLION & ABOVE	11.2	(5)
ALL SDAS	13.9	(82)
II-A STAFF SIZE IN PY 88		
0 - 10	13.3	(18)
11 - 30	15.6	(28)
31 +	12.4	(22)
ALL SDAS	13.9	(68)
ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE		
PIC	17.8	(23)
GOVERNMENT	10.8	(51)
CBO/OTHER	25.2	(8)
ALL SDAS	13.9	(82)

Table III-49

RATE OF TURNOVER OF STATE STAFF
BY WHETHER TITLE II-A STAFF POSITIONS INCREASED OR DECREASED SINCE PY 87

	PERCENT WHO LEFT	
	MEAN	Number of states
CHANGE IN II-A POSITIONS		
INCREASED	9.5	(14)
REMAINED SAME	9.4	(12)
DECREASED	17.8	(12)
ALL STATES	12.2	(38)

Table III-40

RATE OF TURNOVER OF SDA STAFF
BY WHETHER TITLE II-A STAFF POSITIONS INCREASED OR DECREASED SINCE PY 87

	PERCENT WHO LEFT	
	MEAN	Number of SDAs
CHANGE IN II-A POSITIONS		
INCREASED	13.3	(21)
REMAINED SAME	11.7	(36)
DECREASED	18.7	(25)
ALL SDAS	13.9	(82)

117

IV. PREFERRED QUALIFICATIONS FOR JTPA STAFF

In the case studies, we asked directors and managers about the skills, education, and experience that they sought for JTPA staff, both overall and within specific units (such as planning or monitoring). We complemented this information -- the management perspective -- by asking participants in the staff surveys what skills, educational background, and experience they would recommend as most appropriate for their own position. This chapter summarizes the results of both inquiries.

THE QUALIFICATIONS SOUGHT BY MANAGEMENT

At the state level, directors and section managers consistently emphasized requiring people who were good communicators, good analysts, good with people, capable of working independently, and familiar with "program" -- not "the program," but simply "program," meaning JTPA specifically and the employment and training field more generally. To obtain the requisite skills, these sources spoke in favor of generalist or varied backgrounds, combined with experience in the JTPA system (or, for some entry-level positions, related programs such as WIN or vocational education). Most professional positions in most of the agencies were categorized as "associate analyst" or "program specialist" classifications, which were in use outside the JTPA program, and often outside the state agency housing the JTPA program.

In one agency, managers spoke approvingly of the great variety in their staff's education, citing degrees in foreign languages, English, art, and science. They also acknowledged, however, that most of the professional staff had degrees in the social sciences or in human service disciplines, such as counseling. For new professional staff, a Bachelor's degree was generally required or strongly preferred. Managers saw this as signalling that the candidate had developed reasonably good analytic and communication skills and capacity to work independently.

There were partial exceptions to the stress on generalist skills and program background, generally in the more technical units. Directors and managers in charge of MIS staff emphasized a need for good computer programming skills. Some fiscal managers required their professional staff to have acquired some sort of accounting background, though not necessarily through a formal program of education in this field. Similarly, some managers of monitoring staff required their professionals to have acquired some degree of auditing experience. In all these cases, however, the managers also emphasized reasonable working familiarity with JTPA; this emphasis was strongest in the case of the monitors.

At the SDA level, professional and managerial position descriptions tended to be more specific to the employment and training field than at the state level. However, the types of educational background described as appropriate were still very broad.

For mid- and higher-level administrative positions, much like at the state level, directors and managers emphasized analytic and communication skills and an ability to get along with people, such as subcontractors or the staff of other agencies. As at the state level, and for similar reasons, a Bachelor's degree was strongly favored (and in some cases a firm requirement) for most administrative and technical positions.

When it came to line staff, however, a number of respondents made the point that degrees were not as important as an appropriate attitude and approach to the participants. Both managers and the staff that we talked with in some agencies felt that it was very important to be sensitive to and able to communicate effectively with the varying types of participants that their programs serve. A number of these respondents believed that current staff needs improvement in this area.

One unit manager offered an interesting comment on the type of experience that she sought in intake and certification staff. She favored background in what she called high-stress public sector

120

positions that involve heavy public contact, citing Postal Service window clerk and traffic ticket counter clerk as examples. Beyond such suitable employment histories, she reported trying to get a feel for candidates' behavior under varying circumstances, and their capacity for technicalities and paperwork.

Several interview participants also mentioned the importance of regarding employment and training as a profession, which implied concern for both clients and the program. In describing what they looked for in hiring new staff (when they had the opportunity), they used such expressions as "sense of responsibility for the program," "must be interested in the field," and "have to be willing to learn -- it takes two years just to figure out JTPA." Other general attributes that they mentioned were good judgment, common sense, and a balance of compassion and objectivity. These were qualities that often did not find their way into formal job announcements or position statements.

STAFF PERSPECTIVES ON APPROPRIATE QUALIFICATIONS AND BACKGROUNDS

The staff surveys contained an open-ended question that asked respondents how they would advise someone else to prepare for their own (the respondents') own position, in terms of the skills needed and the educational background and experience that they would recommend acquiring. The results were postcoded into six frequency tables summarizing the recommendations of state staff and those of SDA staff concerning skills, education, and experience. These tables are displayed at the end of this chapter; a discussion of the frequencies and a comparison between the state-level and SDA-level recommendations on each of the three dimensions follow below.

We also explored how the basic frequencies vary by organizational characteristics, staff function, and the personal backgrounds of responding staff. In order to produce usefully large cell and column frequencies for these cross-tabulations, we first consolidated the initial frequencies into somewhat smaller sets of categories. The

resulting tables of consolidated frequencies are also presented at the end of this chapter, and their results summarized below.

It should be noted that the denominator in all of the tables based on consolidated categories is the number of responses, not the number of respondents. Some respondents entered more than one recommendation within a given category, usually as potential alternatives (for example, degrees in counseling or social welfare). The result was that when we initially produced these tables using numbers of respondents for the denominator, the frequencies in some cells exceeded 100%. Converting denominators has left relative rankings intact, but makes the presentation less confusing.

Recommended Skills

Comparison of State and SDA Frequencies

Tables IV-1 and IV-2 display the basic frequencies concerning the skills recommended by state and SDA staff, respectively. At both levels, the two top-ranked categories are interpersonal skills and written and oral communication skills. However, at the state level, written and oral communication is ranked first and is mentioned nearly twice as frequently as interpersonal skills (60% versus 31%, respectively), whereas at the SDA level the two receive nearly equal percentages and the specific ranking is reversed (52% for interpersonal skills, 46% for communication skills).

Both levels also produce high rankings and substantial percentages for computer skills, skills relating to the respondent's specific position, and organizational/time management skills. However, at the state level these are coupled with a third-place ranking for analytical skills, which receive a substantially lower percentage in the SDA table. The SDA table also contains four skills categories that did not show up among the state recommendations: counseling, fiscal/accounting, program development, and teaching.

As mentioned earlier, because many of the percentages were so small, we consolidated categories before proceeding with cross-tabulations. The conversion to frequencies based on number of total responses is displayed for the state level in Table IV-3, and the consolidated state frequencies (also using number of responses as the denominator) in Table IV-4. Corresponding SDA frequencies are displayed in Tables IV-5 and IV-6.

Comparing Tables IV-4 and IV-6, both sets of consolidated frequencies result in top ranking for personal skills, followed by communication skills. However, the percentage for personal skills is considerably higher at the SDA level (38%) than at the state level (16%), and the gap between the two top percentages is also far wider at the SDA level (38% versus 16% at the SDA level, 25% versus 21% at the state level). State staff also recommend analytic skills substantially more frequently than SDA staff (16% versus 5%), while SDA staff recommend client-oriented skills more frequently (8% versus 1%). Among other categories, however, though specific rankings differed, the percentages were all tightly clustered in the range of 5% to 9% at both levels.

State-Level Cross-Tabulations

Generally, the state cross-tabulations reveal few remarkable divergences from the frequencies, and few consistent patterns beyond what could be anticipated. Consequently, these along with other cross-tabulation tables are presented in Appendix B, to reduce the length and congestion of this chapter. For example, it is not surprising to find that the percentage of responses recommending analytic skills rises with educational attainment, or that the percentage recommending job-specific skills drops with education (Table B-5); and otherwise there are few noteworthy patterns in the table. Specific comments on each set of tables follow.

Tables B-1 and B-2 break the frequencies out by funding and staff size, respectively. Table B-1 indicates that staff in the smallest-

funded organizations is somewhat more likely to recommend computer and management skills than state respondents overall, perhaps because of the greater likelihood of overlapping responsibilities in the smallest organizations. In Table B-2 this pattern is less prominent. It appears probable that the smallest organizations are even more concentrated within the bottom funding category than within the smallest staff size category (note the larger denominator at the bottom of the first data column in Table B-2 as compared with the corresponding column in Table B-1), which may account for the difference between the two tables.

Tables B-3 and B-4 present the skill recommendations for different categories of staff functions and for supervisory/nonsupervisory status. The derivation of the "functional clusters" that group staff responsibilities is detailed in Chapter V. Since there is considerable overlap among these clusters (that is, one staff member could be assigned to, say, four of these clusters, as also detailed in Chapter V), the denominators in these tables exceed the 717 responses in Table IV-3. In Table B-3, the most noteworthy differences among functional groups is that both clerical and MIS staff recommends computer and job-specific skills more frequently than other staff -- which is to be expected. Table B-4 demonstrates that supervisory staff is more likely to recommend personal and management skills than average, or than nonsupervisory staff -- again, to be expected.

The remaining tables break out the frequencies by personal attributes of the responding staff. As mentioned above, Table B-5, which presents the cross-tabulation by education level, shows that emphasis on analytic skills rises with increasing level of education. It also indicates that emphasis on job-specific skills is highest among staff with the lowest educational attainments.

Tables B-6 through B-8 present the breakouts for alternative measures of program tenure. They tend to indicate increased emphasis on personal skills, and decreased emphasis on job-specific skills, with rising tenure, probably reflecting the correlation between tenure and both management responsibilities and supervisory status.

124

Tables B-9 through B-13 present the breakouts by personal demographics. A number of the column totals are very small, which limits the amount of analysis that these tables can support. There are some unremarkable differences by age (consistent with the breakouts by tenure), and scattered minor differences by enthic category. Women are more likely to recommend job-specific skills and less likely to recommend analytic skills, which probably reflects their greater likelihood of working in clerical positions. Interestingly, the three-way cross-tabulation of recommended skills by age group by sex indicates greater differences between the sexes in the youngest and oldest age categories for which a comparison is possible.

SDA Cross-Tabulations

Tables B-14 through B-27 present the SDA cross-tabulations for recommended skills. The first three tables in this series concern organizational characteristics: allocation, number of staff, and type of administrative entity, in that order. The breakouts are not especially illuminating. Staff in SDAs with the least funding is somewhat more likely to emphasize client-oriented skills, whereas staff in SDAs with the smallest number of staff positions is more likely than other staff to emphasize quantitative, computer, and analytic skills. Although it would stand to reason that the smallest number of positions breeds a need for more of the staff to acquire more quantitative or technical capabilities, this reasoning does not square well with the results in the allocation breakout. Otherwise, there is little to observe about these three tables.

Tables B-17 and B-18 present SDA skill recommendations by type of staff function and supervisory/nonsupervisory status. (As at the state level, and for the same reason, the total denominators in these tables exceed the total number of responses.) Divergences from the frequencies are few, moderate, and predictable. For example, like clerical staff at the state level, SDA-level clerical staff tends to emphasize computer skills and job-specific skills. Similarly, client service staff (including staff involved in classroom training and bilingual

125

interpreters) gives greater emphasis to client-oriented skills. In contrast to the state level, supervisory staff is no more likely to stress personal skills than nonsupervisory staff; but this is hardly surprising in organizations that deal so much more closely with participants. The parallel to the state level is restored in the gap between supervisory and nonsupervisory staff in emphasis on management skills.

The education breakout is presented in Table B-19. It indicates that staff with less than a Bachelor's degree are more likely to recommend computer skills and job-specific skills.

The tenure breakouts are displayed in Tables B-20 through B-27. As at the state level, they tend to indicate decreased emphasis on job-specific skills with rising tenure, along with increased emphasis on management skills. However, these trends are far from dramatic. In addition, unlike the state level, the SDA tenure tables do not suggest increasing emphasis on personal skills with longer tenure. Again, this is reasonable in organizations that are more closely connected with participants: there is a greater emphasis on personal skills throughout these organizations.

The breakouts by personal demographics, shown in Tables B-23 through B-27, are fairly unremarkable. There are consistent differences between the sexes in emphasis on computer skills, management skills, and job-specific skills, which probably reflect the predominance of women within clerical positions. These gender differences persist in most of the age categories. Additional gender differences arise in the three-way breakout of skills by ethnicity by sex, but most gaps are only moderate, and a number of the column denominators in this table (Table B-27) are very small.

Recommended Educational Background

Comparison of State and SDA Frequencies

Table IV-7 shows the level of education that surveyed staff believe applicants for their own job should have. (Please note that numbers of respondents are relatively low on this and all the other tables concerning educational background.) A majority of state respondents (54%) and a near-majority of those at the SDA level (49%) recommended a Bachelor's degree. SDA respondents were slightly more likely than their state counterparts to recommend high school, an Associate's degree, or business college/secretarial training. At both levels, and despite the overlap in functional clusters, staff in some clusters was more likely to recommend a Bachelor's degree while staff in certain other clusters was more likely to recommend high school, business college, or an associate degree, as shown in Tables IV-8 and IV-9.

Tables IV-10 and IV-11 compare the field of education that staff at the two levels recommends. (The numbers of respondents here are even lower than in the educational attainment tables.) Responding state staff tended to favor management and technical fields, whereas the first choice of SDA respondents was social work/counseling and the fourth choice was education. The difference between the two profiles is substantial, and is consistent with the differences in functional responsibilities between the two levels.

The conversion to consolidated frequencies based on numbers of responses is shown in Tables IV-12 through IV-15. Here, the different percentages and relative rankings produced for accounting and the human service/education cluster are still more striking. Nearly half of the SDA recommendations fall within the human service/education group, close to three times as high a percentage as the 17% frequency for the second highest category, business administration/personnel. At the state level, the highest frequency is indicated for business administration/personnel, at 24%, with accounting a close second, at

127

21%. Human services/education account for only 8% of the state recommendations, ranking last at that level.

State-Level Cross-Tabulations

State cross-tabulations for recommendations on field of education are presented in Appendix B, Tables B-28 through B-40. The low number of respondents to the education question makes for small column totals in a number of these tables, limiting their analytic usefulness.

Generally, variations about the mean frequencies are slight or show a predictable pattern. For example, as seen in Table B-30, fiscal staff recommends accounting twice as frequently as its mean frequency (37% versus 19%), while MIS staff recommends computer/information science nearly three times as frequently as state staff as a whole (27% versus 10%). Table B-32 shows that staff with less than a Bachelor's degree is more likely to recommend studying accounting, while rising educational attainment increases the percentage recommending public administration/policy and, less dramatically, human service/education.

The tenure tables (B-33 through B-35), like the funding and staff size cross-tabulations (Tables B-28 and B-29), are not particularly instructive. Nor are the demographic cross-tabulations (Tables B-36 through B-40). The two three-way cross-tabulations produce so many columns with small total responses that little comparison between gender categories is possible. Table B-36 suggests a greater propensity to recommend human service/education with rising age, and the reverse for computer studies, but the numbers involved in both cases are fairly low.

SDA Cross-Tabulations

The SDA cross-tabulations on recommended field of education are also displayed in Appendix B, Tables B-41 through B-54. Again, the variation about frequency means is generally modest or predictable.

Staff in the smallest organizations is more likely to recommend either business or public administration than staff in medium-sized or large organizations, but this pattern does not hold up for funding categories, as can be seen in Tables B-41 and B-42. There is little difference in the recommendations offered by staff in PIC or government administrative entities, as shown in Table B-43, and the number of respondents from CBO/other administrative entities was too small for useful analysis.

Tables B-44 and B-45 explore how the recommendations vary by functional cluster and supervisory/nonsupervisory status. Not surprisingly, staff having the most direct contact with participants is more likely to recommend human service/education, while fiscal and procurement staff is more likely to recommend accounting and MIS/JASR and data processing staff is more likely to recommend computer/ information science. Generally, staff with supervisory responsibilities is somewhat more likely to recommend business administration/personnel and less likely to recommend human service/education, and the reverse is true for nonsupervisory staff.

Table B-46 displays the cross-tabulation by highest level of education attained. Among the four columns with reasonably large denominators, higher level of education is associated with higher support for human service/education and public administration, while lower levels are associated with higher percentages recommending accounting and computer/information science.

Among the tenure cross-tabulations, Tables B-47 through B-49, only the first shows even modest patterns. This table refers to length of time in the respondent's current position, while the other two concern length of time in the employment and training system. Respondents who had been in their position for less than a year were somewhat more likely to recommend human service/education, and those who had taken their current position within the past six months were slightly more likely to recommend computer/information science. The percentage recommending accounting rose with tenure, but the trend is not dramatic.

As at the state level, most of the demographic cross-tabulations (Tables B-50 through B-54) produced columns with small column totals, and the ethnic and three-way cross-tabulations offer little to analyze as a result. Table B-52, which displays the cross-tabulation by sex, does show several differences, although most of the rankings among education fields remain intact or nearly so. Women were more likely than men to recommend human service/education and computer/information science. Men, on the other hand, were more likely to recommend business and public administration.

Recommended Experience

Comparison of State and SDA Frequencies

Response rates on this question were better than on education, but below the response for recommended skills. Tables IV-16 and IV-17 compare the basic frequencies between the state and SDA levels. Generally, state respondents were more likely to recommend programmatic and public sector experience. (Their responses are thus consistent with the recommendations of case study managers.) SDA respondents also emphasized public sector and employment and training experience, but gave relatively more emphasis to working with the disadvantaged. In addition, 10% of SDA respondents mentioned experience in the private sector, which did not appear among state-level responses. At both levels, substantial percentages recommended secretarial experience (14% at the state level, 13% at the SDA level), probably reflective of the participation of clerical support staff in the surveys.

The conversion to consolidated categories based on numbers of responses, instead of numbers of respondents, is shown in Tables IV-18 through IV-21. At the state level, program experience takes a clear lead at 41%, more than twice the frequency of recommendation for the next highest category (fiscal, at 15%). At the SDA level, the recommendations are spread more evenly among human service (26%), program (22%), and public sector (20%).

The major differences between Tables IV-19 and IV-21 are the percentage indicated for program (41% at the state'level, 22% at the SDA level), the very different percentages and rankings for human service (26% and first at the SDA level, 7% and next to last at the state level), the reverse differences concerning fiscal experience (15% and second rank at the state level, 6% and next to last at the SDA level), and the fact that the SDA table includes the private sector category that does not come into play in the state table. These differences reflect the differences in role at the two levels. To some extent, they may also reflect state staff's desire to be familiar with local programming in order to discharge the state functions in a constructive manner.

State-Level Cross-Tabulations

The state cross-tabulations are displayed in Tables B-55 through B-67 of Appendix B. The first two tables suggest that staff in the smallest organizations are somewhat more likely to recommend experience in various administrative capacities, including fiscal, supervisory, and computer/MIS. This could reflect the greater likelihood that staff in such organizations will be called upon to play multiple roles, although the small numbers in the relevant column in both tables call for not making too much of the percentages.

In Tables B-57 and B-58, presenting cross-tabulations by functional cluster and supervisory status, the clearest variation from the mean frequencies can be seen for MIS, fiscal, and clerical staff. They are more apt to recommend experience that corresponds most closely with their current job.

The education cross-tabulation, Table B-59, indicates that staff with lower levels of education attainment are relatively more likely to recommend secretarial or computer experience. The tenure tables, B-60 through B-62, indicate that staff with longer tenure is more likely to recommend program experience, and less likely to recommend secretarial experience.

131

The three-way demographic cross-tabulations, Tables B-66 and B-67, have too many small-number columns to be useful analytically. Small numbers are also problems in the simpler cross-tabulations by age and ethnicity, Tables B-63 and B-64. The cross-tabulation by sex, Table B-65, indicates that women are less likely than men to recommend program experience, and more likely to recommend secretarial experience. This probably reflects the greater concentration of women within the clerical ranks.

SDA Cross-Tabulations

The SDA cross-tabulations are also presented in Appendix B, Tables B-68 through B-81. The first three of these tables, concerning organizational characteristics (funding, staff size, and type of administrative entity), show little variation about the mean frequencies.

Functional cluster and supervisory status do have a greater bearing on the recommendations, as shown in Tables B-71 and B-72, but the results are predictable. For example, staff who works directly with clients is more likely to recommend human service experience, while fiscal and procurement staff is less likely to do so. Staff in more specialized technical capacities -- fiscal, procurement, data processing -- is instead more likely to recommend experience that corresponds to their job. Supervisory staff is more likely to recommend supervisory experience, while nonsupervisory staff is more likely to stress human service experience -- especially the staff in this category that works directly with participants.

The cross-tabulation by level of education is even more unremarkable, as shown in Table B-73. The most significant trend is that staff with less than a four-year college degree is most likely to recommend secretarial experience.

Among the tenure cross-tabulations, Table B-74 indicates that shorter tenure in one's current position increases the likelihood of

132

recommending human service experience, while Tables B-75 and B-76 show similar trends relating tenure in the employment and training field to likelihood of recommending secretarial experience. The first is consistent with higher turnover among client service staff, the second with turnover among clerical staff.

The most consistent differences among the demographic cross-tabulations, presented in Tables B-77 through B-81, reflect gender. Women are more likely to recommend human service and secretarial experience, men more likely to recommend program and supervisory experience, as well as experience in the public and private sectors. Presumably, the underlying differences have to do with function and tenure.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Case study and staff survey findings are in close correspondence concerning the skills and backgrounds considered appropriate for JTPA staff.

At the state level, both sources emphasize skills in written and oral communication, analysis, and working with people. Managers in the case studies also specified program familiarity and a capacity for independent work. The staff survey added computer skills, occupation-specific skills, organizational and time management skills, and quantitative skills to the list of priority skills for the organization as a whole. Not surprisingly, for certain staff functions -- primarily fiscal, data processing, MIS, and clerical -- staff responses placed comparatively greater emphasis on job-specific skills in relation to more general analytic and interpersonal skills and program knowledge.

SDA staff as a whole also emphasized interpersonal and communication skills, along with organizational/time management skills, computer and quantitative skills, and function-specific skills, but placed more emphasis on counseling and other client-oriented skills than state staff. This divergence from the state profile is consistent with

the fact that most SDAs deal directly with participants, while state staff is removed from such interaction; at the same time, the many parallels in skill recommendations for the two levels should also be kept in mind. Similar to the state level, staff with fiscal, MIS, data processing, client service, and clerical responsibilities showed the greatest systematic divergence from the mean frequencies, placing relatively greater emphasis on skills most relevant to their particular functions.

SDA management recommendations gathered through the case studies fill in the overall SDA profile somewhat. Interviewed managers tended to distinguish between mid- and high-level SDA positions, for which they emphasized analytic, communication, and "people" skills, and line staff, for whom they saw attitude toward and ability to communication effectively with the participants as paramount.

At both the state and SDA levels and in both the case studies and staff surveys, a four-year college degree is generally seen as the most appropriate educational level across organizations as a whole. However, for certain types of staff functions -- especially MIS, data processing, and clerical -- lower levels of education are relatively more likely to be seen as adequate. Interestingly, while case study managers said that specific degrees were less important for line staff than competence in dealing with participants, in the SDA staff survey client service staff was relatively more likely to recommend a Bachelor's degree as appropriate for their positions.

Case study managers generally did not express much concern about staff's specific field of study. In three areas, managers did apply more specific criteria -- MIS staff should have background in computers, fiscal staff in accounting, and monitors in auditing -- but they tended to be flexible about whether this background was acquired in school or through later experience. In the staff surveys, top recommendations included business or public administration and accounting at both levels, but SDA staff gave highest priority to study in the human services or education.

134

At both levels, managers preferred "seasoned" staff and staff with experience in the employment and training field, and preferably specifically with JTPA. This reduced the learning curve on the job. They were most likely to make exceptions for (and also to impose more job-specific experience criteria on) fiscal, MIS, data processing, and clerical staff.

This pattern is consistent with the experience recommendations of surveyed staff. State staff generally emphasized program and public sector experience, and to a somewhat lesser extent experience with fiscal responsibilities. SDA staff also gave priority to public sector and program experience, but gave substantially higher weight than state staff to experience in working with disadvantaged persons. A substantial portion of SDA staff also specified experience in the private sector as desirable. Conversely, relatively few SDA staff respondents recommended experience in fiscal matters. Once again, at both levels, staff in fiscal, MIS, data processing, and clerical positions was most likely to recommend experience that was more specifically relevant to their current responsibilities.

In the following chapter, we will compare surveyed staff's actual backgrounds to those recommended as suitable in this chapter.

Table IV-1

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF:
Percent of Respondents

Recommended Skills	
COMMUNICATION (WRITTEN/ORAL)	60%
INTERPERSONAL SKILLS/WORK W/PEOPLE	31%
ANALYTICAL SKILLS/POLICY ANALYSIS	28%
COMPUTER SKILLS	28%
KNOWLEDGE IN SPECIFIC OCC AREA (ACCOUNTING, CLERICAL, ETC.)	26%
ORGANIZATIONAL SKILLS/TIME MANAGEMENT	20%
STATISTICAL/NUMERICAL	13%
ABILITY TO INTERPRET REGS	13%
NEGOTIATION/MEDIATION	12%
MANAGERIAL/ADMINISTRATIVE	10%
KNOWLEDGE OF JTPA PROGRAMS	9%
ADAPTABILITY/CREATIVITY/FLEXIBILITY	7%
DECISION MAKING/PROBLEM SOLVING	6%
BUDGETING	6%
RESEARCH/EVALUATION	5%
PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT/AA-EEO	4%
KNOWLEDGE OF OTHER PROGRAMS	4%
PUBLIC SPEAKING	2%
LEADERSHIP	2%
ABILITY TO WORK W/DISADVANTAGED/SPEC POPS	2%
CLERICAL SKILLS (NON-CLERICAL EMPLOYEES)	1%
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	1%
DEALING W/PAPERWORK/BUREAUCRACY	0%
	100%
Total Cases	247

Table IV-2

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF:
Percent of Respondents

Recommended Skills	
INTERPERSONAL SKILLS/WORK W/PEOPLE	52%
COMMUNICATION (WRITTEN/ORAL)	46%
ORGANIZATIONAL SKILLS/TIME MANAGEMENT	26%
COMPUTER SKILLS	22%
KNOWLEDGE IN SPECIFIC OCC AREA (ACCOUNTING, CLERICAL, ETC.)	18%
COUNSELING	13%
FISCAL/ACCOUNTING/BOOKKEEPING	11%
MANAGERIAL/ADMINISTRATIVE	10%
STATISTICAL/NUMERICAL	10%
ADAPTABILITY/CREATIVITY/FLEXIBILITY	9%
ANALYTICAL SKILLS/POLICY ANALYSIS	8%
ABILITY TO WORK W/DISADVANTAGED/SPEC POPS	8%
KNOWLEDGE OF JTPA PROGRAMS	8%
CLERICAL SKILLS (NON-CLERICAL EMPLOYEES)	6%
DECISION MAKING/PROBLEM SOLVING	6%
DEALING W/PAPERWORK/BUREAUCRACY	6%
PROG PLANNING/DEV/MANAGMENT	6%
ABILITY TO INTERPRET REGS	5%
PUBLIC SPEAKING	5%
NEGOTIATION/MEDIATION	4%
KNOWLEDGE OF OTHER PROGRAMS	4%
LEADERSHIP	3%
BUDGETING	2%
TEACHING	2%
RESEARCH/EVALUATION	2%
PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT/AA-EEO/SUPERVISORY	2%
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	1%
	100%
Total Cases	517

Table IV-3

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF:
Percent of Total Responses

Recommended Skills	
COMMUNICATION (WRITTEN/ORAL)	21%
INTERPERSONAL SKILLS/WORK W/PEOPLE	11%
ANALYTICAL SKILLS/POLICY ANALYSIS	10%
COMPUTER SKILLS	9%
KNOWLEDGE IN SPECIFIC OCC AREA (ACCOUNTING, CLERICAL, ETC.)	9%
ORGANIZATIONAL SKILLS/TIME MANAGEMENT	7%
STATISTICAL/NUMERICAL	5%
ABILITY TO INTERPRET REGS	4%
NEGOTIATION/MEDIATION	4%
MANAGERIAL/ADMINISTRATIVE	3%
KNOWLEDGE OF JTPA PROGRAMS	3%
ADAPTABILITY/CREATIVITY/FLEXIBILITY	2%
DECISION MAKING/PROBLEM SOLVING	2%
BUDGETING	2%
RESEARCH/EVALUATION	2%
PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT/AA-EEO	2%
KNOWLEDGE OF OTHER PROGRAMS	1%
PUBLIC SPEAKING	1%
LEADERSHIP	1%
ABILITY TO WORK W/DISADVANTAGED/SPEC POPS	1%
CLERICAL SKILLS (NON-CLERICAL EMPLOYEES)	0%
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	0%
DEALING W/PAPERWORK/BUREAUCRACY	0%
	100%
All Responses	717

Table IV-4

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF:
Consolidated Categories

Recommended Skills	
PERSONAL[a]	25%
COMMUNICATION	21%
ANALYSIS[b]	16%
COMPUTER	9%
MANAGEMENT[c]	9%
JOB-SPECIFIC	9%
QUANTITATIVE[d]	7%
PROGRAM[e]	5%
CLIENT[f]	1%
	100%
All Responses	717

[a]Subsumes (from Table IV-3) interpersonal skills, organizational skills, adaptability, decision-making, public speaking, leadership, clerical skills (cited by non-clerical staff), information management, and dealing with paperwork.

[b]Subsumes analytical skills, ability to interpret reguations, and research/ evaluation.

[c]Subsumes negotiation, managerial, and personnel management.

[d]Subsumes statistical and budgeting.

[e]Subsumes knowledge of JTPA and knowledge of other programs.

[f]New category label for ability to work with disadvantaged persons. (At SDA level, additional specific categories are included within this grouping).

140

Table IV-5

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF:

Percent of Total Responses

Recommended Skills	
INTERPERSONAL SKILLS/WORK W/PEOPLE	18%
COMMUNICATION (WRITTEN/ORAL)	16%
ORGANIZATIONAL SKILLS/TIME MANAGEMENT	9%
COMPUTER SKILLS	8%
KNOWLEDGE IN SPECIFIC OCC AREA (ACCOUNTING, CLERICAL, ETC.)	6%
COUNSELING	5%
FISCAL/ACCOUNTING/BOOKKEEPING	4%
MANAGERIAL/ADMINISTRATIVE	3%
STATISTICAL/NUMERICAL	3%
ADAPTABILITY/CREATIVITY/FLEXIBILITY	3%
ANALYTICAL SKILLS/POLICY ANALYSIS	3%
ABILITY TO WORK W/DISADVANTAGED/SPEC POPS	3%
KNOWLEDGE OF JTPA PROGRAMS	3%
CLERICAL SKILLS (NON-CLERICAL EMPLOYEES)	2%
DECISION MAKING/PROBLEM SOLVING	2%
DEALING W/PAPERWORK/BUREAUCRACY	2%
PROG PLANNING/DEV/MANAGMENT	2%
ABILITY TO INTERPRET REGS	2%
PUBLIC SPEAKING	2%
NEGOTIATION/MEDIATION	1%
KNOWLEDGE OF OTHER PROGRAMS	1%
LEADERSHIP	1%
BUDGETING	1%
TEACHING	1%
RESEARCH/EVALUATION	1%
PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT/AA-EEO/SUPERVISORY	1%
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	0%
	100%
All Responses	1517

Table IV-6

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF:
Consolidated Categories

Recommended Skills	
PERSONAL[a]	38%
COMMUNICATION	16%
CLIENT [b]	8%
QUANTITATIVE [c]	8%
COMPUTER	8%
MANAGEMENT [d]	7%
JOB-SPECIFIC	6%
ANALYSIS [e]	5%
PROGRAM [f]	4%
	100%
All Responses	1517

[a]Subsumes (from Table IV-5) interpersonal skills, organizational skills, adaptability, clerical skills (cited by non-clerical staff), decision-making, dealing with paperwork, public speaking, leadership and information management.

[b]Subsumes counseling, ability to work with disadvantaged persons, and teaching.

[c]Subsumes fiscal, statistical, and budgeting.

[d]Subsumes managerial, negotiation, and personnel management.

[e]Subsumes analytical skills, ability to interpret regulations and research/evaluation.

[f]Subsumes knowledge of JTPA and knowledge of other programs.

Table IV-7

RECOMMENDED LEVEL OF EDUCATION:
COMPARISON OF STATE AND SDA STAFF

	Percent of Respondents	
	State Staff	SDA Staff
Recommended Educational Level		
HIGH SCHOOL/GED	11%	20%
SOME COLLEGE	16%	14%
ASSOCIATE DEGREE	3%	9%
BACHELOR'S DEGREE	54%	49%
MASTER'S DEGREE	6%	3%
SECRETARIAL/ BUSINESS COLLEGE	11%	6%
Total Cases	179	404

143

Table IV-8

LEVEL OF EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER

	Functional Cluster									All Responses
	POL./ ADMIN.	PUB. CONTACT	LMI	MONITOR	MIS	FISCAL	PERSONNEL	LEGAL	CLERICAL	
ED LEVEL										
H.S./GED	4%	5%	0%	5%	20%	9%	4%	0%	24%	10%
SOME COLLEGE	15%	10%	36%	9%	26%	17%	4%	0%	16%	16%
ASSOCIATE	3%	3%	0%	2%	6%	4%	2%	0%	4%	3%
BACHELOR'S	69%	69%	45%	80%	34%	64%	80%	100%	16%	53%
MASTER'S	9%	9%	18%	5%	4%	6%	4%	0%	0%	6%
SEC/BUS COLLEGE	0%	3%	0%	0%	10%	0%	6%	0%	40%	10%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(115)	(88)	(11)	(66)	(50)	(47)	(49)	(1)	(45)	(174)

144

Table IV-9

LEVEL OF EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER

	Functional Cluster												All Responses
	POL./ ADMIN.	CLIENT SVC.	CLASS TRAIN	INTERP RETING	MONITO R	MIS/ JASR	DATA PROC.	FISCAL	PROCUR EMENT	PERSON NEL	LEGAL	CLERIC AL	
ED LEVEL													
H.S./GED	14%	17%	8%	0%	11%	24%	26%	11%	17%	10%	25%	39%	19%
SOME COLLEGE	12%	16%	11%	24%	11%	14%	16%	13%	17%	10%	0%	19%	15%
ASSOCIATE	6%	6%	11%	10%	4%	8%	9%	9%	8%	6%	13%	9%	8%
BACHELOR'S	61%	55%	67%	48%	66%	44%	36%	59%	48%	65%	50%	15%	49%
MASTER'S	4%	2%	2%	5%	5%	7%	2%	6%	3%	6%	0%	2%	3%
SEC/BUS COLLEGE	3%	3%	0%	14%	2%	3%	11%	3%	8%	3%	13%	17%	6%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	266	283	(89)	(21)	167	(59)	169	140	(65)	121	(8)	109	399

145

Table IV-10

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF:

Percent of Respondents

Recommended Educational Background	
BUSINESS ADMIN/PERSONNEL	36%
ACCOUNTING	31%
PUBLIC ADMIN/MANAGEMENT/POLICY	27%
MISCELLANEOUS	22%
COMPUTER/MIS	16%
SOCIAL WORK/PSYCH/COUNSELING	8%
LAW	6%
EDUCATION	3%
PLANNING (URBAN/REGIONAL)	1%
HUMAN SERVICES	1%
	100%
Total Cases	134

Table IV-11

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF:
Percent of Respondents

Recommended Educational Background	
SOCIAL WORK/PSYCH/COUNSELING	43%
BUSINESS ADMIN/PERSONNEL	24%
MISCELLANEOUS	15%
EDUCATION	13%
ACCOUNTING	13%
HUMAN SERVICES	13%
PUBLIC ADMIN/MANAGEMENT/POLICY	12%
COMPUTER/MIS	10%
PLANNING (URBAN/REGIONAL)	1%
	100%
Total Cases	256

Table IV-12

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF:
Percent of Total Responses

Recommended Educational Background	
BUSINESS ADMIN/PERSONNEL	24%
ACCOUNTING	21%
PUBLIC ADMIN/MANAGEMENT/POLICY	18%
MISCELLANEOUS	15%
COMPUTER/MIS	11%
SOCIAL WORK/PSYCH/COUNSELING	5%
LAW	4%
EDUCATION	2%
PLANNING (URBAN/REGIONAL)	0%
HUMAN SERVICES	0%
	100%
All Responses	203

148

Table IV-13

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF:

Consolidated Categories

Recommended Educational Background	
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	24%
ACCOUNTING	21%
MISCELLANEOUS [a]	19%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY [b]	18%
COMPUTER/MIS	11%
HMN SERVICE/EDUC [c]	8%
	100%
All Responses	203

[a]Subsumes (from Table IV-39) miscellaneous and law.

[b]Subsumes public administration and planning.

[c]Subsumes social work/counseling, education, and human services.

Table IV-14

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF:

Percent of Total Responses

Recommended Educational Background	
SOCIAL WORK/PSYCH/COUNSELING	30%
BUSINESS ADMIN/PERSONNEL	17%
MISCELLANEOUS	10%
EDUCATION	9%
ACCOUNTING	9%
HUMAN SERVICES	9%
PUBLIC ADMIN/MANAGEMENT/POLICY	8%
COMPUTER/MIS	7%
PLANNING (URBAN/REGIONAL)	1%
	100%
All Responses	370

Table IV-15

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF:
Consolidated Categories

Recommended Educational Background	
HMN SERVICE/EDUC[a]	48%
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	17%
MISCELLANEOUS[b]	10%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY[c]	9%
ACCOUNTING	9%
COMPUTER/MIS	7%
	100%
All Responses	370

[a]Subsumes (from Table IV-41) social work/counseling, education, and human services.

[b]Subsumes miscellaneous and law.

[c]Subsumes public administration and planning.

Table IV-16

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF:

Percent of Respondents

Recommended Experience	
PRIOR JTPA/CETA/E&T	39%
LOCAL LEVEL/PROG MANAGEMENT	22%
GOVERNMENTAL/PUBLIC SECTOR/POLITICAL	20%
SECRETARIAL	14%
MONITORING/CONTRACTS ADMIN	11%
SOCIAL SERVICES	9%
COMPUTER/MIS	8%
SUPERVISORY/MANAGERIAL	6%
ACCOUNTING/FISCAL/BOOKKEEPING	6%
PERSONNEL	5%
GRANTS MANAGEMENT	4%
WORKING W/DISADVANTAGED	1%
COUNSELING	1%
	100%
Total Cases	189

Table IV-17

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF:

Percent of Respondents

Recommended Experience	
GOVERNMENTAL/PUBLIC SECTOR/POLITICAL	30%
PRIOR JTPA/CETA/E&T	23%
WORKING W/DISADVANTAGED	14%
SECRETARIAL	13%
PRIVATE SECTOR/BUSINESS	10%
LOCAL LEVEL/PROG MANAGEMENT/DEVELOPMENT	9%
SOCIAL SERVICES	8%
SUPERVISORY/MANAGERIAL	8%
COUNSELING	8%
COMPUTER/MIS	6%
ACCOUNTING/FISCAL/BOOKKEEPING	6%
TEACHING	4%
INTERACTING WITH PEOPLE	3%
PERSONNEL	2%
MONITORING/CONTRACTS ADMIN	2%
GRANTS MANAGEMENT/WRITING	1%
	100%
Total Cases	410

Table IV-18

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF:
Percent of Total Responses

Recommended Experience	
PRIOR JTPA/CETA/E&T	27%
LOCAL LEVEL/PROG MANAGEMENT	15%
GOVERNMENTAL/PUBLIC SECTOR/POLITICAL	13%
SECRETARIAL	10%
MONITORING/CONTRACTS ADMIN	7%
SOCIAL SERVICES	6%
COMPUTER/MIS	5%
SUPERVISORY/MANAGERIAL	4%
ACCOUNTING/FISCAL/BOOKKEEPING	4%
PERSONNEL	4%
GRANTS MANAGEMENT	3%
WORKING W/DISADVANTAGED	1%
COUNSELING	0%
	100%
All Responses	275

Table IV-19

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF:
Consolidated Categories

Recommended Experience	
PROGRAM [a]	41%
FISCAL [b]	15%
PUBLIC SECTOR	13%
SECRETARIAL	10%
SUPRVSRY/PERSONNEL [c]	8%
HUMAN SERVICE [d]	7%
COMPUTER/MIS	5%
	100%
All Responses	275

[a] Subsumes)from Table IV-72) prior JTPA/CETA and local level/program management.

[b] Subsumes monitoring, accounting/fiscal, and grants management.

[c] Subsumes supervisory and personnel.

[d] Subsumes social services, working with disadvantaged persons, and counseling.

Table IV-20

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF:
Percent of Total Responses

Recommended Experience	
GOVERNMENTAL/PUBLIC SECTOR/POLITICAL	20%
PRIOR JTPA/CETA/E&T	16%
WORKING W/DISADVANTAGED	10%
SECRETARIAL	9%
PRIVATE SECTOR/BUSINESS	7%
LOCAL LEVEL/PROG MANAGEMENT/DEVELOPMENT	6%
SOCIAL SERVICES	6%
SUPERVISORY/MANAGERIAL	5%
COUNSELING	5%
COMPUTER/MIS	4%
ACCOUNTING/FISCAL/BOOKKEEPING	4%
TEACHING	3%
INTERACTING WITH PEOPLE	2%
PERSONNEL	2%
MONITORING/CONTRACTS ADMIN	1%
GRANTS MANAGEMENT/WRITING	1%
	100%
All Responses	604

Table IV-21

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF:
Consolidated Categories

Recommended Experience	
HUMAN SERVICE [a]	26%
PROGRAM [b]	22%
PUBLIC SECTOR	20%
SECRETARIAL	9%
SUPVSRY/PERSNNL[c]	7%
PRIVATE SECTOR	7%
FISCAL[d]	6%
COMPUTER/MIS	4%
	100%
All Responses	604

[a]Subsumes (from Table IV-74) working with disadvantaged persons, social services, counseling, teaching, and interacting with people.

[b]Subsumes prior JTPA/CETA and local level/program management.

[c]Subsumes supervisory and personnel.

[d]Subsumes accounting/fiscal, monitoring, and grants management.

V. PROFILE OF JTPA STAFF TODAY

Drawing on the staff survey data, this chapter summarizes the education and experience of JTPA staff currently serving in state JTPA units and at the SDA level. It also explores how these profiles vary by type of position and organizational characteristics, and links them back to the recommendations presented in the last chapter concerning appropriate backgrounds for JTPA staff.

The chapter then presents survey data on the salaries of staff participating in the surveys. These data are more comprehensive than salary levels of selected positions presented in Chapter III, which were designed to characterize organizational pay scales.

Next, the chapter compares both staff backgrounds and salaries in the JTPA systems to available information on staff backgrounds and pay levels in other human service systems. The information that we were able to locate on these other systems -- vocational rehabilitation, teaching, and social work -- is very spotty. For vocational rehabilitation, for example, we have information on staff background but not on salaries, whereas we have salary information for the child welfare field but next to no information on educational backgrounds. As a result, the comparisons are also only partial.

Finally, the chapter summarizes management perceptions of the relationship between staff qualifications and program or unit performance. This information is based on the case study interviews.

BACKGROUND AND CHARACTERISTICS OF JTPA STAFF

Comparison of Characteristics of Staff Survey Organizations and Director Survey Organizations

In Chapter II, we compared the characteristics of the director and staff survey samples based on information available before the surveys were conducted. Tables V-1 and V-2 summarize selected characteristics

159

of the two sets of samples based on questionnaire responses, comparing the distributions of the staff survey organizations with director survey frequencies presented in Chapter III.

The key points that Table V-1 makes is that state staff survey participants come from organizations that tend to be somewhat larger than state JTPA organizations as a whole. (Remember that the sample for the state staff survey was drawn purposively rather than randomly.)

Table V-2 indicates that the sample of SDAs participating in the staff survey missed both the very largest and the very smallest organizations. The staff survey SDAs are thus somewhat more concentrated within the middle of the funding spectrum, and tend to be somewhat below average in staff size. However, there is still a sizable percentage in the largest staff category (although this category no longer includes representatives of the top two dozen or so administrative entities). The distribution by type of administrative entity is reasonably similar to that of SDAs participating in the director survey.

Characteristics of Surveyed State and SDA Staff

Most JTPA staff has a college education and substantial program experience. As shown in Table V-3, a majority of both state and SDA staff has at least a Bachelor's degree, although the proportion is barely above half at the SDA level and only slightly larger at the state level. Larger majorities have at least attended some college, and virtually all staff at both levels has at least a high school education. At the state level, 7% of the respondents were currently enrolled in a degree program at the time of the surveys, while at the SDA level the percentage was 11%.

The major field of education specified by respondents who had attained a postsecondary degree varied somewhat by specific degree and state/SDA level. For both state and SDA staff with an Associate's degree, the dominant major was business administration/accounting,

160

followed at a distance by computer-oriented majors. Among state staff with a Bachelor's degree, the most frequent majors specified were business administration/accounting and the social sciences (including economics, psychology, sociology, history, political science, and anthropology); there was a tie between the two categories in number of responses. At the SDA level, however, there was a clear lead for social science majors, followed by a tie for business administration/accounting and social work/counseling/education. Particularly among respondents with a Bachelor's degree, small but substantial numbers of responses were in the humanities and sciences.

Among state respondents with a Master's degree, the four top fields (with equal numbers of responses) were public administration/planning, social science, personnel/human (or industrial) relations, and counseling/social work. SDA staff respondents with a Master's degree were most likely to have obtained it in education, followed in descending order by public administration/planning, counseling/social work, business administration, and social science. There were very few doctoral degrees at either level. Those specified were scattered evenly among several fields, including education, social welfare, counseling, human resource management, the social sciences, and law.

Table V-4 displays how long staff respondents have been employed in their current position, how long in the JTPA or CETA program, and how long in the overall field of employment and training. In each column, the modal response is the longest duration -- five or more years for the current position, ten years or more for program and system experience. Over half of state staff has spent at least ten years in the employment and training field, while the corresponding percentage at the SDA level is 37%. Two-fifths of state staff and one-third of SDA staff have at least ten years' experience in JTPA and CETA. Even for the current position, where somewhat shorter tenure is to be expected, 54% of the staff at both levels has held the position for at least three years.

Despite the respondents' generally long tenure in the employment and training field, only a minority were members of any professional

161

associations: 31% of state staff and 25% of SDA staff. Among the still smaller percentage of state staff respondents who specified one or more professional associations in which they had membership, half belonged to IAPES, the International Association of Personnel in Employment Security. The Partnership for Training and Employment Careers was a distant second among this group of state respondents, claiming less than 10% of them as members. At the SDA level, no single organization predominated, and the tremendous variety of occupational associations was noteworthy. However, the most common form of organizational membership specified was in a state or regional employment and training association.

Demographic characteristics are relevant to the personal experience that JTPA staff members bring to their work. Most JTPA staff members are white, most are at least 36 years old, and most are women. SDA staff tends to be slightly more ethnically diverse, somewhat younger, and more likely to be female.

More specifically, at the state level, 74% of responding staff members were white, 17% were black, 4% apiece were Hispanic or Asian/Pacific Islander, and 1% American Indian/Alaskan native. This distribution is displayed in Table V-5. As indicated in Table V-6, corresponding percentages at the SDA level were 67%, 19%, 4%, 4%, and 2%, respectively.

At the state level, 47% of respondents were between the ages of 36 and 45 years, 22% from 46 to 55 years, and 10% were 56 or older; 20% were between 26 and 35 years of age, and only 1% between 18 and 25 years. Following the same sequence, the percentages at the SDA level were 38%, 16%, 11%, 28%, and 8%. Tables V-5 and V-6 combine age and ethnicity breakouts (so the total percentages by age group are slightly different from those just reported, due to varying numbers of respondents on individual questionnaire items).

Overall, 58% of state staff respondents and 70% of those at the SDA level were women. For reference purposes, Tables V-7 and V-8 show the age/ethnicity cross-tabulation further broken out by gender.

·Variation by Type of Position

Derivation of Functional Clusters (Position Categories)

The staff surveys asked participating staff to check off all the functions that are part of their current job. The results are presented in Tables V-9 and V-10. As these tables suggest, most staff members perform multiple functions. This holds true even when we group the individual functions through cluster analysis to permit cross-tabulation with other variables.

The frequencies resulting from the computerized clustering procedure are displayed in Table V-11 for state staff, and Table V-12 for SDA staff. Some of the categories are not entirely intuitive, so attention should be paid to footnote explanations of which specific functions are included within a cluster. For example, at the state level, the "personnel" cluster includes procurement along with more predictable personnel functions, and at the SDA level, "data processing" includes manual filing systems as well as computer hardware/software and data entry.

We tried several approaches to reducing the overlap of staff among these categories, in order to be able to produce more discrete profiles of the staff within each cluster. These included, for example, splitting staff into supervisory and nonsupervisory categories before running the functional cluster frequencies, anticipating that nonsupervisory staff might be more specialized than those with supervisory responsibilities. Another approach included only staff that had checked off some minimum percentage of the individual functions within a cluster. None of these efforts was successful: some did little to reduce the overlap, while others discarded too many respondents.

163

So, we are left with acknowledging substantial overlap of staff among functional clusters as we explore the backgrounds and characteristics of staff in each of the clusters.

Variation in Level of Education. Tables V-13 and V-14 show the distribution of highest level of education by functional cluster for state and SDA staff, respectively.

The state table shows that whereas 57% of all state staff has a Bachelor's or Master's degree, the proportions are closer to three-quarters of most of the professional clusters, but only 16% for the clerical cluster. Clerical staff is instead concentrated in the categories of high school and some college. Two more technical clusters have corresponding proportions that fall between the two extremes: for fiscal staff, it is 66%, and for MIS staff, 48%. Because the MIS cluster includes data entry and manual filing, there is substantial overlap of staff between this and the clerical cluster, which helps account for the lower educational attainment.

A somewhat similar picture emerges at the SDA level, although the proportions involved tend generally to be lower. The percentage of all SDA staff with either a Bachelor's or a Master's degree is 51%. The percentage is 20% for the clerical cluster and 39% for data processing (which again includes data entry and manual filing). It is highest for classroom training staff, at 72%, and closer to two-thirds of the policy/administration, personnel, monitoring, and fiscal clusters. Clerical staff is again concentrated in the categories of high school and some college.

Thus, these breakouts show that professional and technical JTPA staff tends to have higher educational qualifications than JTPA staff as a whole, which is to be expected.

Tables V-15 and V-16 offer a slightly different perspective, breaking out actual educational attainment by the recommended level for

each staff respondent's current position. There is a clear correlation between recommended and actual educational attainment.

Variation in Tenure. Tables V-17 through V-22 break out three alternative tenure distributions by functional cluster. At the state level, staff in the professional and technical clusters tends to have above-average tenure within the employment and training system, which is hardly a dramatic finding; but the distributions are more even for tenure in current position, and less dramatically different for JTPA/CETA tenure. Among SDA staff, there is only a very modest tendency toward above-average system tenure for a number of the professional and technical clusters.

Distribution of Demographic Characteristics. Tables V-23 through V-28 show the distribution of state and SDA staff respondents' demographic characteristics by functional cluster. The clearest differences are by gender.

At the state level, for example, monitoring and LMI staff is far more likely to be male, while women predominate in the clerical and MIS categories. In several professional and technical clusters, however, the distribution between men and women is even or very close to even.

At the SDA level, women again predominate in the clerical and data processing clusters, and also in the three client-oriented categories. Men are more likely to be found in several of the professional/technical clusters.

Variation by Supervisory Status

At the state level, 30% of responding staff had supervisory responsibilities. At the SDA level, the corresponding percentage was 37%.

Tables V-29 and V-30 cross-tabulate staff educational level by supervisory status. At both levels, supervisory staff tends to have had

more education than nonsupervisory staff. However, the differences stand out more clearly when this cross-tabulation is further broken out by whether staff performs clerical functions, as shown in Tables V-31 and V-32.

At the state level, over 90% of supervisory non-clerical staff has at least a four-year degree. At the SDA level, the corresponding proportion is close to three-quarters. On the other hand, more than half of state-level supervisory clerical staff and over 60% of clerical supervisors at the SDA level have less than a four-year degree.

Variation by Organizational Characteristics

Table V-33 presents a cross-tabulation of educational level attained and state staff size. It shows that staff in the largest organizations is somewhat less likely to have a four-year or graduate degree than staff in the other size categories. A similar pattern can be seen in Table V-34, which shows the corresponding breakout for SDA staff.

SALARIES

Table V-35 corroborates the results of the director survey, already described in Chapter III, that indicated that pay scales are higher at the state level than among SDAs. Seventy percent of SDA staff respondents reported earning less than $25,000 annually; the corresponding percentage for state staff was 27%. At the other end of the scale, 41% of state respondents were paid at least $35,000, while only 8% of SDA staff were paid as much.

Some of the disparity could be attributable to differences in hours worked per week, but not much. Eighty-eight percent of state staff and 76% of SDA staff had a full-time schedule, and virtually all of the rest at both levels worked at least 30 hours a week.

Variation by Type of Position

Tables V-36 and V-37 show the cross-tabulations of salary and functional cluster. At both the state and SDA levels, staff in the personnel cluster is the best-paid, and fiscal and procurement staff is also more likely to be in the two highest salary categories. At the state level, however, other clusters as well have a majority of staff earning at least $35,000 annually. At the SDA level, not only is the overall salary profile lower, but even within clusters that correspond to clusters at the state level (such as policy/administration, personnel, fiscal, and clerical) the disparity between the state and SDA salary distributions remains.

A similar point is made concerning supervisory status in Tables V-38 through V-41: in any of the categories, the state salary scale remains higher.

Variation by Organizational Characteristics

Table V-42 shows that salaries in state JTPA organizations tend to be higher in organizations with more staff. In the smallest organizations, 26% of staff is paid at least $35,000 a year; in medium-sized organizations, 38%; and in the largest organizations, 45%. The reverse is true at the SDA level, however, as indicated in Table V-43. The proportion of staff paid at least $35,000 a year is 17% in the smallest organizations, 9% in the middle category, and 6% among the largest organizations.

COMPARISON WITH STAFF IN OTHER HUMAN SERVICE SYSTEMS

As mentioned earlier, the three human service systems for which we were able to locate some amount of comparable information concerning staff backgrounds and pay levels are vocational rehabilitation (VR), teaching, and social work.

Vocational Rehabilitation

Our information on the VR system is limited to its professional positions, and does not include salary. This information is derived from three national surveys of VR agencies and counselors (Chetkovich, 1989, and Pelavin, 1989). In considering this information, it should be kept in mind that many professional classifications within the VR system are a good deal more science-oriented than those prevalent in either JTPA or the other two systems. For example, VR agencies may employ physicians, psychiatrists, rehabilitation engineers, speech pathologists, and many other specialists.

One of the VR agency surveys found that three-quarters of agencies require counselors to have at least a Bachelor's degree, 7% require at least a Master's degree, and 16% require only a high school diploma; agencies requiring less than the graduate degree also specified varying lengths of professional experience (Chetkovich). The survey of counselors conducted as part of the same study found that 99% of all rehabilitation counselors had at least a Bachelor's degree. Further, it found that 58% of the counselors had one or more graduate degrees, and another 22% had attended or were currently attending graduate school.

The counselor survey also found that 26% of the counselors had their primary academic training in vocational rehabilitation. Fifteen percent apiece had been trained in psychology, counseling, or education, another 3% in special education, and 12% in social work. Fourteen percent had been trained in other disciplines. Median tenure in both the field and their agency was ten years, and three-quarters of the respondents had been counselors for at least three years. The median active caseload was 110 clients.

The other study surveyed agencies concerning all professional classifications in the VR system (Pelavin). This survey found that for 7% of the position categories, a high school diploma was considered sufficient; 29% required any Bachelor's degree; 36% required a specific Bachelor's degree; and 28% required at least a Master's degree.

The modal education requirement was high school for prosthetics and orthotics specialists and production supervisors in rehabilitation workshops. A Bachelor's degree in any field was the modal requirement for job development counselors, resident supervisors, independent living specialists, and client assistance administrators. A specific Bachelor's degree was the modal requirement for general rehabilitation counselor and virtually all the other counselor classifications, with the single exception of mental illness counselor. For this last classification and all other VR professional positions (audiologist, physician, rehabilitation dentist, and so on), the modal requirement was at least a Master's degree.

This study also provided some information on vacancy rates, which may provide some perspective on the turnover and vacancy data reported in Chapter III. The average overall vacancy rate among professional positions was 7%. It was 6% for general rehabilitation counselors, 4% for rehabilitation administrators, and 11% for job development counselors. The agency survey identified general rehabilitatior counselor as one of the top occupations combining "notable vacancies" and an "unsatisfactory applicant pool," and cited inadequate education and low salary as the two primary factors contributing to this situation.

Teaching

Our information on the backgrounds of public school teachers is very limited, although we do have some up-to-date salary information. The information that we found on teacher preparation concerns requirements currently in effect -- rather than the backgrounds of teachers themselves -- and these do not always affect (or may be different for) experienced teachers.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education recently published the results of its survey of the licensing/credentialing requirements of the fifty states and the District of Columbia (Stein, 1990). This study reflects the great variety among state requirements

and administrative systems, in part through the absence of any tabulations. Reading through the individual state profiles, however, it can be seen that most states require at least a Bachelor's degree, a number specify a minimum grade point average, some require particular courses or set minimum numbers of hours in various forms of training, and a number specify a minimum score on one or another test (with great variety in which test is specified). The summary narrative reports that 48 states impose a field requirement, 37 stipulate student teaching, and all but two not offer a route of alternative preparation, an emergency credential, or both.

The National Education Association has supported the establishment of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, created in response to the 1986 report of the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. The aim of this board is to provide national standards for a voluntary certification of teaching quality, cutting across the various state licensing requirements (but not supplanting them, since they are public requirements). Stanford University is cooperating in the development of the associated assessment criteria; it is expected to take several years to complete the development of these standards.

The National Education Association recently published state-by-state estimates on salaries for teachers and other instructional staff (NEA, 1990). The national average for classroom teachers is now estimated to be $31,304. It is somewhat lower for elementary school teachers ($30,497) and higher for secondary school teachers ($31,781), but the greater variability is by state. Overall salaries for classroom teachers range from a high of $43,153 in Alaska down to $21,300 in South Dakota. These figures average the salaries of beginning and more experienced teachers; no breakout is provided by seniority.

Social Welfare

Our information in this area is drawn from the 1987 salary survey conducted by the Child Welfare League of America (Maza and Malm, 1987),

which projected salaries through 1989. The survey covered 229 voluntary agencies and 18 public agencies within the U.S., along with ten Canadian agencies, but excluded statewide public agencies "because of their size and diversity of positions" -- which restricts comparability with the salaries of state JTPA staff.

The report contains a table projecting median salaries to 1989 for a series of positions among the U.S. voluntary agencies (which have a median size of 49 employees). The projections for selected positions are as follows:

Executive director	$56,200
Assistant executive director	42,700
Casework director/director of prof. services	37,000
Supervisor	28,300
Social work practitioner with M.S.W.	23,600
Social work practitioner with no grad. degree	17,900
Day care educational director	24,800
Day care teacher with grad. degree	18,700

MANAGEMENT PERCEPTIONS OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STAFF QUALIFICATIONS AND PERFORMANCE

State Level

Almost uniformly, state directors and managers gave high marks to their staff. Of all the managers we interviewed across the eight state agencies, only one mentioned one staffer's writing skills as inadequate, and this was a person that the manager had inherited in taking over the unit.

Many of the managers volunteered comments to the effect that staff qualifications and competence exceeded the level that might be suggested by their titles, salaries, and promotional opportunities. Several commented that most staff members, especially in the professional and analytical ranks, were people whose dedication to the employment and

171

training field to a point compensated for less than outstanding titles, salaries, or promotional opportunities. Some also mentioned that JTPA units and sections were considered desirable places to work by staff elsewhere within the overall state agency, so that they could count on drawing a number of reasonably well qualified, experienced candidates for most openings.

One area where staffing was sometimes seen as impairing performance was MIS. Here, however, the problem was more a matter of attracting and keeping staff than staff qualifications per se.

SDA Level

The picture at the SDA level was similar. Directors and managers routinely used the terms "excellent," "top-notch," and "seasoned," and described staff as being very knowledgeable about the employment and training field and about their local community.

However, concerns about staff qualifications and performance were raised somewhat more frequently than at the state level. Some directors expressed concern about staff's writing skills, and one director mentioned a need for improvement in staff perception of and communication with JTPA clients. In addition, the difficulty of recruiting highest-caliber clerical staff was mentioned a number of times. In several areas, it was said that clerical staff was available in abundance, but it was hard for the SDA to compete with higher salaries offered in the private sector for candidates with the technical and communication skills that the organization required.

In one organization that was having trouble recruiting planning staff, the director did not see the vacancies as significantly affecting overall program performance, but the unit manager and a PIC representative did. The planning manager said that "work gets done that has to, but our creativity isn't what it was, say, a year ago."

In another case, staff qualifications were having a more positive impact. The director in this SDA mentioned that the caliber and developing expertise of SDA staff had recently allowed the SDA to bring more OJT administration in-house, where the SDA could better control the quality of this training. She believed that it might also gradually become possible to take on more recruitment and assessment over the next several years, functions which had devolved away from SDA administration since the implementation of JTPA.

HIGHLIGHTS OF FINDINGS CONCERNING CURRENT JTPA STAFF

In reviewing staff survey data, it should be kept in mind that the organizations participating at the state level tended to be somewhat larger than the general distribution of state JTPA organizations. At the SDA level, organizations that participated in the staff survey were somewhat more concentrated in the broad middle of the funding spectrum, and the distribution of staff sizes was somewhat lower than that for the SDAs participating in the director survey.

Another point to keep in mind in considering how staff characteristics varied by type of position is the tremendous overlap of staff among functional categories, or clusters. Despite this overlap, there are some telling differences in the distributions among these clusters, such as in level of education attained.

Most JTPA staff has at least a Bachelor's degree, but it is a bare majority at the SDA level and only somewhat larger at the state level. However, the percentages are higher for staff in most professional and technical clusters, and especially for staff in these clusters that has supervisory responsibilities. Ninety percent of supervisory state staff in the professional/technical clusters, and three-quarters of comparable SDA staff, has at least a Bachelor's degree. Percentages are markedly lower for clerical and data entry staff, and tend also to be somewhat lower for fiscal staff. At both the state and SDA levels, the proportions of staff with four-year or higher degrees decline as staff size increases.

There is considerable variation among the majors of respondents with postsecondary degrees. In general, however, the fields specified most frequently include the social sciences, business administration/accounting, education/counseling/social work, public administration/planning, and personnel/human (or industrial) relations.

Staff at both levels tends to have substantial experience both in their current position and within the employment and training field. A majority of both state and SDA staff respondents have been in their current position for at least three years. More than half of state staff, and 37% of SDA staff, has worked in the employment and training field for ten years or more.

Only a minority of the staff belongs to any professional associations, according to survey responses. Thirty-one percent of state respondents and 25% of SDA respondents reported belonging to one or more professional associations. At the state level, the organization specified most frequently was IAPES, the International Association of Personnel in Employment Security. At the SDA level, it was the relevant state or regional employment and training association.

In terms of demographic characteristics, most JTPA staff is white, most is at least 36 years old, and most is female. Specifically, three-quarters of state staff respondents and two-thirds of those at the SDA level reported themselves to be white; similar proportions at each level were at least 36 years of age; and 58% of state respondents and 70% of those at the SDA level were women. The clearest patterns of demographic differences across functional clusters are by gender, but there is also relatively equal representation in several professional and technical clusters, especially at the state level.

Staff survey data corroborate the director survey findings of higher state pay scales, as reported in Chapter III. Among staff survey respondents, 41% of the state staff is paid at least $35,000 annually, whereas only 8% of SDA staff earns as much. Conversely, 70% of SDA staff, but only 27% of state staff, is paid no more than $25,000. The

differences persist even within corresponding functional clusters, such as policy/administration, personnel, fiscal, and clerical, as well as between supervisory staff at the two levels. Pay levels are generally higher in larger state staffs, but at the SDA level higher pay scales are found in the smaller organizations.

The survey data permit only partial and broad comparisons to the recommended qualifications summarized in Chapter IV: the staff surveys did not attempt to assess actual skills, and their only source of information on job-specific experience is tenure in current position. There is a strong correspondence between the level of education respondents recommend for their current position and the level they actually have attained. There is also a strong similarity between the distribution of recommended and actual major field of postsecondary education. With respect to experience, large proportions of staff in most clusters have lengthy tenure in the overall field of employment and training, and the percentages with at least three years in their current position are also substantial.

Case study comments are our source of information on staff skills and overall qualifications, and these are generally highly positive. Managers did express some concern about written and oral communication skills and about the caliber of some clerical staff, especially at the SDA level. Overall, however, directors and managers interviewed for the case studies said that much of their staff had qualifications and skills that exceeded those warranted by their titles, salaries, or promotional opportunities. They credited this profile and the tendency toward long tenure to staff's commitment to the employment and training field.

The comparisons we have been able to draw with other human service systems are fragmentary. Professional positions within the vocational rehabilitation (VR) system tend to be more science-oriented than most JTPA positions, and VR professionals generally have higher educational credentials than professional and technical JTPA staff taken as a whole.

Licensing requirements for teachers vary greatly across states, but at least a four-year degree and some field experience are generally required. With this or greater background, the average classroom teacher today is paid slightly in excess of $31,000 annually. Teacher organizations are moving to establish a national system of voluntary certification based on a common set of standards of teaching quality; however, development of the assessment criteria is expected to take several years.

Pay scales in social work appear to be lower, even for personnel with graduate degrees, and may thus be more comparable with current SDA pay scales. (The last point is enhanced by the fact that the information source, a survey of salaries in the child welfare field, deliberately excluded statewide public agencies).

Table V-1

Selected Characteristics of State JTPA Organizations
Responding to Director Survey and Staff Survey

Characteristic	Director Survey States (n=40)	Staff Survey States (n=8)
Funding		
Minimum	$237,000	$339,213
Maximum	Over $10 million	Over $10 million
Mean	Over $1.8 million	Over $3 million
Median	Over $1.2 million	Over $1.7 million
Percent by size category		
Under $500,000	35%	13%
$500,000 - $2 million	35%	50%
More than $2 million	30%	38%
Staff size (positions)		
Mean	44	60
Median	38	48
Size of state agency (percent)		
0 - 100	25%	38%
100 - 1,000	44%	37%
More than 1,000	33%	25%

Table V-2

Selected Characteristics of SDA Administrative Entities
Responding to Director Survey and Staff Survey

Characteristics	Director Survey SDAs (n=82)	Staff Survey SDAs (n=30)
Funding		
Minimum	$158,000	$463,000
Maximum	Over $26 million	$5.5 million
Mean	$2.9 million	$1.9 million
Median	$1.8 million	$1.6 million
Percent by size category		
Under $1 million	15%	20%
$1 million-$1.9 million	39%	37%
$2 million-$6.9 million	40%	43%
$7 million and over	6%	0%
II-A staff size (positions)		
Mean	25	19
Median	23	14
Percent by size category		
0 - 10	27%	40%
11 - 30	41%	40%
31 and over	32%	20%
Type of administrative entity (percent)		
PIC	28%	20%
Government	62%	70%
CBO/Other	10%	10%

Table V-3

Highest Education Level Attained by JTPA Staff

Level	State Staff	SDA Staff
Did not finish high school	0.4%	1%
High school diploma/GED	7	13
Some college	21	26
Associate's degree	9	7
Bachelor's degree	37	38
Master's degree	20	13
Doctoral degree	2	0.3
Other	4	2

Table V-4

Tenure of State and Local JTPA Staff

	Percent of Staff		
Length of Time	In Current Position	In JTPA/ CETA	In Training Field
State Staff			
Less than 6 months	13%	8%	7%
6-12 months	10	6	4
1-2 years	23	13	8
3-4 years	19	13	10
5 or more years[a]	35	21	15
10 or more years	(not asked)	41	56
SDA Staff			
Less than 6 months	11	7	6
6-12 months	12	7	6
1-2 years	24	17	15
3-4 years	20	16	16
5 or more years[a]	34	20	20
10 or more years	(not asked)	33	37

[a]5 to 9 years for both right-hand columns

Table V-5

AGE OF STATE STAFF BY ETHNICITY

	WHITE, NON-HISPANIC	BLACK, NON-HISPANIC	HISPANIC	ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER	AMERICAN INDIAN /ALASKAN NATIVE	All Cases
AGE GROUP						
18 - 25	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
26 - 35	13%	5%	0%	1%	0%	20%
36 - 45	34%	8%	2%	2%	0%	48%
46 - 55	17%	2%	1%	1%	1%	22%
56 OR OLDER	8%	1%	0%	0%	0%	10%
All Cases	74% (208)	17% (48)	4% (12)	4% (11)	1% (3)	100% (282)

Table V-6

AGE OF SDA STAFF BY ETHNICITY

	WHITE, NON-HISPANIC	BLACK, NON-HISPANIC	HISPANIC	ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER	AMERICAN INDIAN /ALASKAN NATIVE	OTHER	All Cases
AGE GROUP							
18 - 25	5%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	8%
26 - 35	16%	6%	2%	2%	1%	1%	28%
36 - 45	26%	7%	2%	2%	0%	1%	38%
46 - 55	11%	3%	1%	0%	0%	0%	15%
56 OR OLDER	9%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%
	67%	19%	6%	4%	2%	2%	100%
All Cases	(381)	(107)	(36)	(24)	(13)	(11)	(572)

Table V-7

AGE OF STATE STAFF BY ETHNICITY BY GENDER

AGE GROUP	WHITE, NON-HISPANIC		BLACK, NON-HISPANIC		HISPANIC		ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER		AMERICAN INDIAN /ALASKAN NATIVE		All Cases
	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	
18 - 25	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
26 - 35	11%	2%	4%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	20%
36 - 45	21%	13%	6%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	48%
46 - 55	6%	11%	2%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	22%
56 OR OLDER	2%	6%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%
All Cases	41% (116)	32% (91)	13% (36)	4% (12)	2% (5)	2% (7)	2% (5)	2% (6)	1% (2)	0% (1)	100% (281)

Table V-8

AGE OF SDA STAFF BY ETHNICITY BY GENDER

	WHITE, NON-HISPANIC		BLACK, NON-HISPANIC		HISPANIC		ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER		AMERICAN INDIAN /ALASKAN NATIVE		OTHER		All Cases
	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	
AGE GROUP													
18 - 25	4%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%
26 - 35	11%	5%	5%	1%	2%	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	28%
36 - 45	17%	9%	4%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	38%
46 - 55	8%	3%	3%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	15%
56 OR OLDER	6%	3%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%
	45%	21%	14%	5%	4%	2%	3%	1%	2%	0%	1%	1%	100%
All Cases	259	121	(78)	(28)	(23)	(13)	(17)	(7)	(12)	(1)	(8)	(3)	570

Table V-9

Percent of State JTPA Staff Performing Specific Functions

SJTCC Support
  Orienting SJTCC   14%
  Developing GCSSP,
    target group policies   12
  Designating SDAs   5
  SDA reorganizations   6
  Approving SDA plans   22
  Use & allocation of non-
    78% funds   17
  Other   8

Support for State Policy &
  Administration
  Policy on funding recapture 17
  Policy on performance-
    based contracting   15
  Policy on SDA liaison,
    monitoring, T.A.   30
  Policy on conducting post-
    program follow-up   16
  Content & organization of
    MIS   12
  Other   6

Support for Performance
  Standards Policy
  Additional state standards   14
  Procedures for adjusting
    SDA performance standards 16
  6% performance awards
    policy   16
  Sanctions policy   17
  Other   2

State Program Management
  Goal setting   21
  Planning & program devel.   31
  Field rep/SDA monitoring/
    liaison   30
  Provision of T.A. to SDAs   39
  Liaison with elected
    officials   17
  Public information   21
  Employer relations   11
  Coordination with other
    agencies   36
  Contract negotiation   21
  Establishing personnel
    policies   7
  Other   5

MIS/Computers
  Establishing & updating MIS   14%
  Compilation of JASR data   8
  Manual filing systems   15
  Computer hard/software   20
  Data entry   18
  Other   9

Research/Statistics/Evaluation
  Collecting labor market info   7
  Analyzing & reporting statistical
    information   27
  Program evaluation   29
  Other   2

Fiscal
  Budgeting   14
  Accounting   11
  Auditing   6
  Audit resolutions   11
  Contract monitoring   24
  Procurement   11
  Other   6

Personnel/Labor Relations
  Personnel   7
  Labor relations   3
  Affirmative action/equal opp.   6
  Staff development   12
  Staff evaluation   13
  Other   2

Support
  Clerical/secretarial   24
  Legal   1
  Other   1

185

Table V-10

Percent of SDA Staff Performing Specific Functions

SDA PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT
Program design	24%
Developing new service approaches	26
Developing service systems	16
Developing performance standards standards policy	14
Long-range planning	21
Using labor market information	35
Conducting population analysis	9
Proposal writing	14
RFP writing	13
Other	2

SDA PROGRAM MANAGEMENT
Evaluating proposals	25
Assessing program performance	31
Managing overall performance goals	20
Monitoring client systems (intake, assessment, follow-up)	33
Monitoring contractors	27
Establishing personnel policies	12
Relationships with business	36
Relationships with community	42
Liaison with state	19
Other	4

PUBLIC/PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT (PIC SUPPORT)
Liaison with local elected officials	17
Recruiting PIC members	11
Oversight of PIC organization and roles	8
Monitoring PIC liability issues	6
Public/community relations	29
Coordination with other agencies	40
Economic development	15
Other	2

EMPLOYER RELATIONS
Determining training needs	27
Marketing job training services to employers	28
Developing and serving employer accounts	17
Determining local employer personal needs	20
Other	2

OUTREACH, RECRUITMENT, AND INTAKE
Marketing to participants	36
Orientation	35
Eligibility determination	33
Other	4

ASSESSMENT AND COUNSELING
Motivating and working with participants	46
Functional and vocational testing	29
Development of EDPs	30
Individual and group counseling	40
Life skills counseling	26
Personal goal-setting	33
Crisis intervention	22
Determining supportive services needs	34
Assignment/referral to services	36
Interpreting (bilingual/ASL)	6
Other	2

FISCAL AND PROCUREMENT
Cost-reimbursement contracting	15%
Performance-based contracting	13
Fiscal monitoring	14
Cost allocation	11
RFP and contract development	15
Budgeting	19
Accounting	13
Auditing	5
Audit resolutions	8
Procurement of supplies, equipment, facilities	15
Other	4

MIS/COMPUTERS
Establishing and updating MIS	14
Compilation of JASR data	5
Manual filing systems	25
Computer hardware/software	23
Data entry	29
Other	8

RESEARCH/STATISTICS/EVALUATION
Collecting labor market information	15
Analyzing and reporting statistical information	19
Program/contract evaluation	23
Other	1

PERSONNEL/LABOR RELATIONS
Personnel	12
Labor relations	5
Affirmative action/equal opportunity	8
Staff development	17
Staff evaluation	19
Other	1

SUPPORT
Clerical/secretarial	26
Legal	2
Other	2

JOB DEVELOPMENT/PLACEMENT
Job search supervision	22
Conducting job clubs	14
Contacting employers	29
Matching clients and jobs	31
Client follow-up	37
Other	2

ON-THE-JOB TRAINING
OJT contracting	21
Upgrading and retraining contracts	13
Developing work experience slots	19
Other	2

CLASSROOM TRAINING/EDUCATION
Curriculum development	13
Provision of basic skills remediation	13
Designing computer-assisted instruction	6
Provision of occupational skills training	12
Other	3

Table V-11

Percent of State Staff in Each Functional Cluster

Functional Cluster	Percent of State Staff (n=287)
Policy/administration[a]	65%
Public contact[b]	47
LMI[c]	7
Monitoring[d]	38
MIS[e]	30
Fiscal[f]	25
Personnel[g]	23
Legal[h]	1
Clerical[i]	24

NOTE: Categories are derived from Table V-9, as detailed in footnotes below. Percentages sum to more than 100% due to overlap of staff across categories.

[a]Includes all of SJTCC support; all of support for state policy and administration; all of support for performance standards policy; goal-setting; planning; providing T.A. to SDAs; analyzing statistical information; and program evaluation.

[b]Includes liaison with public officials, public information, employer relations, and coordination with other agencies.

[c]Collecting labor market information.

[d]Includes field rep/SDA liaison and contract monitoring.

[e]Includes all MIS/computers categories.

[f]Includes budgeting, accounting, auditing, and audit resolutions.

[g]Includes all of personnel/labor relations; establishing personnel policies; and procurement.

[h]Legal support.

[i]Clerical/secretarial support.

Table V-12

Percent of SDA Staff in Each Functional Cluster

Functional Cluster	Percent of SDA Staff (n=577)
Policy/administration[a]	65%
Client service[b]	70
Classroom training[c]	21
Interpreting[d]	6
Monitoring[e]	40
MIS/JASR[f]	15
Data processing[g]	40
Fiscal[h]	34
Procurement[i]	15
Personnel[j]	29
Legal[k]	2
Clerical[l]	26

NOTE: Categories are derived from Table V-10, as detailed in footnotes below. Percentages sum to more than 100% due to overlap of staff across categories.

[a]Includes all of SDA program development; all of public/private sector involvement; all of research; evaluating proposals; assessing program performance; developing service systems; conducting population analysis; proposal writing; and RFP writing.

[b]Includes all of outreach, recruitment, and intake; all of assessment and counseling, except interpreting; all of on-the-job training; all of job development/placement; and all of employer relations.

[c]Includes all of classroom training/education.

[d]Interpreting (bilingual/ASL).

[e]Includes monitoring client systems and monitoring contractors.

[f]Includes establishing/updating MIS and compilation of JASR data.

[g]Includes manual filing systems, computer hardware/software, and data entry.

[h]Includes all of fiscal except procurement.

[i]Procurement.

[j]Includes all of personnel/labor relations and establishing personnel policies.

[k]Legal support.

[l]Clerical/secretarial support.

Table V-13

LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF STATE STAFF
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER

	Functional Cluster									All Cases
	POL./ ADMIN.	PUB. CONTACT	LMI	MONITOR	MIS	FISCAL	PERSON EL	LEGAL	CLERICAL	
LEVEL OF EDUCATION										
DID NOT FINISH H.S.	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%
H.S./GED	3%	4%	0%	3%	11%	1%	2%	0%	19%	7%
SOME COLLEGE	13%	15%	5%	10%	27%	14%	12%	0%	43%	22%
ASSOCIATE	7%	6%	16%	8%	8%	15%	9%	0%	12%	9%
BACHELOR'S	47%	44%	47%	49%	29%	44%	47%	50%	12%	37%
MASTER'S	26%	28%	32%	24%	19%	22%	24%	0%	4%	20%
DOCTORATE	2%	1%	0%	3%	0%	1%	5%	50%	0%	2%
OTHER	3%	2%	0%	4%	6%	3%	2%	0%	9%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Cases	(187)	(136)	(19)	(109)	(85)	(73)	(66)	(2)	(69)	(279)

Table V-14

LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF SDA STAFF
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER

	Functional Cluster												All Cases
	POL./ ADMIN.	CLIENT SVC.	CLASS TRAIN	INTERP RETING	MONITO R	MIS/ JASR	DATA PROC.	FISCAL	PROCUR EMENT	PERSON NEL	LEGAL	CLERIC AL	
EDUCATION LEVEL													
DID NOT FINISH H.S.	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	1%
H.S./GED	8%	9%	6%	6%	6%	16%	18%	6%	7%	5%	0%	24%	12%
SOME COLLEGE	21%	25%	15%	25%	20%	24%	29%	22%	30%	24%	36%	39%	26%
ASSOCIATE	6%	5%	6%	6%	7%	8%	10%	7%	7%	4%	9%	10%	7%
BACHELOR'S	44%	43%	52%	50%	47%	39%	31%	45%	43%	45%	36%	16%	38%
MASTER'S	18%	15%	20%	6%	18%	13%	8%	20%	14%	21%	18%	4%	13%
DOCTORATE	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
OTHER	1%	1%	1%	6%	1%	0%	2%	1%	0%	1%	0%	4%	2%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Cases	(374)	(403)	(120)	(32)	(230)	(87)	(231)	(197)	(87)	(167)	(11)	(147)	(564)

Table V-15

ACTUAL LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF STATE STAFF
BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION RECOMMENDED

	RECOMMENDED EDUCATION LEVEL						All Cases
	H.S./GED	SOME COLLEGE	ASSOCIATE	BACHELOR'S	MASTER'S	SEC/BUS COLLEGE	
HIGHEST LEVEL OF ED COMPLETED							
H.S./GED	47%	11%	0%	1%	0%	17%	9%
SOME COLLEGE	32%	46%	17%	5%	0%	50%	19%
ASSOCIATE	11%	14%	33%	3%	9%	17%	8%
BACHELOR'S	5%	14%	17%	66%	9%	0%	39%
MASTER'S	5%	4%	17%	23%	64%	0%	18%
DOCTORATE	0%	7%	0%	1%	18%	0%	3%
OTHER	0%	4%	17%	1%	0%	17%	3%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Cases	(19)	(28)	(6)	(96)	(11)	(18)	(178)

Table V-16

ACTUAL LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF SDA STAFF
BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION RECOMMENDED

	RECOMMENDED EDUCATION LEVEL						All Cases
	H.S./GED	SOME COLLEGE	ASSOCIATE	BACHELOR'S	MASTER'S	SEC/BUS COLLEGE	
HIGHEST LEVEL OF ED COMPLETED							
DID NOT FINISH H.S.	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
H.S./GED	39%	7%	6%	1%	0%	29%	11%
SOME COLLEGE	42%	45%	29%	12%	8%	50%	26%
ASSOCIATE	5%	9%	29%	3%	0%	13%	7%
BACHELOR'S	3%	28%	31%	63%	8%	4%	38%
MASTER'S	3%	12%	3%	20%	75%	0%	14%
DOCTORATE	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%	0%	0%
OTHER	4%	0%	3%	1%	0%	4%	1%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Cases	79	58	35	196	12	24	404

Table V-17

LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN CURRENT POSITION
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER OF STATE STAFF

	Functional Cluster									All Cases
	POL./ ADMIN.	PUB. CONTACT	LMI	MONITOR	MIS	FISCAL	PERSON EL	LEGAL	CLERICAL	
LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT										
LESS THAN 6 MOS	11%	13%	5%	7%	14%	10%	6%	0%	13%	14%
6 - 12 MOS	9%	9%	11%	9%	12%	10%	9%	0%	16%	10%
1 - 2 YEARS	22%	21%	26%	17%	18%	25%	23%	50%	26%	23%
3 - 4 YEARS	22%	22%	11%	22%	19%	25%	29%	50%	16%	19%
5 OR MORE YEARS	37%	36%	47%	45%	38%	32%	33%	0%	29%	34%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Cases	(186)	(136)	(19)	(109)	(85)	(73)	(66)	(2)	(69)	(278)

Table V-18

LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN ANY JTPA OR CETA POSITION
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER OF STATE STAFF

	Functional Cluster									All Cases
	POL./ ADMIN.	PUB. CONTACT	LMI	MONITOR	MIS	FISCAL	PERSON EL	LEGAL	CLERICAL	
LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT LESS THAN 6 MOS	5%	3%	0%	3%	11%	7%	2%	0%	11%	8%
6 - 12 MOS	5%	5%	5%	6%	7%	6%	8%	0%	8%	6%
1 - 2 YEARS	8%	7%	16%	6%	13%	11%	9%	50%	17%	12%
3 - 4 YEARS	12%	16%	11%	13%	12%	13%	8%	0%	13%	13%
5 - 9 YEARS	20%	21%	5%	19%	23%	20%	23%	50%	31%	21%
10 OR MORE YEARS	50%	48%	63%	53%	34%	44%	52%	0%	20%	40%
All Cases	100% (183)	100% (133)	100% (19)	100% (108)	100% (83)	100% (71)	100% (66)	100% (2)	100% (64)	100% (270)

Table V-19

LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN ANY PUBLIC SECTOR OR NONPROFIT JOB TRAINING POSITION
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER OF STATE STAFF

	Functional Cluster									All Cases
	POL./ ADMIN.	PUB. CONTACT	LMI	MONITOR	MIS	FISCAL	PERSON EL	LEGAL	CLERICAL	
LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT										
LESS THAN 6 MOS	4%	2%	0%	2%	11%	6%	2%	0%	15%	8%
6 - 12 MOS	3%	4%	6%	3%	4%	3%	6%	0%	6%	3%
1 - 2 YEARS	3%	2%	11%	3%	10%	10%	3%	50%	13%	8%
3 - 4 YEARS	8%	12%	11%	7%	10%	7%	8%	0%	15%	10%
5 - 9 YEARS	13%	11%	0%	13%	13%	16%	14%	50%	24%	15%
10 OR MORE YEARS	70%	69%	72%	72%	52%	58%	68%	0%	27%	56%
All Cases	100% (181)	100% (132)	100% (18)	100% (104)	100% (79)	100% (69)	100% (65)	100% (2)	100% (62)	100% (264)

195

Table V-20

LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN CURRENT POSITION
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER OF SDA STAFF

LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT	Functional Cluster												All Cases
	POL./ ADMIN.	CLIENT SVC.	CLASS TRAIN	INTERP RETING	MONITOR	MIS/ JASR	DATA PROC.	FISCAL	PROCUR EMENT	PERSON NEL	LEGAL	CLERIC AL	
LESS THAN 6 MOS	9%	10%	11%	16%	9%	5%	9%	5%	3%	5%	9%	7%	10%
6 - 12 MOS	12%	11%	16%	22%	10%	6%	11%	11%	8%	10%	9%	13%	12%
1 - 2 YEARS	23%	24%	26%	16%	27%	30%	26%	27%	28%	20%	9%	27%	24%
3 - 4 YEARS	20%	22%	19%	25%	20%	17%	18%	20%	18%	24%	36%	19%	20%
5 OR MORE YEARS	36%	33%	28%	22%	33%	43%	36%	37%	43%	41%	36%	33%	34%
All Cases	100% (374)	100% (404)	100% (120)	100% (32)	100% (231)	100% (87)	100% (232)	100% (198)	100% (87)	100% (167)	100% (11)	100% (147)	100% (566)

196

Table V-21

LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN ANY JTPA OR CETA POSITION
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER OF SDA STAFF

	Functional Cluster												All Cases
	POL./ ADMIN.	CLIENT SVC.	CLASS TRAIN	INTERP RETING	MONITO R	MIS/ JASR	DATA PROC.	FISCAL	PROCUR EMENT	PERSON NEL	LEGAL	CLERIC AL	
LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT													
LESS THAN 6 MOS	5%	6%	5%	13%	6%	4%	6%	3%	1%	1%	9%	6%	6%
6 - 12 MOS	6%	7%	8%	9%	5%	2%	7%	6%	5%	4%	0%	10%	8%
1 - 2 YEARS	16%	16%	17%	16%	16%	17%	19%	15%	16%	11%	9%	21%	17%
3 - 4 YEARS	15%	18%	18%	22%	14%	14%	19%	15%	18%	14%	27%	18%	16%
5 - 9 YEARS	23%	21%	26%	25%	23%	24%	18%	21%	21%	26%	9%	18%	20%
10 OR MORE YEARS	35%	32%	25%	16%	36%	39%	32%	41%	39%	43%	45%	27%	33%
All Cases	100% (371)	100% (402)	100% (119)	100% (32)	100% (230)	100% (84)	100% (226)	100% (198)	100% (87)	100% (166)	100% (11)	100% (145)	100% (557)

Table V-22

LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN ANY PUBLIC SECTOR OR NONPROFIT JOB TRAINING POSITION
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER OF SDA STAFF

	Functional Cluster												All Cases
	POL./ ADMIN.	CLIENT SVC.	CLASS TRAIN	INTERP RETING	MONITO R	MIS/ JASR	DATA PROC.	FISCAL	PROCUR EMENT	PERSON NEL	LEGAL	CLERIC AL	
LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT													
LESS THAN 6 MOS	4%	5%	3%	13%	4%	2%	5%	2%	1%	0%	9%	6%	5%
6 - 12 MOS	5%	5%	7%	6%	4%	1%	5%	5%	3%	4%	0%	8%	6%
1 - 2 YEARS	13%	14%	14%	9%	12%	13%	16%	15%	13%	10%	0%	8%	6%
3 - 4 YEARS	15%	18%	21%	19%	14%	16%	19%	14%	13%	10%	0%	19%	15%
5 - 9 YEARS	22%	21%	25%	34%	22%	26%	20%	17%	19%	14%	36%	18%	16%
10 OR MORE YEARS	42%	37%	31%	19%	43%	41%	35%	48%	44%	51%	45%	31%	20%
													37%
All Cases	100% (369)	100% (399)	100% (117)	100% (32)	100% (230)	100% (85)	100% (226)	100% (195)	100% (86)	100% (166)	100% (11)	100% (144)	100% (556)

Table V-23

AGE OF STATE STAFF BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER

	Functional Cluster									All Cases
	POL./ ADMIN.	PUB. CONTACT	LMI	MONITOR	MIS	FISCAL	PERSON EL	LEGAL	CLERICAL	
AGE GROUP										
18 - 25	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	4%	1%
26 - 35	13%	10%	16%	11%	20%	22%	14%	50%	43%	20%
36 - 45	52%	55%	37%	44%	45%	47%	50%	50%	34%	48%
46 - 55	24%	23%	26%	30%	19%	19%	24%	0%	13%	21%
56 OR OLDER	11%	12%	21%	15%	14%	12%	12%	0%	6%	10%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Cases	(186)	(135)	(19)	(109)	(85)	(73)	(66)	(2)	(70)	(279)

Table V-24

GENDER OF STATE STAFF BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER

	Functional Cluster									All Cases
	POL./ ADMIN.	PUB. CONTACT	LMI	MONITOR	MIS	FISCAL	PERSON EL	LEGAL	CLERICAL	
GENDER FEMALE	47%	50%	26%	37%	61%	51%	45%	50%	87%	58%
MALE	53%	50%	74%	63%	39%	49%	55%	50%	13%	42%
All Cases	100% (187)	100% (136)	100% (19)	100% (108)	100% (85)	100% (72)	100% (65)	100% (2)	100% (70)	100% (279)

Table V-25

ETHNICITY OF STATE STAFF BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER

	Functional Cluster									All Cases
	POL./ ADMIN.	PUB. CONTACT	LMI	MONITOR	MIS	FISCAL	PERSON EL	LEGAL	CLERICAL	
ETHNICITY										
WHITE, NON-HISPANIC	76%	78%	95%	72%	75%	77%	77%	50%	75%	74%
BLACK, NON-HISPANIC	14%	13%	5%	16%	18%	14%	11%	50%	19%	17%
HISPANIC	5%	4%	0%	6%	2%	4%	5%	0%	3%	4%
ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER	4%	2%	0%	4%	2%	4%	5%	0%	1%	4%
AMERICAN INDIAN /ALASKAN NATIVE	1%	2%	0%	2%	2%	1%	3%	0%	1%	1%
All Cases	100% (185)	100% (135)	100% (19)	100% (108)	100% (84)	100% (73)	100% (66)	100% (2)	100% (69)	100% (276)

Table V-26

AGE OF SDA STAFF BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER

AGE GROUP	Functional Cluster												All Cases
	POL./ ADMIN.	CLIENT SVC.	CLASS TRAIN	INTERP RETING	MONITO R	MIS/ JASR	DATA PROC.	FISCAL	PROCUR EMENT	PERSON NEL	LEGAL	CLERIC AL	
18 - 25	6%	7%	9%	12%	6%	5%	10%	7%	0%	3%	9%	14%	8%
26 - 35	27%	27%	26%	48%	30%	32%	32%	29%	31%	23%	27%	29%	28%
36 - 45	41%	41%	39%	27%	40%	44%	36%	41%	41%	44%	27%	30%	38%
46 - 55	15%	16%	19%	9%	13%	13%	12%	15%	15%	17%	27%	16%	15%
56 OR OLDER	11%	10%	7%	3%	10%	7%	10%	9%	13%	13%	9%	12%	11%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Cases	(375)	(404)	(119)	(33)	(233)	(87)	(232)	(199)	(87)	(167)	(11)	(146)	(567)

Table V-27

GENDER OF SDA STAFF BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER

	Functional Cluster												All Cases
	POL./ ADMIN.	CLIENT SVC.	CLASS TRAIN	INTERP RETING	MONITO R	MIS/ JASR	DATA PROC.	FISCAL	PROCUR EMENT	PERSON NEL	LEGAL	CLERIC AL	
GENDER FEMALE	61%	68%	66%	73%	58%	64%	75%	53%	60%	56%	82%	88%	70%
MALE	39%	32%	34%	27%	42%	36%	25%	47%	40%	44%	18%	12%	30%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Cases	(374)	(404)	(120)	(33)	(232)	(87)	(232)	(198)	(87)	(166)	(11)	(147)	(566)

Table V-28

ETHNICITY OF SDA STAFF BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER

	Functional Cluster												All Cases
	POL./ADMIN.	CLIENT SVC.	CLASS TRAIN	INTERP RETING	MONITO R	MIS/ JASR	DATA PROC.	FISCAL	PROCUR EMENT	PERSON NEL	LEGAL	CLERIC AL	
ETHNICITY													
WHITE, NON-HISPANIC	70%	67%	76%	27%	66%	81%	69%	73%	70%	70%	82%	70%	67%
BLACK, NON-HISPANIC	17%	19%	12%	18%	19%	7%	15%	15%	16%	16%	0%	16%	19%
HISPANIC	6%	6%	6%	39%	6%	2%	3%	4%	2%	6%	9%	3%	6%
ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER	3%	4%	3%	9%	4%	2%	5%	5%	8%	4%	9%	4%	4%
AMERICAN INDIAN /ALASKAN NATIVE	2%	2%	2%	0%	3%	5%	4%	2%	1%	2%	0%	4%	2%
OTHER	2%	2%	3%	6%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	3%	0%	3%	2%
All Cases	100% (373)	100% (402)	100% (120)	100% (33)	100% (231)	100% (85)	100% (230)	100% (198)	100% (86)	100% (166)	100% (11)	100% (145)	100% (564)

Table V-29

LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF STATE STAFF

By Supervisory Status

	SUPERVISORY	NOT SUPERVISORY	All Cases
LEVEL OF EDUCATION			
DID NOT FINISH H.S.	0%	1%	0%
H.S./GED	6%	8%	7%
SOME COLLEGE	5%	28%	21%
ASSOCIATE	5%	11%	9%
BACHELOR'S	47%	33%	37%
MASTER'S	32%	15%	20%
DOCTORATE	2%	2%	2%
OTHER	2%	4%	3%
	100%	100%	100%
All Cases	(81)	(199)	(280)

Table V-30

LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF SDA STAFF
By Supervisory Status

	SUPERVISORY	NOT SUPERVISORY	All Cases
LEVEL OF EDUCATION			
DID NOT FINISH H.S.	0%	1%	1%
H.S./GED	7%	16%	13%
SOME COLLEGE	20%	29%	26%
ASSOCIATE	6%	8%	7%
BACHELOR'S	41%	37%	38%
MASTER'S	24%	8%	13%
DOCTORATE	1%	0%	0%
OTHER	1%	1%	1%
	100%	100%	100%
All Cases	(182)	(361)	(543)

206

Table V-31

LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF STATE STAFF

By Supervisory and Clerical Status

	SUPERVISORY		NOT SUPERVISORY		All Cases
	CLERICAL	NOT CLERICAL	CLERICAL	NOT CLERICAL	
LEVEL OF EDUCATION					
DID NOT FINISH H.S.	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%
H.S./GED	33%	0%	15%	5%	7%
SOME COLLEGE	13%	3%	52%	19%	21%
ASSOCIATE	7%	5%	13%	10%	9%
BACHELOR'S	20%	53%	9%	41%	37%
MASTER'S	13%	36%	2%	19%	20%
DOCTORATE	0%	3%	0%	3%	2%
OTHER	13%	0%	7%	2%	3%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Cases	(15)	(66)	(54)	(145)	(280)

Table V-32

LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF SDA STAFF

By Supervisory and Clerical Status

	SUPERVISORY		NOT SUPERVISORY		All Cases
	CLERICAL	NOT CLERICAL	CLERICAL	NOT CLERICAL	
LEVEL OF EDUCATION					
DID NOT FINISH H.S.	0%	0%	3%	1%	1%
H.S./GED	18%	4%	28%	11%	13%
SOME COLLEGE	39%	15%	38%	25%	26%
ASSOCIATE	5%	6%	13%	6%	7%
BACHELOR'S	26%	45%	12%	47%	38%
MASTER'S	8%	28%	3%	10%	13%
DOCTORATE	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
OTHER	3%	1%	4%	0%	1%
All Cases	100% (38)	100% (144)	100% (104)	100% (257)	100% (543)

Table V-33

**LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF STATE STAFF
BY STAFF SIZE IN PY 88**

	TOTAL STAFF IN PY88			All Cases
	1 - 20	21 - 60	61 +	
LEVEL OF EDUCATION				
DID NOT FINISH H.S.	4%	0%	0%	0%
H.S./GED	0%	7%	8%	7%
SOME COLLEGE	15%	19%	23%	21%
ASSOCIATE	12%	5%	11%	9%
BACHELOR'S	46%	36%	36%	37%
MASTER'S	23%	28%	15%	20%
DOCTORATE	0%	2%	2%	2%
OTHER	0%	2%	5%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Cases	(26)	(88)	(171)	(285)

Table V-34

LEVEL OF EDUCATION OF SDA STAFF
BY STAFF SIZE IN PY 88

	II-A STAFF SIZE IN PY 88			All Cases
	0 - 10	11 - 30	31 +	
LEVEL OF EDUCATION				
DID NOT FINISH H.S.	0%	1%	1%	1%
H.S./GED	10%	13%	13%	13%
SOME COLLEGE	28%	20%	29%	26%
ASSOCIATE	5%	8%	7%	7%
BACHELOR'S	32%	45%	36%	38%
MASTER'S	26%	12%	11%	13%
DOCTORATE	0%	1%	0%	0%
OTHER	0%	1%	2%	2%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Cases	(82)	(181)	(309)	(572)

Table V-35

Comparison of State and SDA Staff Salaries

	Percent of Staff	
Annual Salary[a]	State (n=286)	SDA (n=575)
Under $15,000	6%	15%
$15,000 - $24,999	21	55
$25,000 - $34,999	32	22
$35,000 - $44,999	29	7
$45,000 or more	12	1

[a]Part-time employees were instructed to indicate their actual annual salary, not the full-time equivalent.

Table V-36

CURRENT ANNUAL SALARY OF STATE STAFF
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER

	Functional Cluster									All Cases
	POL./ ADMIN.	PUB. CONTACT	LMI	MONITOR	MIS	FISCAL	PERSON EL	LEGAL	CLERICAL	
CURRENT SALARY										
UNDER $15,000	1%	1%	0%	0%	9%	1%	0%	0%	19%	6%
$15,000 - $24,999	8%	10%	11%	2%	21%	15%	12%	0%	54%	20%
$25,000 - $34,999	35%	34%	32%	39%	33%	26%	20%	50%	13%	32%
$35,000 - $44,999	38%	37%	42%	42%	22%	38%	27%	0%	6%	29%
$45,000 OR MORE	18%	18%	16%	18%	14%	19%	41%	50%	9%	13%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Cases	(186)	(136)	(19)	(108)	(85)	(72)	(66)	(2)	(70)	(279)

Table V-37

CURRENT ANNUAL SALARY OF SDA STAFF
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER

| | Functional Cluster | | | | | | | | | | | | All Cases |
	POL./ ADMIN.	CLIENT SVC.	CLASS TRAIN	INTERP RETING	MONITO R	MIS/ JASR	DATA PROC.	FISCAL	PROCUR EMENT	PERSON NEL	LEGAL	CLERIC AL	
CURRENT SALARY													
UNDER $15,000	6%	11%	8%	21%	7%	14%	22%	6%	9%	3%	9%	32%	14%
$15,000 - $24,999	52%	59%	62%	55%	50%	54%	55%	41%	43%	38%	27%	56%	55%
$25,000 - $34,999	30%	23%	27%	24%	31%	23%	19%	34%	29%	36%	45%	10%	22%
$35,000 - $44,999	11%	7%	3%	0%	11%	8%	5%	17%	20%	20%	9%	1%	7%
$45,000 OR MORE	2%	1%	1%	0%	2%	1%	0%	3%	0%	4%	9%	1%	1%
All Cases	100% (375)	100% (403)	100% (120)	100% (33)	100% (232)	100% (87)	100% (232)	100% (198)	100% (87)	100% (166)	100% (11)	100% (147)	100% (566)

Table V-38

CURRENT ANNUAL SALARY OF STATE STAFF

By Supervisory Status

	SUPERVISORY	NOT SUPERVISORY	All Cases
CURRENT SALARY			
UNDER $15,000	3%	7%	6%
$15,000 - $24,999	8%	26%	21%
$25,000 - $34,999	29%	33%	32%
$35,000 - $44,999	23%	32%	30%
$45,000 OR MORE	39%	2%	12%
	100%	100%	100%
All Cases	(80)	(201)	(281)

214

Table V-39

CURRENT ANNUAL SALARY OF SDA STAFF

By Supervisory Status

	SUPERVISORY	NOT SUPERVISORY	All Cases
CURRENT SALARY			
UNDER $15,000	5%	21%	15%
$15,000 - $24,999	33%	66%	55%
$25,000 - $34,999	40%	12%	21%
$35,000 - $44,999	19%	1%	7%
$45,000 OR MORE	·3%	0%	1%
All Cases	100% (184)	100% (363)	100% (547)

Table V-40

CURRENT ANNUAL SALARY OF STATE STAFF

By Supervisory and Clerical Status

	SUPERVISORY		NOT SUPERVISORY		All Cases
	CLERICAL	NOT CLERICAL	CLERICAL	NOT CLERICAL	
CURRENT SALARY					
UNDER $15,000	13%	0%	20%	2%	6%
$15,000 - $24,999	27%	3%	62%	12%	21%
$25,000 - $34,999	20%	31%	11%	41%	32%
$35,000 - $44,999	0%	28%	7%	42%	30%
$45,000 OR MORE	40%	38%	0%	3%	12%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Cases	(15)	(65)	(55)	(146)	(281)

Table V-41

CURRENT ANNUAL SALARY OF SDA STAFF
By Supervisory and Clerical Status

	SUPERVISORY		NOT SUPERVISORY		All Cases
	CLERICAL	NOT CLERICAL	CLERICAL	NOT CLERICAL	
CURRENT SALARY					
UNDER $15,000	16%	2%	39%	13%	15%
$15,000 - $24,999	47%	29%	58%	70%	55%
$25,000 - $34,999	29%	42%	3%	15%	21%
$35,000 - $44,999	5%	23%	0%	1%	7%
$45,000 OR MORE	3%	3%	0%	0%	1%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Cases	(38)	(146)	(104)	(259)	(547)

Table V-42

CURRENT ANNUAL SALARY OF STATE STAFF
BY STAFF SIZE IN PY 88

	TOTAL STAFF IN PY88			All Cases
	1 - 20	21 - 60	61 +	
CURRENT SALARY				
UNDER $15,000	0%	1%	9%	6%
$15,000 - $24,999	37%	26%	16%	21%
$25,000 - $34,999	37%	35%	30%	32%
$35,000 - $44,999	19%	24%	33%	29%
$45,000 OR MORE	7%	14%	12%	12%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Cases	(27)	(88)	(171)	(286)

Table V-43

CURRENT ANNUAL SALARY OF SDA STAFF
BY STAFF SIZE IN PY 88

	II-A STAFF SIZE IN PY 88			All Cases
	0 - 10	11 - 30	31 +	
CURRENT SALARY				
UNDER $15,000	15%	15%	15%	15%
$15,000 - $24,999	43%	51%	61%	55%
$25,000 - $34,999	26%	26%	18%	22%
$35,000 - $44,999	15%	7%	5%	7%
$45,000 OR MORE	2%	2%	1%	1%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Cases	(82)	(180)	(313)	(575)

VI. STAFF TRAINING PRACTICES AND PRIORITIES

This chapter draws on both the case studies and survey data to describe staff development practices within state and SDA organizations, the kinds and quality of training received by JTPA staff, and management and staff priorities for future training. After these topics, the chapter discusses the impediments to participation in staff training, as identified through the case studies, the director surveys, and the staff surveys.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES

The first portion of this section discusses staff training practices within the case study organizations. The discussion then turns to the survey data to summarize the extent of specific budgeting and planning for staff training at the state and SDA levels, the relative roles of supervisors and their staff in initiating training, the most common formats used for formal staff training, and how organizations accommodate staff time in training. On certain of these topics we are able to compare the management and staff perspective. The section concludes with a brief discussion of the extent of training provided by states to SDA staff and contractual providers, and by SDA administrative entities to their contractors.

Practices in the Case Study States and SDAs

The most interesting finding concerning case study states was that six of the eight have developed their own training institutes that offer training to both state and local JTPA staff. Some of these have been developed through the state agency, while others have grown out of SDA associations. Most are affiliated with area universities or colleges, but some are independent organizations. All are of relatively recent vintage.

The case study states were generally more thorough and more generous in promoting staff training than the SDAs, although some of the

221

SDAs exceeded some of the states in the richness and accessibility of their training offerings. At either level, organizations that are part of an extensive civil service system are most likely to do some amount of regular planning and budgeting for staff training and to offer the greatest variety of training programs.

Yet even in one of the states that budgeted the largest amount of 5% funds for staff training and related travel, the set-aside came to less than 1% of total staff expenditures. One PIC director with both Federal and private sector experience observed that both the Federal government and many private sector organizations plan staff training more carefully and budget it more generously.

States were divided in their descriptions of the degree to which staff training was actually managed. In some organizations, most interview participants said that managers and supervisors most frequently initiated the selection of training for their staff. In others, there was unanimity among the director and managers that most training was initiated by the affected employee. A few managers mentioned instances in which they had required specific individuals to take specific course (with effective writing being the most frequent choice), but these cases stood out even for these managers as exceptions. Somewhat more frequently, managers recalled training requests that they had turned down because they had received unfavorable feedback on the quality of the particular training course.

Most SDA sources said that they hired people who already had the desired skills, since they had neither time nor funding for training staff. One SDA that described itself as having a staff development program, including provision for tuition reimbursement, in fact had not paid for any staff training since the beginning of JTPA. In some of the SDAs, we conducted a few interviews with recently hired staff, who reported that they had received what they considered excellent on-the-job training from their new colleagues, as well as some training from state staff, but had not received any formal training from other sources.

222

One SDA had a comparatively intensive training program for its staff, attributable largely to its membership in an SDA association. This SDA had received technical assistance in MIS issues and PIC member orientation, and a PIC manual. It also had a line item budgeted specifically for staff training, and had secured its staff training in stress and time management, WordPerfect, and handling angry clients.

Another SDA where management took considerable pride in staff's professionalism offered comprehensive training for new staff -- but rarely had any new hires. This SDA provided cross-training in each of its units, with the purpose of facilitating coordination among staff and providing some diversity and opportunity to move to different types of positions within the organization. This SDA, like most of the others we visited, had developed detailed manuals concerning positions and procedures, which its one recent hire considered very helpful.

Two SDAs were starting to increase managerial control over the training their staff received. In one, staff training had become a reality only within the past year and a half, mostly in the form of conference attendance. Its director was now maintaining a training log.

In the other SDA, the director volunteered that over the year prior to the interview, she had begun trying to use staff training "more as a management tool." She said she was encouraging unit managers to identify staff training needs, and that the SDA was now planning and budgeting staff training on a quarterly basis. One unit manager in this SDA also mentioned trying to be more systematic in planning training for his staff, but said other priorities and available resources made it difficult.

Survey Data

Existence of Separate Staff Training Budget

When asked whether their organization had an annual budget for staff training, 35% of the state directors reported that it did, 37%

said that whether there was a separate line item varied from year to year, and 28% said that there was no budgeting for staff training. There were no systematic patterns according to organization size, as shown in the cross-tabulations of Tables VI-1 through VI-3. Only 35% of the states reported having a staff training budget in PY 89; in these organizations, the line item ranged from $300 to over $63,000, with a mean of $18,000 and a median of $10,000.

At the SDA level, 39% of the responding organizations maintained a separate staff training budget, while 21% did not; in 40%, this varied from year to year. As at the state level, there were no systematic patterns of response by size of organization, but PICs were somewhat more likely than other forms of administrative entity to report that they always or sometimes had a training budget. (These results can be seen in Tables VI-4 through VI-6.) Just over half (51%) of the SDAs had a staff training budget in PY 89, which ranged from $11,000 to $50,000, with a mean of $11,000 and median below $9,000.

The Management of Staff Training

States were divided about equally in terms of whether or not they regularly prepared training and development plans for new employees, newly promoted employees, or current employees. There is not much variation by the amount of state funds or the size of the state agency containing the JTPA unit, as can be seen in Tables VI-7 and VI-8. (If anything, formal planning for staff training appears to be less frequent in states with higher allocations and JTPA units situated in larger agencies.)

About three-quarters of the directors indicated that it was the supervisor who usually initiated training, while the other quarter reported that staff tended to initiate this training; these responses are displayed in Table VI-9. Among surveyed state staff, a smaller majority located the initiative with management: 2% reported that training choices were determined according to a formal training plan developed for the individual staff member, while 52% said they were a

matter of supervisory or management decision. The remaining 46% said an interested staff person typically initiated the training selection.

Only about one-third of the SDAs responding regularly prepared training and development plans for either new employees, newly promoted employees, or current employees. SDAs with higher allocations were generally more likely to report formal planning for staff training, but there was no significant variation by type of administrative entity; these results are presented in Tables VI-10 and VI-11.

Table VI-12 indicates that 95% of the SDA directors reported that their supervisors were the ones who initiated most staff training. This is higher than the corresponding percentage at the state level, and so is the percentage of SDA staff reporting that their supervisor or management usually initiated training: 66%. Another 4% said that training choices were determined according to a formal training plan developed for each staff member, and 31% located the initiative with the interested staff person.

Training Formats

State and SDA directors were asked to check any of a list of formats that their agency had ever used to provide formal staff training. The resulting frequencies are displayed in Tables VI-13 and VI-14.

Ninety-five percent of responding state directors reported sending staff to one- to two-day training sessions, and nearly as many, 92%, said they had sent staff to JTPA-specific conferences. Slightly lower numbers indicated that they had sent staff to training that lasted less than one day or to professional association conferences. Nearly as many indicated they had used in-service training. Community college courses were used by 69% of the respondents, and three- to five-day training sessions by 62% of the respondents. Only one-third used university extension courses.

Among responding SDAs, 91% reported taking advantage of JTPA-specific conferences for staff training. The next highest category, at 79%, was professional association conferences. This was closely followed by one- to two-day training sessions, and training sessions that lasted less than a day. Sixty-five percent of SDAs had taken advantage of in-service training, and a little more than half utilized community college courses. Training formats used by the smallest percentages of SDAs were three- to five-day training sessions, at 32%, and university extension courses, at 25%.

How Staff Time in Training Is Covered

Tables VI-15 and VI-16 summarize directors' responses concerning how their organization covers the time of staff attending training. Nearly all the state JTPA directors indicated that staff time was covered by a release time policy when state staff attended training. This was more prevalent in the larger states. Less than half used flexible scheduling, and a very small number approved or supported training outside of regular hours, or required staff to take time off without pay or to use their vacation time.

Most SDAs also reported using a release time policy, although the percentage is lower than among state JTPA units, at 70%. Half used flexible scheduling. Only about a quarter specifically approved or supported training outside regular work hours, and very few expected staff to use vacation time or take time off without pay.

Extent of Training Provided to Different Levels in the JTPA System

State and SDA directors were asked whether their state provides staff training on a regular basis for SDA-level staff, and for the staff of contractual service providers. SDA directors were asked, in addition, whether their SDA provides regular training for local contractors.

As indicated in Tables VI-17 and VI-18, an identical proportion of the state and SDA directors, 68%, reported that their state provides staff training for its SDAs. However, the proportions were nearly reversed concerning whether the state regularly provides staff training to contractors: 54% of the state directors, but only 43% of the SDA directors, answered this question affirmatively. Concerning SDA provision of staff training to contractors, 72% of the SDA directors reported that their SDA did so on a regular basis. (However, case study evidence discussed in Chapter VII suggests that this training tends to be very limited, and that service providers are often unaware of training and information potentially available to them through the JTPA system.)

Directors were also asked which level in the JTPA system initiates most of the staff training provided in their state: the state, its SDAs, or contractual service providers. As displayed in Tables VI-19 and VI-20, nearly all the state directors and almost two-thirds of the SDA directors responded that their state was the primary initiator. SDAs with the very largest allocations were more likely to identify SDAs as the primary initiator of the state's staff training. Otherwise, there was little variation by allocation, size of state agency, or type of administrative entity.

KINDS OF TRAINING RECEIVED BY JTPA STAFF

Training received by staff in the case study organizations spanned a wide variety of specific topics, ranging from EDWAA and JOBS through contracting and fiscal regulations, monitoring, customer service training, handing clients, supervisory skills, specific software packages, and stress management. A number of managers mentioned participation in training concerning fiscal topics, with varying degrees of satisfaction.

On the staff surveys, we asked respondents to list up to ten training courses that their organization had sponsored them for since July, 1987. For each item, they were asked to indicate the topic of

227

training, the setting (e.g., outside seminar, conference, in-service training), and their assessment of the usefulness of this training for their job. The topics were postcoded into eight topic categories: JTPA regulations/procedures, position-specific training, cross-training on other human service programs, training specific to a state or area, software packages, general management, stress management, and miscellaneous other.

As can be seen in Table VI-21, 235 state respondents and 430 SDA respondents indicated at least one training topic, and the total number of courses listed came to 913 and 1,656, respectively. This amounts to an average of 3.9 training courses for each of the state respondents on this item, or 3.2 if it is assumed that each state survey participant who did not answer this question had not received any training during the time period indicated. The mean for SDA respondents to this question is also 3.9; it falls to 2.9 if nonrespondents on the item are assumed to have received no training. In either case, this is not an unsubstantial amount of training.

At both the state and SDA levels, the median number of courses taken was three. This is indicated in the totals columns of Tables VI-22 and VI-23, which also display the distribution of number of training courses taken by functional cluster.

Additional data contained in Table VI-21 indicate the percent of training courses attended in each of eight topic categories. At the state level, training most frequently covered JTPA regulations and procedures (38%), followed by general management (22%), software packages (17%), and position-specific training (15%); percentages for the other four categories were negligible. At the SDA level, almost half the training courses were position-specific (46%), followed by JTPA regulations and procedures (24%) and general management and software packages (10% each). Percentages in the remaining four categories were again very small.

The distribution of training settings was fairly similar at both levels. Just under half of the courses were outside seminars at both the state and SDA levels, and in both samples 4% were community college courses or college-affiliated (including university extension courses). At the state level, a third of the courses were in-service training, and the remainder (16%) were set at conferences or conventions. At the SDA level, conferences and in-service training each accounted for a quarter of the courses.

Responses on quality were even closer between the two samples. Half of the respondents termed the training very useful, and 40% called it somewhat useful; only 9% or 10% described courses as not very useful for their job.

PRIORITIES FOR FUTURE TRAINING

Overall Frequencies

On both the director surveys and the staff surveys, we asked respondents to check up to twenty priority topics from a long list of specific training topics. Directors were asked to indicate their priorities for three sets of potential trainees: their staff, staff at the other level (i.e., SDA staff for state directors and vice versa), and contractual service providers. Staff respondents were asked to indicate personal training priorities for their own position.

The overall frequencies on the perceived training needs of state and SDA staff, each time from the three different vantage points, are presented in Tables VI-24 and VI-25. (The percentages concerning service providers are reported in Chapter VII.)

A striking feature of these tables is how similar both sets of director frequencies for either state staff or SDA staff tend to be. A general point of difference is that at either level, the directors within that level give relatively higher priority to general managerial and professional topics than the directors from the other level. This

suggests that responding directors are more acutely aware of the general managerial and skill needs of their own organization, but less likely to transfer this understanding to organizations at the other level.

Generally, however, the profiles of director frequencies are fairly similar, while the frequencies of staff at the particular level chart a different pattern. The more diffuse pattern among staff respondents is to be expected, since they had been asked to indicate priorities bearing on their own position -- which varied across the staff samples -- while directors' choices reflected their perspectives on their organization's overall needs.

Comparison Among Top Twenty Rankings

Tables VI-26 through VI-29 simplify the information presented in Tables VI-24 and VI-25 by restricting consideration to top twenty rankings.

The first two tables in this set present directors' perspectives on priority training needs of state and SDA staff, respectively, and confirm the high degree of correspondence in directors' perspectives at the two levels. Aside from specific rankings, the directors concur on three-quarters of the top twenty training topics for both sets of staff.

The directors also tend to stress JTPA-specific topics over more general topics such as supervisory skills or methods of program evaluation, although this is somewhat less true of the state directors. More specifically, state directors' top priorities for their staff include training in monitoring, liaison, and T.A.; a number of program development/SJTCC support topics; several fiscal topics; practical applications of performance standards; and MIS development and maintenance. But the list also includes three more general management topics (supervisory skills, developing staff competencies, and time management), and three topics concerned with analytic and evaluation skills.

Top priorities for SDA directors include two topics relating to expanding their funding base and another focused on increasing private sector involvement; YECs, performance standards, and EDWAA; meeting employers' needs and marketing services to them; and several topics relating to program development, including RFP development. Two topics are concerned with evaluation approaches, and a single topic is oriented to staff needs: stress management.

Staff, and especially state staff, lays relatively greater emphasis on general skills like computer competency, stress management, and problem-solving strategies, as shown in Tables VI-28 and VI-29. There are differences between the two sets of staff that clearly reflect the different responsibilities of the state and SDA levels. State staff emphasizes the general skills considerably more than SDA staff, while the latter emphasizes a number of topics focused on clients and the employer community.

The specific priorities for state staff include, at the top of the list, computer competency. Three topics relate to stress and conflict management. Others include writing and oral presentation skills; several fiscal topics; problem-solving and time management; several JTPA-specific topics (performance standards, monitoring, successful T.A., EDWAA, and a general JTPA orientation); and three topics relating to analytical skills and evaluation methods.

The top item for SDA staff is stress management, and dealing with others' stress is also a priority. More than one-third of the list focuses on understanding, reaching, motivating, and helping participants, including one topic on working with hostile or resistant clients. Computer competency is the third-highest priority. Two topics are JTPA-oriented (performance standards and JTPA orientation), two geared to the employer community (meeting their needs and marketing services to them), and two focus on learning about and building partnerships with other programs. Five more general topics close out the list: supervisory skills, problem-solving strategies, dealing with the public and effective community relations, and time management.

231

State staff agrees with state directors on half of the top twenty priorities, whereas the correspondence between SDA staff and directors is limited to five topics. This discrepancy arises largely because SDA directors tend to emphasize overall program development and fiscal topics, whereas SDA staff lays greater emphasis on client-focused and interpersonal skill topics.

Comparison with Case Study Responses

The only significant difference between the priorities identified through the director surveys and those mentioned by case study directors and managers is the absence of writing as a priority in the surveys, at either level. In site visits, it came up repeatedly, even among managers who expressed great overall satisfaction with their staff's skills and performance. Some also stressed oral communication skills as a training priority.

Another priority expressed frequently at both the state and local levels was training in contracting, procurement, and other fiscal topics. Although several interview participants mentioned training on fiscal subjects that they thought had been very helpful, there were also complaints. Some expressed a need for more sophisticated contracting training. One respondent said that training on new regulations and requirements consistently came too late, "so you end up being taught what you're doing wrong instead of how to implement it correctly."

Other topics that came up fairly frequently included software training, effective supervision, dealing with stress, customer service training, working with others, and assessment and other client-oriented topics.

Comparison with Results of Other Surveys

Missouri. In early 1987, the Missouri Training Institute surveyed directors and staff of that state's SDAs concerning their training needs

(as well as PIC members; these results are not discussed here). The questionnaire listed 214 training topics.

Out of the director' top 25 priorities, eight related to outreach and marketing. Another group focused on general management topics, including developing staff competencies, providing constructive criticism, time management, stress management/burnout prevention, resolving conflict, and effective meetings. Three topics related to analytical methods, including evaluation, labor market forecasting, and identifying occupations with the greatest potential. Two topics concerned developing additional funding sources and securing private sector involvement. Other priorities included "external awareness," liability, the special needs of the economically disadvantaged, performance-based criteria and objectives, and coordination.

Among staff participating in the same survey -- which could include service provider staff -- half of the top 18 priorities concerned participants. These included motivating participants (two nearly identical topics), motivating the hard-to-employ, getting the unemployed to believe in themselves, crisis intervention and helping participants put their problems in perspective, dealing with hostile or resistant participants, getting them job-ready, and helping them develop more effective job-finding approaches.

Four of staff respondents' priority topics focused on oral and written communication skills: communication, presenting before groups, writing skills, and dealing with the public. Several topics were of a more general nature, including time management, stress management/burnout prevention, conflict management, and problem-solving. Computer competency was also on the list of staff training priorities.

California. At about the same time as the Missouri surveys were being conducted and analyzed, the new California Training Institute was conducting a statewide needs assessment through a survey that appears to have been directed to SDA directors. According to the summary of survey

results, the top priorities were entrepreneurship development, income-generating activities, and securing diversified funding.

Other high priorities included a number of program-oriented topics: developing program designs to meet emerging needs, orienting PIC members to "what works," program monitoring techniques, post-program follow-up techniques, up-front and ongoing assessment systems, dropout prevention models, summer enrichment programs, and support services for welfare mothers. Two topics were oriented toward collaborative relationships, two were geared toward marketing (including outreach and recruitment), and one focused on developing performance-based contracts for different programs and populations. One topic centered on evaluation techniques.

Washington State. More recently (apparently around early 1989), as we were advised by one of our director survey participants, the state of Washington conducted a "State Capacity-Building Needs Assessment" that used the same 214 possible training topics as the Missouri survey. 297 questionnaires were returned and their responses tallied.

Of the top 20 topics, the first was computer literacy skills. Four of the topics concerned communication skills: communicating effectively; presenting before groups; writing effective memos, letters, and reports; and dealing with the public.

Nine of the topics focused on clients: motivating participants (selected twice in two separate sections of the questionnaire), motivating the hard-to-employ, dealing with hostile or resistant clients, getting the unemployed to believe in themselves, helping clients with problem-solving, helping clients put their problems in perspective, understanding the needs of the economically disadvantaged and those of minority groups, and helping clients develop more effective ways of finding their own jobs. More general priorities included stress/burnout management, problem-solving strategies and decision-making, resolving conflict, time management, and effective meetings.

Variation in Training Priorities by Organizational and Staff Characteristics

Variation in Directors' Priorities by Organizational Characteristics

Differences among organizations in funding level, staff size, and recent funding trends did not have a great impact on directors' training priorities. There were gaps in percentages, as identified below; but often, even for these topics, the _relative_ standing of the topic was not that dramatically different.

State Level. At the state level, organizations with higher funding and larger staffs tended to place higher priority than lower-funded, smaller organizations on training in target group policies, developing strategies to meet performance standards, funding recapture policies, effective SDA liaison and monitoring, assessment systems and techniques, developing staff competencies, and supervisory skills/motivating staff. Conversely, lower-funded and smaller organizations placed comparatively greater emphasis on training in JTPA fiscal regulations and procedures, auditing within the JTPA system, analyzing and reporting statistical information, securing private sector involvement in JTPA, cross-training about related programs, and analytical skills and methods.

State JTPA directors whose funding had recently increased were somewhat more likely to stress planning and program development, effective SDA liaison and monitoring, effective monitoring of programs and contractors, developing staff competencies, and stress management as training priorities. They placed less emphasis than states with stable or declining funding on negotiating successful contracts, computer competency, and time management. Those whose organizations had experienced declining funding gave greater weight to training in strategies for meeting performance standards, and less to cost allocation and building partnerships.

235

SDA Level. A number of differences that emerged between larger, higher-funded SDAs and their smaller, lower-funded counterparts paralleled the size-related differences at the state level. Directors of SDAs with higher funding and larger staffs tended to place higher priority on training in practical applications of the performance standards, planning and program development, setting target group policies, proposal and program evaluation, securing diversified funding, developing and using LMI, post-program follow-up, marketing services to employers, effective community relations, building partnerships, and cross-training about related programs. They also produced higher percentages for training in understanding the needs of homeless persons and welfare recipients, motivating participants, getting clients to believe in themselves, and entrepreneurship development. Finally, they placed greater emphasis on training in staff performance appraisals, managing conflict, dealing with the public, time management, stress management, and dealing with others' stress.

Directors in lower-funded, smaller organizations tended to give greater emphasis to training in providing effective support for the PIC, effective monitoring of programs and contractors, JTPA fiscal regulations and procedures, income-generating activities, preparing effective RFPs, and auditing within the JTPA system. They also accorded higher priority to understanding the needs of youth. Among general skill topics, they produced higher percentages for training in analytical skills, problem-solving, and effective meetings.

Directors of SDAs with increasing allocations gave higher priority to training in setting target group policies and program evaluation, but lower priority to training in planning and program development. Directors of SDAs whose funding had been trending downward gave above-average priority to training in developing programs to meet client needs, evaluating proposals, cross-training about related programs, and supervisory skills. Their percentages were below average for practical applications of performance standards, providing effective support for the PIC, and auditing within the JTPA system.

236

Variation in Staff Priorities by Personal Characteristics

Compared with the differences in director training priorities associated with organizational characteristics, there was even less variation in staff training priorities according to personal characteristics. The lack of variation was especially pronounced at the SDA level. Moreover, some of the differences that were observed are probably a more direct reflection of differences in staff functions, or positions (which we examine in the next subsection).

Education. State staff respondents with a college education gave higher priority than staff with lower educational attainment to training in planning and program development, effective monitoring of programs and contractors, and methods of program evaluation. They produced lower percentages for training in writing, computer competency, stress management, and dealing with other people's stress.

College-educated SDA staff respondents placed higher priority than their peers without a college degree on training in goal-setting, planning and program development, developing service programs to meet client needs, establishing YECs, developing strategies to meet performance standards, and effective monitoring of programs and contractors. Their percentages were below the SDA staff average for dealing with the public and stress management.

Experience. The one training topic that consistently differentiated both state and SDA staff with relatively long tenure (three years or more for current position, five years or more for JTPA and the employment and training sector) from staff with less experience was orientation to JTPA and related programs. Not surprisingly, the staff with shorter tenure was more likely to place priority on this topic.

What may be more surprising is that at the SDA level there were no other significant differences related to tenure. At the state level, there were a few others. Staff with greater experience placed higher

237

priority on training in SDA liaison, developing successful T.A. program, evaluating proposals, and effective monitoring of programs and contractors. Less experienced staff placed relatively greater priority on training concerning EDWAA and time management.

Demographics. There were <u>no</u> significant differences among SDA staff associated with demographic characteristics. Among state staff, there were a handful of differences associated with age. Older respondents gave higher priority to training in effective monitoring of programs and contractors, costs allocation under JTPA, and methods of program evaluation. Younger state staff, on the other hand, gave above-average priority to the basic JTPA orientation, plus training in managing conflicts and stress. White state staff produced an above-average percentage for training in evaluating proposals, while nonwhite staff gave somewhat elevated priority to training in the development of performance-based contracts. Since these are the only topics producing a difference by ethnic group across staff at either the state or SDA level, and since no compelling reason suggests itself to explain why precisely these two topics should vary as they do, it probably makes sense to regard them as "random nonrandom" differences.

Variation in Staff Priorities by Functional Cluster

Tables VI-30 and VI-31 present the top twenty training priorities for each state and SDA functional cluster, and indicate the degree to which priorities are shared with other clusters at the same (state or SDA) level. (These tables do not include three functional clusters that had very small numbers of respondents: legal staff at both the state and SDA levels, and LMI staff at the state level.)

Seven training priorities are shared across all the state functional clusters displayed in Table VI-30: EDWAA, JTPA fiscal regulations, managing conflict, analytical skills and methods, problem-solving strategies, computer competency, and stress management. On a number of other topics, priorities are shared among four, five or six of

the clusters. In most of the clusters, the priorities mix JTPA-specific and more general topics.

For example, the top twenty training priorities of state fiscal staff start with three fiscal topics. However, these are followed by a series of more general topics, including problem-solving strategies, stress management, EDWAA (which has implications for specific fiscal responsibilities), conflict management, and computer competency, before returning to a fiscal topics: effective contract monitoring and budget management. The next priority is writing; and several more general topics are interspersed with subjects like negotiating successful contracts and developing performance-based contracts toward the end of the list.

In contrast with the higher proportion of JTPA-specific priorities in the other state clusters, among state clerical staff only five topics focus on JTPA: orientation to JTPA, EDWAA, performance standards, developing successful T.A. programs, and JTPA fiscal regulations. Top priorities for this staff category are stress management, computer competency, dealing with others' stress, writing, and time management. Conflict management, problem-solving strategies, oral presentation skills, dealing with the public, supervisory skills, and effective meetings are also top priorities for staff within this cluster.

At the SDA level, there is somewhat less commonality of training priorities across the clusters. The four priorities shared by all or most staff clusters are performance standards, cross-training about related programs, computer competency, stress management, and dealing with others' stress. (Note that it was indicated earlier in this chapter that staff has received very little training focused on related human service programs.) The strongest overall interest, though variable across clusters, was in training about how to motivate participants.

SDA staff in the policy/administration, client service, monitoring, and clerical clusters all placed high priority on participant-oriented

training topics. Policy/administration and client services staff also chose both of the employer-oriented training topics. SDA fiscal staff shared a number of training priorities with its state-level counterparts. Similarly, SDA clerical staff shared half of its top training priorities with state clerical staff. In f ct, the top three choices are identical between the two groups: stress management, dealing with others' stress, and computer competency. The fourth priority for the SDA group, however, is motivating participants -- the first of the nine participant-oriented training priorities identified by this staff.

Thus, there are training priorities that are particular to certain functional clusters. These may be worth paying special attention to in organizations where there has been substantial turnover in the related units, or where there is concern about performance in specific staff areas. Overall, however, there are also substantial commonalities in the training needs perceived by staff, particularly within one or the other level; and it is worth taking note of the fact that many of the priorities identified are general rather than JTPA-specific in nature.

IMPEDIMENTS TO PARTICIPATION IN STAFF TRAINING

As shown in Tables VI-32 and VI-33, 88% of state JTPA directors and 77% of SDA directors reported that there had been training opportunities that their organization had been unable to take advantage of in the past. For the organizations answering this first question affirmatively, Tables VI-34 and VI-35 compare state and SDA responses concerning the five primary impediments to participating in staff training.

As the tables indicate, at both levels, two cost-related reasons are cited most frequently as major impediments: insufficient administrative funds and excessive travel costs. In the next tier, there are some noteworthy differences between the two levels: state directors cite restrictions on out-of-state travel and concerns over the quality of training, whereas SDA directors cite problems with timing and

240

location. (Location may, for SDAs, again relate to cost concerns.) However, problems with staff coverage are cited by identical percentages of state and SDA directors, at 46%. At both levels, duration and level (distinct from quality) of training appear to present the least difficulty.

Staff responses are somewhat more diffuse, as shown in Table VI-36, but the patterns of relative rankings are fairly similar to those of the directors at their respective level. (It should be noted that the staff questionnaire contained an extra response option for this question: "Supervisor will not release time for training.") SDA staff was most keenly aware of funding limitations, but was almost as likely to choose coverage, the most frequent choice of state staff.

At both levels, the next most frequent choice was that the subject offered was not exactly what the staff member needed. Again at both levels, this was followed by a somewhat similar reason: "Not convinced of quality of training offered;" at the SDA level, this was tied with inaccessible training location. The fourth most common reason identified by state staff was insufficient funding, and the fifth most frequent choice was restrictions on out-of-state travel, which was not a major factor for SDA staff. The sixth rank at both levels went to problems with the month or days of the week when training was scheduled, and the seventh to travel costs.

In case study organizations, training costs, funding limitations, and the pressure of workload demands and coverage needs were mentioned most consistently as barriers to staff training. Restrictions on out-of-state travel came up at the state level, as it did in the surveys. Some respondents also expressed skepticism about the quality, and particularly the excessive generality, of much available training. This was the complaint about much fiscal training.

An interesting comment made in one state agency was that staff members had grown so accustomed to funding and coverage constraints that they tended to "self-edit" requests for training. Thus, often managers

241

were not put in the position of having to turn down training requests because staff knew better than to make them.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS CONCERNING STATE AND SDA STAFF TRAINING

There appears to be increasing interest in training for JTPA staff, to judge by the growth of state training institutes that we encountered in the case study visits and have heard about in other states during the course of this study. In addition, two of the eight case study SDAs were taking steps to increase managerial control over the training their staff receives.

The staff surveys identified a considerable amount of training received by staff between July, 1987, and early 1990. During that period, the mean number of training courses attended by staff respondents was almost four, while the median was three courses. Most of this training either covered JTPA regulations and procedures or was position-specific. Additional substantial percentages of the courses were in general management subjects or offered training in software packages.

Despite these indications of training activity and interest, only a minority of state and SDA organizations regularly plan and budget for staff training, and the line items set aside for training in those organizations that have them tend to be tiny in relation to overall staff expenses. A case study respondent with experience in both the private sector and the Federal government commented that both the Federal government and many private sector organizations plan staff training more carefully and budget it more generously.

The main barriers to more deliberate and more widespread provision of staff training in state and local JTPA organizations are cost-related: insufficient administrative funds and excessive administrative costs. Staff coverage is also considered a serious barrier. Other problems cited by both directors and staff include restrictions on out-of-state travel (more of a factor at the state level), inaccessible

242

(which may translate as expensive) location, poor timing, and concerns over the quality of proposed training.

The surveys have uncovered considerable consensus about overall training priorities for the two levels, as well as identified priorities specific to staff performing different types of functions. Tables VI-26 and VI-28 identify the top twenty overall training priorities for state staff, the first from the perspective of state and SDA directors (who agree on three-quarters of the topics) and the second from the more varied perspectives of individual staff members in their different specific positions. The corresponding two tables for the SDA level are VI-27 and VI-29.

It is noteworthy that although the staff priorities can be expected to be somewhat different from those of directors, state directors and staff are in agreement on ten of the top twenty priorities. In addition, state and SDA staff share a third of the twenty priorities. SDA staff's priorities tend to be somewhat more distinct and more client-focused, while SDA directors stress topics more oriented toward overall program development and fiscal responsibilities.

Table VI-1

WHETHER STATE HAS TRAINING BUDGET
BY AMOUNT OF JTPA FUNDS

| | WHETHER STATE HAS TRAINING BUDGET | | | ALL STATES | |
	YES		NO		VARIES			
PY 88 STATE FUNDS								
LESS THAN $500,000	29%	(4)	21%	(3)	50%	(7)	100%	(14)
$500,000 TO $2 MILLION	50%	(6)	33%	(4)	17%	(2)	100%	(12)
GREATER THAN $2 MILLION	25%	(3)	33%	(4)	42%	(5)	100%	(12)
ALL STATES	34%	(13)	29%	(11)	37%	(14)	100%	(38)

Table VI-2

WHETHER STATE HAS TRAINING BUDGET
BY STAFF SIZE

| | WHETHER STATE HAS TRAINING BUDGET | | | | | | ALL STATES | |
	YES		NO		VARIES			
TOTAL STAFF IN PY 88								
1 - 20	17%	(2)	33%	(4)	50%	(6)	100%	(12)
21 - 60	43%	(6)	21%	(3)	36%	(5)	100%	(14)
61 +	38%	(3)	25%	(2)	38%	(3)	100%	(8)
ALL STATES	32%	(11)	26%	(9)	41%	(14)	100%	(34)

Table VI-3

WHETHER STATE HAS TRAINING BUDGET
BY SIZE OF AGENCY CONTAINING JTPA UNIT

| | WHETHER STATE HAS TRAINING BUDGET | | | ALL STATES | |
	YES	NO	VARIES		
SIZE OF STATE AGENCY					
0 - 250	50% (6)	17% (2)	33% (4)	100% (12)	
251 - 1,000	36% (5)	36% (5)	29% (4)	100% (14)	
1,000 +	17% (2)	33% (4)	50% (6)	100% (12)	
ALL STATES	34% (13)	29% (11)	37% (14)	100% (38)	

Table VI-4

**WHETHER SDA HAS TRAINING BUDGET
BY PY 88 II-A ALLOCATION**

| | WHETHER SDA HAS TRAINING BUDGET | | | | | | ALL SDAS | |
	YES		NO		VARIES			
PY 88 II-A ALLOCATION								
BELOW $1 MILLION	17%	(2)	17%	(2)	67%	(8)	100%	(12)
$1-1.9 MILLION	31%	(10)	28%	(9)	41%	(13)	100%	(32)
$2-6.9 MILLION	55%	(18)	15%	(5)	30%	(10)	100%	(33)
$7 MILLION & ABOVE	40%	(2)	20%	(1)	40%	(2)	100%	(5)
ALL SDAS	39%	(32)	21%	(17)	40%	(33)	100%	(82)

Table VI-5

**WHETHER SDA HAS TRAINING BUDGET
BY STAFF SIZE**

| | WHETHER SDA HAS TRAINING BUDGET | | | | | | ALL SDAS | |
	YES		NO		VARIES			
TOTAL STAFF IN PY 88								
1 - 10	56%	(10)	6%	(1)	39%	(7)	100%	(18)
11 -30	36%	(10)	25%	(7)	39%	(11)	100%	(28)
31 +	41%	(9)	14%	(3)	45%	(10)	100%	(22)
ALL SDAS	43%	(29)	16%	(11)	41%	(28)	100%	(68)

Table VI-6

**WHETHER SDA HAS TRAINING BUDGET
BY TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY**

| | WHETHER SDA HAS TRAINING BUDGET | | | | | | ALL SDAS | |
	YES		NO		VARIES			
ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE								
PIC	48%	(11)	13%	(3)	39%	(9)	100%	(23)
GOVERNMENT	33%	(17)	24%	(12)	43%	(22)	100%	(51)
CBO/OTHER	50%	(4)	25%	(2)	25%	(2)	100%	(8)
ALL SDAS	39%	(32)	21%	(17)	40%	(33)	100%	(82)

250

Table VI-7

**WHETHER STATE DEVELOPS STAFF TRAINING PLANS
BY AMOUNT OF JTPA FUNDS**

| | PY 88 STATE FUNDS | | | ALL STATES | |
	LESS THAN $500,000		$500,000 TO $2 MILLION		GREATER THAN $2 MILLION			
FOR NEW EMPLOYEES								
YES	50%	(7)	50%	(7)	42%	(5)	48%	(19)
NO	50%	(7)	50%	(7)	58%	(7)	53%	(21)
FOR NEWLY PROMOTED EMPLOYEES								
YES	57%	(8)	43%	(6)	33%	(4)	45%	(18)
NO	43%	(6)	57%	(8)	67%	(8)	55%	(22)
FOR CURRENT EMPLOYEES ON A REGULAR BASIS								
YES	64%	(9)	36%	(5)	42%	(5)	48%	(19)
NO	36%	(5)	64%	(9)	58%	(7)	53%	(21)
ALL STATES	100%	(14)	100%	(14)	100%	(12)	100%	(40)

251

Table VI-8

WHETHER STATE DEVELOPS STAFF TRAINING PLANS
BY SIZE OF AGENCY CONTAINING JTPA UNIT

| | SIZE OF STATE AGENCY | | | ALL STATES | |
	0 - 250		251 - 1,000		1,000 +			
FOR NEW EMPLOYEES								
YES	46%	(6)	50%	(7)	46%	(6)	48%	(19)
NO	54%	(7)	50%	(7)	54%	(7)	53%	(21)
FOR NEWLY PROMOTED EMPLOYEES								
YES	46%	(6)	57%	(8)	31%	(4)	45%	(18)
NO	54%	(7)	43%	(6)	69%	(9)	55%	(22)
FOR CURRENT EMPLOYEES ON A REGULAR BASIS								
YES	46%	(6)	50%	(7)	46%	(6)	48%	(19)
NO	54%	(7)	50%	(7)	54%	(7)	53%	(21)
ALL STATES	100%	(13)	100%	(14)	100%	(13)	100%	(40)

Table VI-9

STATE DIRECTORS' PERCEPTIONS ON
WHICH STAFF INITIATES TRAINING IN THE STATE JTPA UNIT
BY AMOUNT OF JTPA FUNDS AND SIZE OF AGENCY CONTAINING JTPA UNIT

| | WHO INITIATES MOST TRAINING | | ALL STATES | |
	SUPERVISOR		SUPERVISED STAFF			
PY 88 STATE FUNDS LESS THAN $500,000	67%	(8)	33%	(4)	100%	(12)
$500,000 TO $2 MILLION	75%	(9)	25%	(3)	100%	(12)
GREATER THAN $2 MILLION	70%	(7)	30%	(3)	100%	(10)
ALL STATES	71%	(24)	29%	(10)	100%	(34)
SIZE OF STATE AGENCY 0 - 250	82%	(9)	18%	(2)	100%	(11)
251 - 1,000	64%	(7)	36%	(4)	100%	(11)
1,000 +	67%	(8)	33%	(4)	100%	(12)
ALL STATES	71%	(24)	29%	(10)	100%	(34)

253

Table VI-10

WHETHER SDA DEVELOPS STAFF TRAINING PLANS
BY PY 88 TITLE II-A ALLOCATION

	PY 88 II-A ALLOCATION				ALL SDAS	
	BELOW $1 MILLION		$1-1.9 MILLION		$2-6.9 MILLION		$7 MILLION & ABOVE			

	BELOW $1 MILLION		$1-1.9 MILLION		$2-6.9 MILLION		$7 MILLION & ABOVE		ALL SDAS	
FOR NEW EMPLOYEES										
YES	27%	(3)	35%	(11)	40%	(12)	60%	(3)	38%	(29)
NO	73%	(8)	65%	(20)	60%	(18)	40%	(2)	62%	(48)
FOR NEWLY PROMOTED EMPLOYEES										
YES	20%	(2)	26%	(7)	37%	(10)	80%	(4)	33%	(23)
NO	80%	(8)	74%	(20)	63%	(17)	20%	(1)	67%	(46)
FOR CURRENT EMPLOYEES ON A REGULAR BASIS										
YES	30%	(3)	22%	(6)	31%	(8)	80%	(4)	31%	(21)
NO	70%	(7)	78%	(21)	69%	(18)	20%	(1)	69%	(47)
ALL SDAS	100%	(10)	100%	(27)	100%	(26)	100%	(5)	100%	(68)

Table VI-11

**WHETHER SDA DEVELOPS STAFF TRAINING PLANS
BY TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY**

	ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE						ALL SDAS	
	PIC		GOVERNMENT		CBO/OTHER			
FOR NEW EMPLOYEES								
YES	40%	(8)	37%	(18)	38%	(3)	38%	(29)
NO	60%	(12)	63%	(31)	63%	(5)	62%	(48)
FOR NEWLY PROMOTED EMPLOYEES								
YES	45%	(9)	29%	(12)	29%	(2)	33%	(23)
NO	55%	(11)	71%	(30)	71%	(5)	67%	(46)
FOR CURRENT EMPLOYEES ON A REGULAR BASIS								
YES	40%	(8)	27%	(11)	29%	(2)	31%	(21)
NO	60%	(12)	73%	(30)	71%	(5)	69%	(47)
ALL SDAS	100%	(20)	100%	(41)	100%	(7)	100%	(68)

Table VI-12

**SDA DIRECTORS' PERCEPTIONS ON
WHICH STAFF INITIATES TRAINING IN THE SDA
BY PY 88 TITLE II-A ALLOCATION AND TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY**

| | WHO INITIATES MOST TRAINING | | | ALL SDAS | |
	SUPERVISORS		SUPERVISED STAFF		SERVICE PROVIDERS			
PY 88 II-A ALLOCATION BELOW $1								
MILLION	90%	(9)	10%	(1)	0%	(0)	100%	(10)
$1-1.9 MILLION	93%	(28)	3%	(1)	3%	(1)	100%	(30)
$2-6.9 MILLION	97%	(29)	3%	(1)	0%	(0)	100%	(30)
$7 MILLION & ABOVE	100%	(4)	0%	(0)	0%	(0)	100%	(4)
ALL SDAS	95%	(70)	4%	(3)	1%	(1)	100%	(74)
ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE								
PIC	90%	(19)	10%	(2)	0%	(0)	100%	(21)
GOVERNMENT	96%	(44)	2%	(1)	2%	(1)	100%	(46)
CBO/OTHER	100%	(7)	0%	(0)	0%	(0)	100%	(7)
ALL SDAS	95%	(70)	4%	(3)	1%	(1)	100%	(74)

Table VI-13

TRAINING FORMATS USED BY STATES
BY AMOUNT OF STATE FUNDING IN PY 88

	PY 88 STATE FUNDS			ALL STATES	
	LESS THAN $500,000	$500,000 TO $2 MILLION	GREATER THAN $2 MILLION		
TRAINING TYPE					
1-2 DAY TRAINING SESSIONS	93% (13)	92% (12)	100% (12)	95% (37)	
JTPA-SPECIFIC CONFERENCES	86% (12)	92% (12)	100% (12)	92% (36)	
IN-SERVICE TRAINING	79% (11)	77% (10)	92% (11)	82% (32)	
TRAININGS < ONE DAY	86% (12)	85% (11)	67% (8)	79% (31)	
PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION CONFERENCES	79% (11)	77% (10)	83% (10)	79% (31)	
COMMUNITY COLLEGE COURSES	64% (9)	85% (11)	58% (7)	69% (27)	
3-5 DAY TRAINING SESSIONS	57% (8)	77% (10)	50% (6)	62% (24)	
UNIVERSITY EXTENSION COURSES	36% (5)	31% (4)	33% (4)	33% (13)	
OTHER	0% (0)	15% (2)	25% (3)	13% (5)	
ALL STATES	100% (14)	100% (13)	100% (12)	100% (39)	

STATE DIRECTORS WERE ASKED TO CHECK ALL THAT APPLIED

257

Table VI-14

TRAINING FORMATS USED BY SDAS
BY TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY

| | ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE | | | | | | ALL SDAS | |
	PIC		GOVERNMENT		CBO/OTHER			
TRAINING TYPE								
JTPA-SPECIFIC								
CONFERENCES	91%	(20)	92%	(47)	88%	(7)	91%	(74)
PROFESSIONAL								
ASSOCIATION								
CONFERENCES	86%	(19)	75%	(38)	88%	(7)	79%	(64)
1-2 DAY TRAINING								
SESSIONS	86%	(19)	75%	(38)	63%	(5)	77%	(62)
TRAININGS < ONE								
DAY	68%	(15)	69%	(35)	63%	(5)	68%	(55)
IN-SERVICE								
TRAINING	77%	(17)	61%	(31)	63%	(5)	65%	(53)
COMMUNITY								
COLLEGE								
COURSES	82%	(18)	43%	(22)	38%	(3)	53%	(43)
3-5 DAY TRAINING								
SESSIONS	36%	(8)	31%	(16)	25%	(2)	32%	(26)
UNIVERSITY								
EXTENSION								
COURSES	14%	(3)	24%	(12)	25%	(2)	21%	(17)
OTHER	18%	(4)	6%	(3)	0%	(0)	9%	(7)
ALL SDAS	100%	(22)	100%	(51)	100%	(8)	100%	(81)

SDA DIRECTORS WERE ASKED TO CHECK ALL THAT APPLIED

Table IV-15

HOW STAFF TIME COVERED WHEN STATE STAFF ATTENDS TRAINING
BY AMOUNT OF STATE FUNDING IN PY 88

	PY 88 STATE FUNDS			ALL STATES	
	LESS THAN $500,000	$500,000 TO $2 MILLION	GREATER THAN $2 MILLION		
HOW TIME COVERED					
RELEASE TIME POLICY	79% (11)	93% (13)	100% (12)	90% (36)	
FLEXIBLE SCHEDULING	21% (3)	43% (6)	67% (8)	43% (17)	
OUTSIDE REGULAR WORK HOURS	14% (2)	7% (1)	33% (4)	18% (7)	
STAFF USE VACATION TIME	0% (0)	0% (0)	17% (2)	5% (2)	
TAKE TIME OFF WITHOUT PAY	14% (2)	0% (0)	17% (2)	10% (4)	
OTHER	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	
ALL STATES	100% (14)	100% (14)	100% (12)	100% (40)	

STATE DIRECTORS WERE ASKED TO CHECK ALL THAT APPLIED

Table IV-16

HOW STAFF TIME COVERED WHEN SDA STAFF ATTENDS TRAINING
BY TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY

| | ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE | | | ALL SDAS | |
	PIC		GOVERNMENT		CBO/OTHER			
HOW TIME COVERED RELEASE TIME POLICY	70%	(16)	69%	(35)	75%	(6)	70%	(57)
FLEXIBLE SCHEDULING	57%	(13)	49%	(25)	25%	(2)	49%	(40)
OUTSIDE REGULAR WORK HOURS	30%	(7)	22%	(11)	0%	(0)	22%	(18)
STAFF USE VACATION TIME	0%	(0)	.4%	(2)	0%	(0)	2%	(2)
TAKE TIME OFF WITHOUT PAY	4%	(1)	2%	(1)	0%	(0)	2%	(2)
OTHER	9%	(2)	2%	(1)	13%	(1)	5%	(4)
ALL SDAS	100%	(23)	100%	(51)	100%	(8)	100%	(82)

SDA DIRECTORS WERE ASKED TO CHECK ALL THAT APPLIED

260

Table VI-17

STATE DIRECTOR RESPONSES ON
WHETHER STATE OFFERS TRAINING TO SDAS AND SERVICE PROVIDERS

	YES	NO
STATE OFFER REG TRAINING FOR SDAS	68%	32%
STATE OFFER REG TRAINING FOR CONTRACTUAL PROVS	54%	46%

Table VI-18

SDA DIRECTOR RESPONSES ON
WHETHER STATES AND SDAS OFFER TRAINING
TO DIFFERENT STAFF LEVELS

	YES	NO
STATE OFFER REG TRAINING FOR SDAS	68%	32%
STATE OFFER REG TRAINING FOR CONTRACTUAL PROVS	43%	57%
SDA OFFERED TRAINING FOR CONTRACTUAL PROVS	72%	28%

Table VI-19

STATE DIRECTORS' PERSPECTIVES ON
WHICH LEVEL INITIATES TRAINING IN THE STATE
BY AMOUNT OF JTPA FUNDS AND SIZE OF AGENCY CONTAINING JTPA UNIT

| | IN STATE, WHO INITIATES MOST TRAINING | | | ALL STATES | |
	STATE		SDAS		SERVICE PROVIDERS			
PY 88 STATE FUNDS								
LESS THAN $500,000	92%	(12)	8%	(1)	0%	(0)	100%	(13)
$500,000 TO $2 MILLION	93%	(13)	0%	(0)	7%	(1)	100%	(14)
GREATER THAN $2 MILLION	88%	(7)	13%	(1)	0%	(0)	100%	(8)
ALL STATES	91%	(32)	6%	(2)	3%	(1)	100%	(35)
SIZE OF STATE AGENCY								
0 - 250	85%	(11)	8%	(1)	8%	(1)	100%	(13)
251 - 1,000	100%	(11)	0%	(0)	0%	(0)	100%	(11)
1,000 +	91%	(10)	9%	(1)	0%	(0)	100%	(11)
ALL STATES	91%	(32)	6%	(2)	3%	(1)	100%	(35)

263

Table VI-20

SDA DIRECTORS' PERSPECTIVES ON
WHICH LEVEL INITIATES TRAINING IN THE STATE
BY PY 88 TITLE II-A ALLOCATION AND TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY

| | IN STATE, WHO INITIATES MOST TRAINING | | | | ALL SDAS | |
	STATE		SDAS			
PY 88 II-A ALLOCATION BELOW $1						
MILLION	70%	(7)	30%	(3)	100%	(10)
$1-1.9 MILLION	67%	(20)	33%	(10)	100%	(30)
$2-6.9 MILLION	65%	(20)	35%	(11)	100%	(31)
$7 MILLION &						
ABOVE	25%	(1)	75%	(3)	100%	(4)
ALL SDAS	64%	(48)	36%	(27)	100%	(75)
ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE						
PIC	62%	(13)	38%	(8)	100%	(21)
GOVERNMENT	67%	(31)	33%	(15)	100%	(46)
CBO/OTHER	50%	(4)	50%	(4)	100%	(8)
ALL SDAS	64%	(48)	36%	(27)	100%	(75)

Table VI-21

Training Received by JTPA Staff Since July 1987

Training Topic	Percent of Training Courses	
	State	SDA
JTPA regulations, procedures	38%	24%
Position-specific	15	46
Other human service programs (e.g., JOBS)	3	2
Specific to state/area	2	5
Software package	17	10
General management	22	10
Stress management	1	2
Other	2	<1
Total training courses	913	1,656
Number of respondents	235	430

Table VI-22

NUMBER OF TRAINING COURSES RECEIVED BY STATE STAFF
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER

	Functional Cluster									All Respondents
	POL./ ADMIN.	PUB. CONTACT	LMI	MONITOR	MIS	FISCAL	PERSONNEL	LEGAL	CLERICAL	
NUMBER OF COURSES										
1	13%	10%	0%	13%	30%	14%	5%	0%	29%	20%
2	16%	13%	14%	15%	17%	16%	15%	50%	18%	17%
3	17%	21%	14%	16%	11%	16%	20%	0%	21%	16%
4	17%	17%	29%	17%	11%	14%	16%	0%	13%	15%
5	10%	8%	14%	5%	13%	9%	9%	0%	5%	8%
6	5%	4%	0%	7%	4%	2%	7%	0%	6%	6%
7	5%	7%	0%	9%	1%	5%	7%	50%	3%	4%
8	6%	8%	21%	4%	3%	5%	5%	0%	0%	5%
9	5%	5%	0%	5%	4%	7%	7%	0%	3%	3%
10	6%	6%	7%	8%	4%	11%	7%	0%	2%	5%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Respondents	(154)	(112)	(14)	(92)	(70)	(56)	(55)	(2)	(62)	(229)

Table VI-23

NUMBER OF TRAINING COURSES RECEIVED BY SDA STAFF
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER

	Functional Cluster												All Respondents
	POL./ ADMIN.	CLIENT SVC.	CLASS TRAIN	INTERP RETING	MONITOR	MIS/ JASR	DATA PROC.	FISCAL	PROCUR EMENT	PERSON NEL	LEGAL	CLERIC AL	
NUMBER OF COURSES													
1	15%	16%	18%	25%	20%	20%	17%	15%	11%	11%	25%	21%	17%
2	17%	17%	13%	17%	18%	23%	24%	22%	24%	17%	13%	17%	19%
3	17%	16%	18%	13%	16%	13%	15%	21%	12%	14%	0%	17%	17%
4	18%	16%	18%	17%	14%	13%	17%	15%	17%	22%	38%	16%	16%
5	10%	10%	8%	8%	10%	8%	12%	9%	12%	10%	0%	13%	10%
6	5%	6%	6%	8%	5%	3%	4%	4%	5%	4%	0%	5%	5%
7	5%	4%	6%	0%	6%	5%	3%	4%	5%	5%	0%	5%	4%
8	5%	5%	6%	8%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	5%	0%	3%	4%
9	3%	3%	1%	0%	3%	5%	3%	1%	5%	4%	13%	3%	2%
10	5%	6%	6%	4%	5%	8%	3%	6%	7%	9%	13%	1%	5%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Respondents	(303)	(316)	(100)	(24)	(192)	(64)	(186)	(162)	(76)	(139)	(8)	(106)	(429)

TABLE VI-24

PERCEIVED TRAINING PRIORITIES FOR STATE JTPA STAFF

	PERSPECTIVE OF:		
	STATE DIRECTORS	STATE STAFF	SDA DIRECTORS
JTPA -- STRUCTURE AND PRINCIPLES			
Orientation to JTPA and related programs	13%	25%	12%
EDWAA	18	29	20
Performance standards: practical applications	51	31	33
Other	3	1	1
POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION			
Providing effective support for the SJTCC	36	9	39
Providing effective support for the PIC	8	9	17
Goal-setting at the state and local levels	59	18	46
Planning and program development	54	19	29
Developing the GCSSP	31	5	13
Target group policies	31	13	21
Developing service programs to meet client needs	5	10	16
Establishing Youth Employment Competencies	28	13	34
Developing strategies to meet performance standards	23	13	18
Effective use of non-78% JTPA funds	31	14	29
Funding recapture policies	21	11	25
Effective SDA liaison and monitoring	56	24	42
Developing successful T.A. programs	59	26	52
Evaluating proposals	31	19	10
Effective monitoring of programs and contractors	62	30	26
Cutback management	10	4	18
Other	0	3	1
FISCAL/CONTRACTS			
JTPA fiscal regulations and reporting procedures	56	29	27
Securing diversified funding/effective grantsmanship	18	9	13
Income-generating activities under JTPA	15	11	13
Preparing successful funding/program proposals	13	10	1
Preparing effective RFPs	28	16	14
Cost allocation under JTPA	44	30	29
Effective budget management	28	18	16
Negotiating successful contracts	21	16	8

TABLE VI-24 (continued)

	PERSPECTIVE OF:		
	STATE DIRECTORS	STATE STAFF	SDA DIRECTORS
Developing performance-based contracts for different programs/populations	26%	19%	17%
Auditing within the JTPA system	46	25	18
Other	5	3	0
MIS/COMPUTERS/STATISTICS/RESEARCH/EVALUATION			
Establishing/updating the MIS	36	14	38
Selecting computer hardware	10	9	14
Selecting software for program management	26	12	18
Selecting educational software	5	6	4
Developing and using labor market information	21	13	22
Conducting post-program follow-up	8	16	29
Analyzing and reporting statistical information	39	23	13
Methods of program evaluation	41	28	23
Other	5	1	0
PARTNERSHIPS/COMMUNITY RELATIONS			
Determining training needs in the employer community	8	11	10
Marketing job training services to employers	15	7	9
Marketing techniques (ads, video, phone, etc.)	23	4	8
Effective liaison with elected officials	13	11	10
Effective public/community relations	13	12	10
Securing private sector involvement in JTPA	23	9	18
Building partnerships with other agencies/programs	33	16	20
Cross-training about related programs (K-12, AFDC, etc.)	18	19	13
Other	5	1	0
CLIENT SERVICES			
Understanding/identifying the needs of:			
Displaced homemakers	5	6	5
Displaced workers	13	7	3
Dropouts/potential dropouts	13	7	7
Ex-offenders	5	3	1
Handicapped persons	8	4	1

TABLE VI-24 (continued)

	PERSPECTIVE OF:		
	STATE DIRECTORS	STATE STAFF	SDA DIRECTORS
Homeless persons	8%	5%	5%
Minorities	3	5	4
Pregnant/parent teenagers	3	4	1
Refugees/immigrants	0	3	0
Rural workers/jobseekers	5	3	4
Youth	5	7	3
Welfare recipients/applicants	10	5	4
Effective outreach and recruitment	5	4	1
Eligibility verifications procedures	3	1	5
Interpreting (bilingual/ASL)	3	12	1
Motivating participants	8	6	1
Getting clients to believe in themselves	0	4	1
Working with hostile/resistant clients	3	3	0
Assessment systems and techniques	26	10	4
Functional and vocational testing	8	3	1
Vocational counseling - individual and group	5	3	0
Personal/life skills counseling	0	5	0
Helping clients set personal goals	0	2	1
Helping clients solve their own problems	0	3	1
Crisis intervention	0	2	3
Determining supportive service needs	3	5	3
Developing EDPs	10	7	5
Accessing client support services	3	2	0
Developing/selecting vocational curricula	0	1	1
Developing/selecting basic/remedial skills programs	8	3	0
Effective teaching techniques	0	1	1
Competency-based instruction	13	7	4
Computer-assisted instruction	3	6	1
Work maturity preparation	0	3	0
Dislocated worker program approaches	21	7	5
Designing job clubs/job search workshops	3	1	0
Supervising individual job search	0	1	0
Helping clients manage their own job search	0	1	0
Preparing clients for job interviews	5	1	0
Job development techniques	5	3	1

TABLE VI-24 (continued)

	PERSPECTIVE OF:		
	STATE DIRECTORS	STATE STAFF	SDA DIRECTORS
Developing OJT slots/contracts	5%	7%	1%
Effective use of work experience activities	0	3	1
Entrepreneurship development	5	3	4
Other	3	1	4
GENERAL MANAGERIAL AND PROFESSIONAL SKILLS [GM]			
Establishing personnel procedures	3	9	1
Developing staff competencies	33	19	12
Supervisory skills/motivating staff	41	21	18
Staff performance appraisals	8	6	1
Managing conflict	15	23	12
Analytical skills and methods	28	29	9
Problem-solving strategies	21	30	14
Writing	26	32	5
Computer competency	23	36	8
Oral presentation skills	5	22	4
Effective meetings/facilitation skills	18	20	18
Dealing with the public	5	13	7
Time management	31	25	5
Stress management/preventing burnout	18	35	20
Dealing with other people's stress	5	26	10
Other	3	3	0
	n=39	n=284	n=77

271

TABLE VI-25

PERCEIVED TRAINING PRIORITIES FOR SDA STAFF

	PERSPECTIVE OF:		
	SDA DIRECTORS	SDA STAFF	STATE DIRECTORS
JTPA -- STRUCTURE AND PRINCIPLES			
Orientation to JTPA and related programs	18%	24%	13%
EDWAA	34	20	21
Performance standards: practical applications	47	27	54
Other	0	1	3
POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION			
Providing effective support for the SJTCC	1	1	0
Providing effective support for the PIC	27	12	46
Goal-setting at the state and local levels	27	14	49
Planning and program development	41	18	41
Developing the GCSSP	3	1	3
Target group policies	18	9	26
Developing service programs to meet client needs	37	23	39
Establishing Youth Employment Competencies	48	14	46
Developing strategies to meet performance standards	38	16	49
Effective use of non-78% JTPA funds	13	7	8
Funding recapture policies	7	3	3
Effective SDA liaison and monitoring	17	6	10
Developing successful T.A. programs	14	7	18
Evaluating proposals	31	11	23
Effective monitoring of programs and contractors	37	18	54
Cutback management	14	5	8
Other	0	0	0
FISCAL/CONTRACTS			
JTPA fiscal regulations and reporting procedures	39	14	33
Securing diversified funding/effective grantsmanship	52	8	28
Income-generating activities under JTPA	39	14	18
Preparing successful funding/program proposals	14	10	18
Preparing effective RFPs	37	10	31
Cost allocation under JTPA	39	10	36
Effective budget management	30	13	28
Negotiating successful contracts	39	10	28

TABLE VI-25 (continued)

	PERSPECTIVE OF:		
	SDA DIRECTORS	SDA STAFF	STATE DIRECTORS
Developing performance-based contracts for different programs/populations	37%	11%	46%
Auditing within the JTPA system	28	13	31
Other	0	1	0
MIS/COMPUTERS/STATISTICS/RESEARCH/EVALUATION			
Establishing/updating the MIS	20	13	18
Selecting computer hardware	11	7	3
Selecting software for program management	24	12	18
Selecting educational software	16	9	8
Developing and using labor market information	27	13	23
Conducting post-program follow-up	28	12	15
Analyzing and reporting statistical information	28	15	10
Methods of program evaluation	41	16	31
Other .	1	1	0
PARTNERSHIPS/COMMUNITY RELATIONS [PAR]			
Determining training needs in the employer community	45	26	33
Marketing job training services to employers	32	22	28
Marketing techniques (ads, video, phone, etc.)	13	15	15
Effective liaison with elected officials	13	9	15
Effective public/community relations	13	22	10
Securing private sector involvement in JTPA	34	19	31
Building partnerships with other agencies/programs	20	23	39
Cross-training about related programs (K-12, AFDC, etc.)	21	23	15
Other	0	1	0
CLIENT SERVICES			
Understanding/identifying the needs of:			
Displaced homemakers	7	15	10
Displaced workers	9	17	21
Dropouts/potential dropouts	18	26	23
Ex-offenders	7	17	5
Handicapped persons	4	15	8

TABLE VI-25 (continued)

	PERSPECTIVE OF:		
	SDA DIRECTORS	SDA STAFF	STATE DIRECTORS
Homeless persons	13%	15%	23%
Minorities	3	14	10
Pregnant/parent teenagers	9	16	10
Refugees/immigrants	1	9	0
Rural workers/jobseekers	4	11	5
Youth	14	20	8
Welfare recipients/applicants	23	23	18
Effective outreach and recruitment	13	22	36
Eligibility verifications procedures	3	15	5
Interpreting (bilingual/ASL)	0	4	0
Motivating participants	27	35	23
Getting clients to believe in themselves	14	25	3
Working with hostile/resistant clients	11	26	10
Assessment systems and techniques	25	18	33
Functional and vocational testing	9	10	10
Vocational counseling - individual and group	7	15	8
Personal/life skills counseling	4	16	3
Helping clients set personal goals	9	16	10
Helping clients solve their own problems	4	22	0
Crisis intervention	1	10	3
Determining supportive service needs	4	9	10
Developing EDPs	9	11	15
Accessing client support services	4	8	10
Developing/selecting vocational curricula	7	5	3
Developing/selecting basic/remedial skills programs	10	8	15
Effective teaching techniques	3	9	3
Competency-based instruction	10	10	23
Computer-assisted instruction	6	12	3
Work maturity preparation	4	9	0
Dislocated worker program approaches	10	12	26
Designing job clubs/job search workshops	4	12	0
Supervising individual job search	3	7	0
Helping clients manage their own job search	10	18	0
Preparing clients for job interviews	1	12	0
Job development techniques	14	14	13

TABLE VI-25 (continued)

	PERSPECTIVE OF:		
	SDA DIRECTORS	SDA STAFF	STATE DIRECTORS
Developing OJT slots/contracts	7%	12%	15%
Effective use of work experience activities	6	9	8
Entrepreneurship development	18	9	8
Other	3	2	3
GENERAL MANAGERIAL AND PROFESSIONAL SKILLS			
Establishing personnel procedures	9	12	0
Developing staff competencies	21	13	18
Supervisory skills/motivating staff	25	22	13
Staff performance appraisals	10	13	3
Managing conflict	17	20	8
Analytical skills and methods	13	10	10
Problem-solving strategies	27	22	10
Writing	17	15.	5
Computer competency	17	28	10
Oral presentation skills	13	21	5
Effective meetings/facilitation skills	14	13	8
Dealing with the public	10	22	3
Time management	24	22	3
Stress management/preventing burnout	38	38	10
Dealing with other people's stress	16	30	3
Other	0	1	3
	n=39	n=552	n=71

Table VI-26

Top 20[a] Training Priorities for State JTPA Staff:
State and SDA Directors' Rankings

Training Topic	Rank	
	State Directors	SDA Directors
Shared Priorities		
Effective monitoring of programs and contractors	1	13
Goal-setting at the state and local levels	2	2
Developing successful T.A. programs	3	1
JTPA fiscal regulations and reporting procedures	4	12
Effective SDA liaison and monitoring	5	3
Planning and program development	6	10
Performance standards: practical applications	7	7
Cost allocation under JTPA	9	8
Methods of program evaluation	11	15
Establishing/updating the MIS	13	5
Providing effective support for the SJTCC	14	4
Building partnerships with other agencies/programs	16	19
Target group policies	19	17
Effective use of non-78% JTPA funds	20	11
Additional State Director Priorities		
Auditing within the JTPA system	8	
Supervisory skills/motivating staff	10	
Analyzing and reporting statistical information	12	
Developing staff competencies	15	
Time management	17	
Developing the GCSSP	18	
Evaluating proposals[b]	21	
Additional SDA Director Priorities		
Establishing Youth Employment Competencies		6
Conducting post-program follow-up		9
Funding recapture policies		14
Developing and using labor market information		16
Stress management/preventing burnout		18
EDWAA		20

[a] 21 for state directors due to tie.

[b] Also a top-20 choice of SDA directors for SDA staff.

Table VI-27
Top 20[a] Training Priorities for SDA Staff:
State and SDA Directors' Rankings

Training Topic	Rank	
	State Directors	SDA Directors
Shared Priorities		
Securing diversified funding/effective grantsmanship	1	20
Establishing Youth Employment Competencies	2	7
Performance standards: practical applications	3	2
Determining training needs in the employer community	4	15
Methods of program evaluation	5	18
Planning and program development	6	8
JTPA fiscal regulations and reporting procedures	7	14
Cost allocation under JTPA	9	12
Negotiating successful contracts	10	22
Developing strategies to meet performance standards	12	4
Preparing effective RFPs	13	16
Developing performance-based contracts	14	5
Developing service programs to meet client needs	15	10
Effective monitoring of programs and contractors	16	1
Securing private sector involvement in JTPA	17	19
Marketing job training services to employers	19	23
Additional SDA Director Priorities		
Income-generating activities under JTPA	8	
Stress management/preventing burnout	11	
EDWAA	18	
Evaluating proposals[b]	20	
Additional State Director Priorities		
Goal-setting at the state and local levels		3
Providing effective support for the PIC		6
Building partnerships with other agencies/programs		9
Effective outreach and recruitment		11
Assessment systems and techniques		13
Auditing within the JTPA system		17
Effective budget management		21

[a]23 for state directors due to tie.

[b]Also a top-20 choice of state directors for state staff.

Table VI-28

Top 20 Training Priorities of State JTPA Staff

Training Topic	Shared with State Directors	SDA Staff
Computer competency		X
Stress management/preventing burnout		X
Writing		
Performance standards: practical applications	X	X
Cost allocation under JTPA	X	
Problem-solving strategies		X
Effective monitoring of programs and contractors	X	
JTPA fiscal regulations and reporting procedures	X	
Analytical skills and methods		
EDWAA		
Methods of program evaluation	X	
Dealing with other people's stress		X
Developing successful T.A. programs	X	
Auditing within the JTPA system	X	
Time management	X	X
Orientation to JTPA and related programs		X
Effective SDA liaison and monitoring	X	
Managing conflict		
Analyzing and reporting statistical information	X	
Oral presentation skills		

Table VI-29

Top 20[a] Training Priorities of SDA Staff

| | Shared with | |
| | SDA | State |
Training Topic	Directors	Staff
Stress management/preventing burnout	x	x
Motivating participants		
Dealing with other people's stress		x
Computer competency		x
Performance standards: practical applications	x	x
Understanding the needs of dropouts/potential dropouts		
Working with hostile/resistant clients		
Determining training needs in the employer community	x	
Getting clients to believe in themselves		
Orientation to JTPA and related programs		x
Understanding the needs of welfare recipients/applicants		
Building partnerships with other agencies/programs		
Cross-training about related programs (K-12, AFDC, etc.)		
Developing service programs to meet client needs	x	
Effective outreach and recruitment		
Helping clients solve their own problems		
Supervisory skills/motivating staff		
Problem-solving strategies		x
Dealing with the public		
Time management		x
Marketing job training services to employers	x	
Effective public/community relations		

[a]22 due to tie.

Table VI-30

Staff's Top Twenty Training Priorities by Functional Cluster: State Staff

	POLICY/ ADMIN.	PUBLIC CONTACT	MONITORING	MIS	FISCAL	PERSONNEL	CLERICAL
ORIENTATION TO JTPA AND RELATED PROGRAMS				7	9		5
EDWAA	11	10	11	4	5	7	7
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS: PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS	4	2	8	3		5	13
GOAL-SETTING AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVELS	14	12				7	15
PLANNING AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	13	4					
EFFECTIVE SDA LIAISON AND MONITORING	8	9	2		13	7	
DEVELOPING SUCCESSFUL T.A. PROGRAMS	2	1	3		10	3	17
EVALUATING PROPOSALS	13	7	12				16
EFFECTIVE MONITORING OF PROGRAMS AND CONTRACTORS	1	4	1		8	3	
JTPA FISCAL REGULATIONS & REPORTING PROCEDURES	8	9	6	4	1	4	14
PREPARING EFFECTIVE RFPS			14		11		
COST ALLOCATION UNDER JTPA	6	6	2	7	1	4	
EFFECTIVE BUDGET MANAGEMENT					9	8	
NEGOTIATING SUCCESSFUL CONTRACTS			9		10	7	
DEVELOPING PERFORMANCE-BASED CONTRACTS FOR DIFFERENT PROGRAMS/POPULATIONS	14		6		11		
AUDITING WITHIN THE JTPA SYSTEM	13		4		2		
ESTABLISHING/UPDATING THE MIS				3			
SELECTING COMPUTER HARDWARE				10			
SELECTING SOFTWARE FOR PROGRAM MANAGEMENT				7			
CONDUCTING POST-PROGRAM FOLLOW-UP				5			
ANALYZING & REPORTING STATISTICAL INFORMATION	12	10	12	4			

Table VI-30 (continued)

	POLICY/ ADMIN.	PUBLIC CONTACT	MONITORING	MIS	FISCAL	PERSONNEL	CLERICAL
METHODS OF PROGRAM EVALUATION	3	3	7	3		6	
BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS WITH OTHER AGENCIES/PROGRAMS		8				4	
CROSS-TRAINING ABOUT RELATED PROGRAMS (K-12, AFDC, ETC.)			14				
ESTABLISHING PERSONNEL PROCEDURES							15
DEVELOPING STAFF COMPETENCIES						8	17
SUPERVISORY SKILLS/MOTIVATING STAFF			13		12	6	11
MANAGING CONFLICT	14	7	14	8	6	2	6
ANALYTICAL SKILLS AND METHODS	5	4	5	6	9	4	13
PROBLEM-SOLVING STRATEGIES	7	2	10	2	3	1	8
WRITING	10	11	7	5	9		4
COMPUTER COMPETENCY	9	6	11	2	7	6	2
ORAL PRESENTATION SKILLS		12		9			9
EFFECTIVE MEETINGS/FACILITATION SKILLS		11					12
DEALING WITH THE PUBLIC							10
TIME MANAGEMENT				5	10		4
STRESS MANAGEMENT/PREVENTING BURNOUT	11	5	11	1	4	5	1
DEALING WITH OTHER PEOPLE'S STRESS				4		5	3

Note: Priorities exceed twenty for some staff categories in which there were ties between training topics.

Table VI-31
Staff's Top Twenty Training Priorities by Functional Cluster: SDA Staff

CLIENT SERVICES	POLICY/ ADMIN.	CLIENT SERVICE	CLASSROOM TRAINING	INTERPRETING	MONITORING	MIS/JASR	DATA PROCESSING	FISCAL	PROCUREMENT	PERSONNEL	CLERICAL
ORIENTATION TO JTPA AND RELATED PROGRAMS				2		11	8		7		6
EDWAA						14					
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS: PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS	4	12	7		2	7	2	2	3	2	13
PLANNING AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	16				8			9	8	8	
DEVELOPING SERVICE PROGRAMS TO MEET CLIENT NEEDS	7	12			5				9	9	
ESTABLISHING YOUTH EMPLOYMENT COMPETENCIES					16						
DEVELOPING STRATEGIES TO MEET STDS.					12			12	9	11	
EFFECTIVE MONITORING OF PROGRAMS AND CONTRACTORS					9			4			
JTPA FISCAL REGULATIONS & REPORTING PROCEDURES								5	2		
INCOME-GENERATING ACTIVITIES UNDER JTPA								12	9	15	
COST ALLOCATION UNDER JTPA								13	7		
EFFECTIVE BUDGET MANAGEMENT							15	10	9		
AUDITING WITHIN THE JTPA SYSTEM							15	8	8		
ESTABLISHING/UPDATING THE MIS						14	4				
SELECTING SOFTWARE FOR PROGRAM MANAGEMENT							10				
CONDUCTING POST-PROGRAM FOLLOW-UP							6				
ANALYZING & REPORTING STATISTICAL INFORMATION						13	5				
METHODS OF PROGRAM EVALUATION							4				

Table VI-31 (continued)

CLIENT SERVICES	POLICY/ ADMIN.	CLIENT SERVICE	CLASSROOM TRAINING	INTERPRETING	MONITORING	MIS/JASR	DATA PROCESSING	FISCAL	PROCUREMENT	PERSONNEL	CLERICAL
DETERMINING TRAINING NEEDS IN THE EMPLOYER COMMUNITY	3	6			4	12		6	5	3	
MARKETING JOB TRAINING SERVICES TO EMPLOYERS	9	10	11	5					7		
EFFECTIVE PUBLIC/COMMUNITY RELATIONS	10	13		5					6	9	
SECURING PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT	17							15			
BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS WITH OTHER AGENCIES/PROGRAMS	7	11	9		12				8	11	
CROSS-TRAINING ABOUT RELATED PROGRAMS (K-12, AFDC, ETC.)	11	11	8	2	7	10	10	12	7	8	7
UNDERSTANDING/IDENTIFYING NEEDS OF:											
Displaced Homemakers											
Displaced Workers							14				12
Dropsouts/Potential Dropouts	6	5	4	1	6	14					9
Ex-offenders			10	3							
Homeless Persons				3							
Minorities				3							
Pregnant/Parent Teenagers				5							
Refugees/Immigrants				4							14
Youth		14	6	3	15						
Welfare Recipients/Applicants	14	8	3	3	10						11
EFFECTIVE OUTREACH AND RECRUITMENT	12	9			15	15					14
ELIGIBILITY VERIFICATIONS PROCEDURES				5							11
MOTIVATING PARTICIPANTS	1	1	1	2	1	2	9			6	4
GETTING CLIENTS TO BELIEVE IN THEMSELVES	8	4	2	4	13	13					10
WORKING WITH HOSTILE/RESISTANT CLIENTS	12	3	3	4		6	13				7
ASSESSMENT SYSTEMS AND TECHNIQUES			11	2	14		13				

283

Table VI-31 (continued)

CLIENT SERVICES	POLICY/ ADMIN.	CLIENT SERVICE	CLASSROOM TRAINING	INTERPRETING	MONITORING	MIS/JASR	DATA PROCESSING	FISCAL	PROCUREMENT	PERSONNEL	CLERICAL
VOCATIONAL COUNSELING - INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP			9								
PERSONAL/LIFE SKILLS COUNSELING			9								
HELPING CLIENTS SET PERSONAL GOALS		17	5								
HELPING CLIENTS SOLVE THEIR OWN PORBLEMS	16	7	4								
DEVELOPING EDPS				4							
HELPING CLIENTS MANAGE THEIR OWN JOB SEARCH		15	6								
JOB DEVELOPMENT TECHNIQUES			9								
DEVELOPING STAFF COMPETENCIES										15	
SUPERVISORY SKILLS/MOTIVATING STAFF	15				11	5	7	3	2	4	9
STAFF PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS										12	
MANAGING CONFLICT						14		12	7	7	
PROBLEM-SOLVING STRATEGIES						9		14		13	8
WRITING											12
COMPUTER COMPETENCY	13	16		4	14	4	4	7	3	10	3
ORAL PRESENTATION SKILLS								11	8	13	
DEALING WITH THE PUBLIC						6	11		9		5
TIME MANAGEMENT						8	12	13		14	8
STRESS MANAGEMENT/PREVENTING BURNOUT	2	2	5	5	3	1	1	1	1	1	1
DEALING WITH OTHER PEOPLE'S STRESS	5	6	8		8	3	3	5	4	5	2

Note: More than twenty topics listed for procurement staff due to a tie among training topics.

Table VI-32

STATE DIRECTOR RESPONSES ON
WHETHER TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES HAVE BEEN MISSED
BY AMOUNT OF JTPA FUNDS AND SIZE OF AGENCY CONTAINING JTPA UNIT

| | WHETHER MISSED TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES | | | | ALL STATES | |
	YES		NO			
PY 88 STATE FUNDS						
LESS THAN $500,000	93%	(13)	7%	(1)	100%	(14)
$500,000 TO $2 MILLION	93%	(13)	7%	(1)	100%	(14)
GREATER THAN $2 MILLION	75%	(9)	25%	(3)	100%	(12)
ALL STATES	88%	(35)	13%	(5)	100%	(40)
SIZE OF STATE AGENCY						
0 - 250	85%	(11)	15%	(2)	100%	(13)
251 - 1,000	93%	(13)	7%	(1)	100%	(14)
1,000 +	85%	(11)	15%	(2)	100%	(13)
ALL STATES	88%	(35)	13%	(5)	100%	(40)

Table VI-33

SDA DIRECTOR RESPONSES ON
WHETHER TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES HAVE BEEN MISSED
BY PY 88 TITLE II-A ALLOCATION AND TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY

| | WHETHER MISSED TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES | | | | ALL SDAS | |
	YES		NO			
PY 88 II-A ALLOCATION						
BELOW $1 MILLION	100%	(12)	0%	(0)	100%	(12)
$1-1.9 MILLION	63%	(20)	38%	(12)	100%	(32)
$2-6.9 MILLION	79%	(26)	21%	(7)	100%	(33)
$7 MILLION & ABOVE	100%	(4)	0%	(0)	100%	(4)
ALL SDAS	77%	(62)	23%	(19)	100%	(81)
ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE						
PIC	73%	(16)	27%	(6)	100%	(22)
GOVERNMENT	82%	(42)	18%	(9)	100%	(51)
CBO/OTHER	50%	(4)	50%	(4)	100%	(8)
ALL SDAS	77%	(62)	23%	(19)	100%	(81)

Table VI-34

STATE DIRECTOR PERSPECTIVES OF PRIMARY IMPEDIMENTS TO TRAINING
BY AMOUNT OF STATE FUNDING IN PY 88

| | PY 88 STATE FUNDS | | | ALL STATES | |
	LESS THAN $500,000		$500,000 TO $2 MILLION		GREATER THAN $2 MILLION			
IMPEDIMENTS TO TRAINING								
INSUFFICIENT ADMIN FUNDS	85%	(11)	38%	(5)	67%	(6)	63%	(22)
TRAVEL COSTS TOO HIGH	92%	(12)	46%	(6)	44%	(4)	63%	(22)
RESTRICTIONS ON OUT OF STATE TRAVEL	46%	(6)	62%	(8)	44%	(4)	51%	(18)
PROBLEM COVERING STAFF DUTIES	38%	(5)	62%	(8)	33%	(3)	46%	(16)
NOT CONVINCED OF QUALITY	54%	(7)	38%	(5)	44%	(4)	46%	(16)
TIMING OF TRAINING	23%	(3)	31%	(4)	44%	(4)	31%	(11)
SUBJECTS OFFERED NOT NEEDED	23%	(3)	31%	(4)	22%	(2)	26%	(9)
LOCATION NOT ACCESSIBLE	15%	(2)	15%	(2)	33%	(3)	20%	(7)
DURATION TOO LONG	15%	(2)	31%	(4)	11%	(1)	20%	(7)
DURATION TOO SHORT	0%	(0)	0%	(0)	11%	(1)	3%	(1)
LEVEL OF TRAINING TOO SIMPLE	0%	(0)	0%	(0)	0%	(0)	0%	(0)
LEVEL OF TRAINING TOO COMPLEX	0%	(0)	0%	(0)	0%	(0)	0%	(0)
OTHER	8%	(1)	0%	(0)	0%	(0)	3%	(1)
ALL STATES	100%	(13)	100%	(13)	100%	(9)	100%	(35)

ANSWERED ONLY BY STATE DIRECTORS WHO ANSWERED YES TO PRIOR QUESTION
STATING THAT THERE HAD BEEN MISSED TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES;
STATE DIRECTORS WERE ASKED TO CHECK UP TO FIVE IMPEDIMENTS.

Table VI-35

SDA DIRECTOR PERSPECTIVES OF PRIMARY IMPEDIMENTS TO TRAINING
BY ALLOCATION IN PY 88

	PY 88 II-A ALLOCATION				ALL SDAS	
	BELOW $1 MILLION	$1-1.9 MILLION	$2-6.9 MILLION	$7 MILLION & ABOVE		
IMPEDIMENTS TO TRAINING						
TRAVEL COSTS TOO HIGH	83% (10)	74% (14)	64% (16)	75% (3)	72%	(43)
INSUFFICIENT ADMIN $	75% (9)	79% (15)	60% (15)	25% (1)	67%	(40)
TIMING OF TRAINING	25% (3)	53% (10)	72% (18)	100% (4)	58%	(35)
LOCATION NOT ACCESSIBILE	42% (5)	47% (9)	52% (13)	25% (1)	47%	(28)
PROBLEM COVERING STAFF DUTIES	33% (4)	53% (10)	36% (9)	25% (1)	40%	(24)
NOT CONVINCED OF QUALITY	25% (3)	32% (6)	44% (11)	25% (1)	35%	(21)
RESTRICTIONS ON OUT OF STATE TRAVEL	33% (4)	26% (5)	16% (4)	25% (1)	23%	(14)
SUBJECTS OFFERED NOT NEEDED	0% (0)	32% (6)	24% (6)	25% (1)	22%	(13)
DURATION TOO LONG	17% (2)	16% (3)	16% (4)	0% (0)	15%	(9)
LEVEL OF TRAINING TOO SIMPLE	0% (0)	5% (1)	8% (2)	25% (1)	7%	(4)
DURATION TOO SHORT	0% (0)	0% (0)	8% (2)	0% (0)	3%	(2)
LEVEL OF TRAINING TOO COMPLEX	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0%	(0)
OTHER	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	25% (1)	2%	(1)
ALL SDAS	100% (12)	100% (19)	100% (25)	100% (4)	100%	(60)

ANSWERED ONLY BY SDA DIRECTORS WHO ANSWERED YES TO PRIOR QUESTION
STATING THAT THERE HAD BEEN MISSED TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES;
SDA DIRECTORS WERE ASKED TO CHECK UP TO FIVE IMPEDIMENTS.

Table VI-36

Staff Perceptions of Most Important Training Impediments

	Percent	
Reason	State Staff (n=286)	SDA Staff (n=576)
Insufficient funds	26%	36%
Travel cost too high	16	23
Restrictions on out-of-state travel	26	16
Coverage	37	35
Supervisor will not authorize release time	11	7
Duration too long	3	4
Duration too short	3	2
Timing (month or days of week)	18	23
Location not accessible	6	25
Subject not exactly what needed	29	32
Level of training too simple	8	8
Level of training too complex	2	1
Not convinced of quality	28	25
Other	14	13

VII. STAFF AND STAFF TRAINING AMONG JTPA SERVICE PROVIDERS

The primary source of information for this chapter is the site visits and interviews in a dozen contractual service provider organizations among the eight case study SDAs. (As noted in Chapter II, one of the case study SDAs used no outside service providers, while others use contractors only for limited functions and still others for everything except planning and administration.)

All the organizations in our sample of contractors turned out to be independent entities, not affiliated with any of the several national networks of organizations involved in JTPA service provision, such as the Urban League and 70001. As partial compensation for this fact, as well as for the smaller than anticipated number of organizations within this sample, we also interviewed representatives of the national offices of several of these networks. Altogether, the five organizations for which we were able to obtain either interviews or documentation represent over 250 individual service sites around the nation, and at least 1,250 staff members involved in the contractual provision of JTPA services. Information on these organizations is incorporated throughout the chapter, wherever applicable.

One section of the chapter draws on an additional data source, as well. After summarizing the staff training priorities expressed by the management of the various service provider organizations, we offer a comparative perspective deriving from the surveys: the recommendations of state and SDA directors on the training topics that would be most beneficial to service provider staff.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CASE STUDY ORGANIZATIONS

Table VII-1 summarizes characteristics of the provider organizations that were of primary interest in sample selection. Five of these organizations were public agencies or programs, another five were nonprofit corporations, and two were proprietary. Among the sample, a full range of services was represented. JTPA contract size

291

ranged from $45,000 to $1.4 million, and the organizations' budgetary dependence on JTPA ranged from low to 100%. Overall organization staff size ranged from three to 35 or more, and the number of JTPA-funded positions from 1.4 to 18. To fill in the profile somewhat, a thumbnail sketch of each organization follows.

The business college is a proprietary institution that enrolls about 400 students a year. About a third of the college's students are JTPA-funded, while many of the rest are referred by workers' compensation insurers. The involvement with JTPA goes back years, before the current owners bought the college, and probably into the CETA era. Enrollment is open-entry, open-exit.

The first CBO in the sample started with a CETA grant, and originally targeted its employment and training services to women. It provides intake and assessment, as well as placement services. The organization's seven-member board of directors includes employers, a therapist, a school counselor, a prominent attorney, and a bank vice-president. An annual open house is held for potential employers which generally attracts about 200 persons.

The community college branch campus has an English as a Second Language institute, an employment skills center, and continuing education programs. Under a performance-based contract, JTPA participants receive word processing, secretarial, or medical office assistant training in addition to assessment and job placement services. The college also provides adult basic education for participants in the state's JOBS program; some of these persons are then enrolled in JTPA for specific occupational training at the college.

The county employment and training department was originally part of a two-county CETA prime sponsor. It now has a $1.4 million performance-based contract with the SDA, and provides all services from outreach and intake to placement.

The city economic development council is a nonprofit agency serving both the city and the surrounding county. Its contract with the SDA calls for it to arrange OJT contracts with new or expanding businesses in the area.

The ethnic CBO was formed in the late 1960s as a self-help organization and evolved into a comprehensive social service agency with a particularly strong orientation toward senior services. It has provided employment and training services since the beginning of CETA.

The job shop is a for-profit organization that provides occupational and job search training and job development for JTPA participants. The company has contracts with a number of SDAs within the state.

The sheltered workshop is a nonprofit agency that provides training and employment counseling to mentally handicapped individuals. Most of its funding comes from the state departments of rehabilitation and mental health.

The teen parent program is operated by a school district, which also has other contracts with the SDA. It provides comprehensive services to pregnant teen-agers and teen parents. SDA funding accounts for about one-fifth of its budget, and is used to support pre-employment and occupational skills training for those of the program's participants who are old enough for JTPA youth services. Most of the rest of its funding comes from the county, foundations, and local businesses.

The continuing education program is offered by a local private university. It includes a small office skills training program that serves about 20 JTPA participants, providing instruction in computers, word processing, and secretarial skills. The program is designed to take four months, but due to its open-exit policy some students remain in the program for as long as six months. Occasional guest lecturers discuss such topics as self-esteem, dressing for the job, and alcohol and drug education.

The university institute, part of a large state university, organizes ongoing training for state and SDA staff. This program is patterned after a similar program that was started in another state within the same Federal region. A two-person staff locates lecturers from around the county to hold workshops and seminars. The institute has offered some three dozen courses, usually of two to three days in duration, in three cities around the state. As of May 1989, nearly 500 persons had participated in training programs developed through the institute.

The vocational school is part of a local public school system. It offers special classes for JTPA participants in GED tutoring, self-esteem, and communication skills. It also integrates JTPA participants with other students in more than two dozen areas of occupational training, from secretarial to civil engineering. JTPA accounts for about one-fifth of its budget.

STAFF STRUCTURES

As can be seen from Table VII-1, staff structures, and particularly the number of JTPA staff, were generally small among the sample service provider organizations. Only two of the providers had more than five JTPA staffers, and of these only one had more than ten. The norm was a director, one part-time or full-time clerical worker, and one or two program staffers. JTPA staff in the largest organization, the county employment and training department, included a deputy director, three managers, an intake worker, a case manager, a work experience counselor, a job search technician, a placement coordinator, three job developers, an accountant, an accounting clerk, a word processor, a clerk, and a receptionist.

Most of the organizations had positions that were specifically designated as JTPA-related, and were known to their incumbents as such. However, several of the organizations spread their JTPA funding throughout the budget in such a way that no staff members identified themselves as "JTPA" staff.

The general pattern of small JTPA staff size holds true for most of the national affiliates, as well, gauging by interviews and available documents. The largest average staff size was between eight and nine, while available data or estimates on several of the organizations produces a local average of four or five.

SALARY AND BENEFIT STRUCTURE

In general, salaries among the nonprofit and for-profit organizations ranged from $18,000 to $28,000, with most staff in the area of $22,000. In the public institutions, staff salaries ranged from $22,000 to $35,000, with most salaries in the neighborhood of $25,000. Benefit structures were more generous within the public agencies, as well.

Most interview respondents considered their organization's salary and benefit structure competitive with comparable organizations, such as other nonprofit organizations, or other business colleges. Most acknowledged that better salaries and benefits were available in other organizations, beyond those that they perceived to be their most direct competitors, and several mentioned that this contributed to staff turnover. However, with some exceptions, most did not consider their salaries and benefits to be a serious problem, especially in connection with their ability to recruit suitable staff.

RECRUITMENT PRACTICES

Recruitment has not been a significant issue for most of the sample providers, because their staff is small and most have not experienced much turnover.

Specific recruitment practices varied widely. The business college hires new graduates from area colleges, who stay for a couple years to gain experience and then move on. Several of the college-level and public school system programs follow procedures typical for their systems, placing notices with local college placement offices and

295

publishing ads locally; some move beyond these steps to recruit regionally or nationally if they perceive the need. The smaller CBO maintains a file of resumes, and has developed a point system to aid in objective selection of new staff as positions open. The ethnic CBO hires only bilingual staff, which it recruits through a combination of word of mouth and formal advertising. Several of the organizations recruit SDA training graduates (including those of their own programs) and staff of other nonprofit agencies.

Several interview participants mentioned that they make a point of recruiting amply qualified people (more on their qualifications in the following section), both to minimize the need for staff training and because the organization's capacity to support staff training is minimal.

STAFF BACKGROUND AND TENURE

Among the national organizations, most reported that the norm for their local professional staff is at least a Bachelor's degree, and most also seek a combination of experience and community familiarity. These organizations generally required a valid teaching credential for their instructional staff, and one mentioned giving preference to persons with experience in teaching at the junior high or high school level. Private sector experience was generally sought for job developers, while counseling or psychology degrees were preferred for assessment and counseling staff.

Among the organizations within our provider sample, the background and experience of staff was appropriate to their responsibilities, and in most cases extensive. For example, employment counselors in the small CBO had either doctoral or Master's degrees in social work, plus previous experience in employment issues. The director of this program had a Master's degree, ten years' prior experience in vocational counseling, and an additional ten years in administration.

Staff of the community college branch campus had to meet the regular requirements for teaching staff at the college. Most had Master's degrees, which gained them a starting salary of $23,000. The counselors all had degrees in counseling. Similarly, several staff members in the teen parent program had postgraduate degrees in relevant fields along with a number of years of experience. Whatever their other qualifications, however, if they did not have a valid state teaching credential, their salary and benefits were markedly lower than if they did have such a credential, even if they were in management positions.

In the county employment and training department, the vast majority of staff had bachelor's degrees in the social sciences. The exceptions were the counselors, who had degrees in counseling, and some of the support staff, who had A.A. degrees. This department also exemplified the long tenure characterizing staff in most of the sample organizations: almost three-quarters of its staff had been with the organization since CETA.

With only a few exceptions, all or most of the staff in most of the sample organizations had been with their organization for years. For example, the staff of the sheltered workshop had been in place since CETA, while the core staff at the community college branch campus had been with that institution for six years or more.

MANAGEMENT'S PERCEPTIONS OF STAFF QUALIFICATIONS

Directors and managers uniformly praised the qualifications and caliber of their staff -- the lack of variability on this point was impressive. A number added that their staff could find better-paying and less stressful jobs elsewhere, but stayed because of their commitment to the kind of work that they did.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR ADVANCEMENT

To quote one manager, "Surely you jest." In most cases, the only opportunity for advancement within the organization is into management,

297

and with the small staff sizes this is likely to mean the director's position.

Some interview participants had in fact advanced internally as the result of the previous director's departure or retirement. For example, the director of the sheltered workshop had started as a counselor, then moved up when the former director left to take a state job. Similarly, the current director of county employment and training department had originally joined that organization as a counselor. However, in a number of the organizations the top staff had been virtually unchanged for years, providing little or no opportunity for entering or mid-level staff (in organizations large enough to have a middle level) to advance without leaving the organization. The public school and university settings did provide avenues for advancement, but these generally led out of the JTPA program.

STAFF TURNOVER

Most of the sample organizations had experienced little turnover. Interviewed directors and assistant directors ranged between five and fifteen years with their organization, and all had been working in the area of job training and employment for a minimum of fifteen years.

The business school accepted the turnover of instructional staff as a fact of doing business, and to some extent may be said to have managed turnover. Instructors tend to leave at predictable times, relating to academic calendars elsewhere, so their departures are not usually very disruptive. In addition, since they go elsewhere to get better pay and benefits, their departure helps keep costs low. At the same time, few turn over quickly; according to the school's president, average tenure among the instructional staff was around four years.

The ethnic CBO was something of an exception to this general picture, in that it had had five people in its two employment specialist positions over the past two years. The director of this organization traced the departures to low salaries (especially as compared to area

norms) and concern over long-term job stability. Although he saw recent turnover within these two positions as excessive, he was fairly philosophical about overall staff turnover in general. As long as staff stayed for a couple of years, he welcomed it when a staff member left to return to school or to accept better-paying employment elsewhere within the community. Two other interview respondents had a similar attitude, saying they actually wished their organizations had somewhat higher staff turnover.

Representatives of the national organizations were somewhat less sanguine on this topic. One called it one of his organization's major staffing issues. Another said that turnover among local managers was in the neighborhood of 20% annually, and that job developers and other staff who worked directly with clients tended to have an even shorter "life span." A third termed the overall turnover rate among JTPA staff high, and said that the organization did perceive an impact on local affiliates' performance.

All three cited low salaries and unstable funding as contributing factors, and one added paperwork and other "diversions" from what JTPA staff saw as their proper functions. Another offered the perspective that staff joining the affiliates today tended to see their organization as a stepping stone, whereas twenty years ago they would have seen it as their career.

STAFF TRAINING PRACTICES

Only about half of the sample organizations had a separate budget item to cover staff training and related travel, and in most of these cases the item was no more than $3,000 annually for the entire staff. As mentioned earlier, the organizations make a point of recruiting what they consider amply qualified staff, and to rely on the stability of much of their staff, in part to compensate for this lack of training.

The vocational school was the only organization with an ongoing staff training program. New staff members who are to work with JTPA

clients attend workshops on how to deal with "at risk" people. These workshops are organized by the school district, but conducted by outside lecturers. The schools in general seemed better positioned to keep staff informed of training opportunities, and to support staff training to a limited degree, while the nonprofit organizations were generally the least well informed about available training offerings and the least able to afford training expenses.

Several of the national organizations provide training for the staff of their affiliates; one called this one of its major services to the local organizations. The subjects provided cover the spectrum, but focus on specific client service topics and JTPA-related management issues. Local staff's practical access to such offerings is often severely impeded, however, by a combination of budget constraints, concern over staff coverage, and in some cases SDA restrictions on funded travel for provider staff.

Consequently, often only the director or top management is able to participate in formal training or conferences. In an exception to this pattern, one organization described the training that it targets to line staff under the auspices of the Title IV Community-Based Organization Partnership Program. However, the number of staff that it is able to reach through this mechanism remains fairly small relative to the potential audience.

STAFFING ISSUES

Key Issues

None of the sample contractors considered staffing issues to be among their top management concerns. Funding, cash flow, and compliance ranked considerably higher. This is true for the national organizations, as well.

Among staffing issues, for the case study providers, the top concern was declining overall JTPA staff size (an outcome of funding).

300

The lack of internal opportunities for advancement was next on the list, and clearly is closely related to declining staff size, but did not appear to be perceived as that serious a concern for most of the organizations. It should be noted that salaries and benefits were a serious concern among some of the sample providers, in contrast to the relative complacency found among other organizations within the sample.

Among the national organizations, on the other hand, the greatest concern was expressed about staff turnover and low salaries, and the level of concern did appear to be significant. The organizations contacted did not specify declining staff size as a problem, possibly viewing it as part and parcel of broader funding trends that do give them serious concern.

Staffing Needs

Among the sample contractors, there was widespread agreement that JTPA contracts do not allow for sufficient, if any, clerical and secretarial support. In addition, the smaller programs reported a general need for more staff, especially in the face of the newer challenges they are facing in dealing with a harder-to-serve clientele.

Staff Training Needs

Service Provider Perceptions

Perceptions regarding top needs for staff training varied widely among the sample of service providers. Some, such as the county employment and training department, indicated a need for management training aimed at people with social service backgrounds who had moved into administrative positions. Another category seen as necessary by some of the providers was training concerning technical aspects more or less peculiar to JTPA, such as the procurement process, reporting, and performance-based contracting.

The most commonly expressed need was for training or information-sharing that described innovative and effective programs or procedures for dealing with the types of populations that a given provider served. For example, the director of the sheltered workshop expressed a desire for this kind of training. When asked whether she had ever seen or heard about descriptions of innovative programs for serving handicapped populations in the Employment and Training Reporter -- which the administrative entity subscribed to -- she said no.

Perceptions of State and SDA Staff

The general consensus of case study SDA staff was that service providers need training and technical assistance in three areas: the mission of JTPA, contracting procedures, and performance standards. Staff in a large rural SDA thought that its providers could use training in contracting, invoicing, and audit procedures and the kinds of information required in an audit. Staff in a large urban SDA agreed with the usefulness of training concerning contracting and performance standards, but also believed service provider staff would benefit from training that conveyed information on "best practice" service models. This source also noted that, because service provider staff is "stretched tight" and because few providers can budget for travel and training, the training would have to be of short duration and provided locally.

The director surveys obtained a more comprehensive profile of the perspectives of state and SDA directors concerning service providers' primary training needs, as displayed in Table VII-2. The overall similarity of percentages between the two levels is impressive, and the occasional substantial differences can generally be reconciled with the different experiences and working relationships that the two levels have with local contractors.

Thus, both levels place highest emphasis on training in motivating participants, at 46% among state directors and 45% among SDA directors. But whereas 46% of the state directors also recommended training in

302

assessment systems and techniques, only 25% of the SDA directors did so, presumably because many SDAs reserve this function for themselves. Similar reasons may account for the lower SDA frequencies on such topics as developing EDPs, accessing client support services, and developing OJT positions and contracts. State directors also show greater interest than their SDA counterparts in providing local contractors with training in fundraising, budgeting, and JTPA-specific contracting, fiscal, and audit rules and procedures.

At the state level, the top three rankings are shared by four topics. As mentioned above, first place is shared by motivating participants and assessment systems and techniques, at 46% each. Selected next most frequently was training in JTPA fiscal regulations and reporting procedures, at 44%, followed by effective outreach and recruitment, at 36%. At the SDA level, the first-place 45% frequency for motivating participants is followed by effective outreach and recruitment, at 38%, and orientation to JTPA and related programs, at 36%.

This basic orientation to JTPA and to addressing the performance standards effectively is given relatively high support at both levels. Other topics finding common support include determining the employer community's training needs, marketing job training services to employers, and understanding the needs of specific client groups (especially dropouts, at-risk youth, and welfare recipients) and developing service programs that meet these needs. The topics that find least support at both levels are in the areas of general managerial and professional skills; MIS, computers, statistical analysis, and research and evaluation; and, to a somewhat lesser extent, policy and administration.

Training Impediments

The largest overt impediments to staff training for provider staff are the lack of training and travel budgets and the press of work. Most of the organizations are very small and cannot provide back-up for

303

absent staff. If someone is out on a given day, work backs up. This makes it difficult to let someone go away for a training session or conference.

A partial solution would be to hold training sessions at the SDA level, reducing the need for travel, and schedule it on a part-day basis. The model for this kind of training would be the sessions that many SDAs hold focusing on contracting and invoicing procedures after each round of contracts is awarded.

A more subtle impediment is the perception among a number of the provider managers that their staff really did not require training, or could get it without the assistance of the organization. As discussed earlier, most of the providers emphasized that they look for well qualified persons when recruiting. So a number see staff training as a dispensable luxury. This perception was not unanimous, however: others made an effort to see that their staff received training on budgeting and contracting, or on innovative program models for the populations they serve.

Perceived Impact on Performance

Most of the case study providers saw their staff delivering high-quality performance in spite of the various obstacles posed by small staff size, salary or benefit disincentives, paperwork, and other program pressures. Most of these organizations were also considered good to excellent by their SDA, although some encountered occasional expenditure or performance problems.

At the same time, a number of the providers clearly feel a need for more training on JTPA procedural requirements and on new approaches to meeting the needs of an increasingly challenging participant population. So most would probably welcome training or technical assistance that they felt confident would assist their organization in these areas -- if it could be made practically accessible for their staff.

Table VII-1

Case Study JTPA Contractors

Contractor	Type of Organization	JTPA Services Provided	JTPA Funding	Proportion of Budget from JTPA	JTPA Staff	Total Staff
Business college	For-profit	Advanced typing Bookkeeping Word processing	$112,000	1/3	NA[a]	12
Community-based organization (CBO) primarily serving women	Nonprofit	Assessment Counseling Placement	$65,000	Fairly high	4 (part-time)	4
Community college branch campus	Public	Adult basic ed. ESL Medical assistant Secretarial Word processing	$750,000	Moderate	NA[a]	26
County employment and training department	Public	Adult basic ed. GED Job club Job search workshop OJT Tryout employment	$1.4 million	100%	18	18
Economic development council	Nonprofit	OJT	$200,000	Moderate	2.5	5
Ethnic CBO	Nonprofit	ESL Job search skills OJT	$160,000	19%	4.5	28 employees 22 contract
Job shop	For-profit	Basic construction skills Basic literacy GED OJT	($200,000)[b]	High	3	3

Contractor	Type of Organization	JTPA Services Provided	JTPA Funding	Proportion of Budget from JTPA	JTPA Staff	Total Staff
Sheltered workshop	Nonprofit	Counseling Job training Placement	$75,000	23%	1.5	5
Teen parent program (school district program)	Public	Case management Comprehensive social services Occupational skills Pre-employment skills	$45,000	Small	1.4	13
University continuing education program	Nonprofit	Office skills training Placement	$75,000	NA	2	(Large)
University institute	Public	Staff training	$213,000	NA	2	NA
Vocational education school	Public	GED Occupational skills training Pre-employment skills Placement	$100,000	20%	(7 FTE)	35

[a]Performance-based contract does not specify staff positions.

[b]$1,650 to $2,050 per placement.

Table VII-2
PERCEIVED TRAINING PRIORITIES FOR SERVICE PROVIDER STAFF

	PERSPECTIVE OF:	
	STATE DIRECTORS	SDA DIRECTORS
JTPA -- STRUCTURE AND PRINCIPLES		
Orientation to JTPA and related programs	26%*	36%*
EDWAA	21*	20*
Performance standards: practical applications	28*	29*
Other	3	0
POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION		
Providing effective support for the SJTCC	0	0
Providing effective support for the PIC	0	1
Goal-setting at the state and local levels	18	1
Planning and program development	18	18
Developing the GCSSP	3	1
Target group policies	15	12
Developing service programs to meet client needs	33*	30*
Establishing Youth Employment Competencies	18	26*
Developing strategies to meet performance standards	23*	24*
Effective use of non-78% JTPA funds	10	3
Funding recapture policies	3	0
Effective SDA liaison and monitoring	3	3
Developing successful T.A. programs	8	3
Evaluating proposals	5	5
Effective monitoring of programs and contractors	13	8
Cutback management	5	3
Other	0	0
FISCAL/CONTRACTS		
JTPA fiscal regulations and reporting procedures	44*	11
Securing diversified funding/effective grantsmanship	21*	9
Income-generating activities under JTPA	13	11
Preparing successful funding/program proposals	26*	21*
Preparing effective RFPs	8	9
Cost allocation under JTPA	28*	8
Effective budget management	26*	11
Negotiating successful contracts	15	8

	PERSPECTIVE OF:	
	STATE DIRECTORS	SDA DIRECTORS
Developing performance-based contracts for different programs/populations	10%	7%
Auditing within the JTPA system	21*	7
Other	0	0
MIS/COMPUTERS/STATISTICS/RESEARCH/EVALUATION		
Establishing/updating the MIS	10	1
Selecting computer hardware	3	1
Selecting software for program management	10	3
Selecting educational software	5	13
Developing and using labor market information	13	11
Conducting post-program follow-up	8	13
Analyzing and reporting statistical information	13	1
Methods of program evaluation	8	11
Other	0	1
PARTNERSHIPS/COMMUNITY RELATIONS		
Determining training needs in the employer community	23*	26*
Marketing job training services to employers	28*	24*
Marketing techniques (ads, video, phone, etc.)	13	20*
Effective liaison with elected officials	5	1
Effective public/community relations	8	12
Securing private sector involvement in JTPA	10	16
Building partnerships with other agencies/programs	21*	16
Cross-training about related programs (K-12, AFDC, etc.)	18	13
Other	0	0
CLIENT SERVICES		
Understanding/identifying the needs of:		
Displaced homemakers	13	9
Displaced workers	21*	17
Dropouts/potential dropouts	26*	33*
Ex-offenders	5	11
Handicapped persons	13	9

	PERSPECTIVE OF:	
	STATE DIRECTORS	SDA DIRECTORS
Homeless persons	23%*	18%
Minorities	18	12
Pregnant/parent teenagers	13	8
Refugees/immigrants	3	5
Rural workers/jobseekers	3	13
Youth	10	18
Welfare recipients/applicants	23*	32*
Effective outreach and recruitment	36*	38*
Eligibility verifications procedures	15	11
Interpreting (bilingual/ASL)	5	3
Motivating participants	46*	45*
Getting clients to believe in themselves	21*	22*
Working with hostile/resistant clients	18	16
Assessment systems and techniques	46*	25*
Functional and vocational testing	8	16
Vocational counseling - individual and group	15	9
Personal/life skills counseling	13	15
Helping clients set personal goals	18	22*
Helping clients solve their own problems	15	15
Crisis intervention	10	7
Determining supportive service needs	18	7
Developing EDPs	28*	17
Accessing client support services	21*	8
Developing/selecting vocational curricula	8	13
Developing/selecting basic/remedial skills programs	21*	20*
Effective teaching techniques	5	15
Competency-based instruction	15	21*
Computer-assisted instruction	15	12
Work maturity preparation	8	18
Dislocated worker program approaches	28*	12
Designing job clubs/job search workshops	0	3
Supervising individual job search	8	4
Helping clients manage their own job search	5	12
Preparing clients for job interviews	15	7
Job development techniques	21*	15

	PERSPECTIVE OF:	
	STATE DIRECTORS	SDA DIRECTORS
Developing OJT slots/contracts	23%*	13%
Effective use of work experience activities	10	5
Entrepreneurship development	15	9
Other	0	4
GENERAL MANAGERIAL AND PROFESSIONAL SKILLS		
Establishing personnel procedures	3	1
Developing staff competencies	10	11
Supervisory skills/motivating staff	15	11
Staff performance appraisals	0	1
Managing conflict	5	5
Analytical skills and methods	10	7
Problem-solving strategies	13	12
Writing	5	9
Computer competency	8	4
Oral presentation skills	8	4
Effective meetings/facilitation skills	3	5
Dealing with the public	0	8
Time management	3	8
Stress management/preventing burnout	10	18
Dealing with other people's stress	5	15
Other	3	0
	n=39	n=76

*Selected by 20% or more of responding directors.

VIII. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarizes key findings to the first four study questions posed in Chapter I.   Because our information concerning contractual service providers is much more limited than that on state and SDA administrative entity staff, findings for service provider organizations are kept separate from those for the state and administrative entity levels.

Following this discussion, the chapter offers recommendations for policy and actions relating to staffing and staff training.   Some of these recommendations are aimed at the Federal level, while others are more appropriate for state JTPA organizations or SDA administrative entities.

FINDINGS CONCERNING STATE AND SDA STAFF

Range of Staff Structures and Extent of Commonalities Among Them

A key finding discussed at the beginning of Chapter III is the tremendous variability among organizational structures at both the state and SDA levels. We illustrated this variation through a description of the many locations and reporting relationships of MIS staff at the state and SDA levels. Extending the variety found in this one function across the numerous functions performed at both levels, and adding in the finding that some organizations are organized along geographic rather than functional lines (while others fall somewhere between these two principles), we concluded that there was no legitimate way to tame the resulting multiplicity of structures into a manageable and analytically useful set of structural types.

Funding and Staff Size, Type of Administrative Entity

There are, however, a number of individual dimensions of staff structure along which JTPA organizations can be compared.   The most useful are funding, staff size, whether staff size has recently

increased or decreased, and, at the SDA level, type of administrative entity.

State Level.   Among the states participating in our director survey, funding for state administration in PY 88 ranged from $237,000 to over $10 million, the group mean was over $1.8 million, and the median exceeded $1.2 million. Thirty-five percent of the organizations received less than $500,000, another 35% received between $500,000 and $2 million, and 30% received more than $2 million.

The mean number of state JTPA staff positions was 44, and the median was 38. On average, 36 positions were located within the state JTPA unit, while 12 were located elsewhere within the larger state agency. (The numbers do not add up because of varying response rates on individual survey items.)   There was close correspondence between funding level and staff size. In states with less than $500,000 in state funds, the mean number of staff was 15, whereas in the states receiving more than $2 million, the mean number of staff was 88.

States were divided fairly evenly in recent trends in staff size. Since July, 1987, 37% of the responding agencies reported that their staff size had increased, 32% that it had stayed about the same, and 32% that it had decreased.

Four-fifths of the responding states had a single staff for both the SJTCC and the state JTPA unit. In the states that had separate staffs, the mean size of the separate SJTCC staff was 7.8 positions, while the median size was 8.5 positions.

SDA Level. PY 88 allocations for the SDAs participating in the director survey ranged from a low of $158,000 to more than $26 million, with a mean of $2.9 million and a median of $1.8 million. Fifteen percent of the SDAs received less than $1 million, 39% received $1 million to $1.9 million, 40% received between $2 million and $6.9 million, and 6% fell into the "giant" category of $7 million and above.

312

Sixty-two percent of the SDAs were administered by government agencies, 28% by incorporated PICs, and 10% by CBOs or miscellaneous other organizations, such as community colleges. Partly due to the fact that a sizable number of administrative entities are PICs, the separation of administrative entity and PIC staff was less prevalent at the SDA level than the separation of the corresponding state staffs: only 12% of the SDAs had separate staffs for the administrative entity and the PIC. Where there was a separate PIC staff, the mean number of positions was 4, and the median was 3.5.

The average number of Title II-A staff in the administrative entity was 25 in PY 88, with a median of 23. Despite variability in the degree of contracting out of SDA funds, there was a close correspondence between staff size and allocation. SDAs with allocations under $1 million had a mean Title II-A staff size of 13, while those with allocations of at least $7 million averaged 59 positions.

Staff sizes were somewhat more likely to have remained the same among surveyed SDAs than at the state level. Twenty-six percent reported that staff positions had increased since July, 1987, 44% said staff size had remained about the same, and 30% said it had decreased.

Internal vs. External Allocation of JTPA Functions

At both the state and SDA levels, most functions were generally performed in-house or shared with outside staff or vendors. This was especially true at the state level. Here, there were only a few functions that more than half the states indicated were performed by outside staff or a contractor. The exceptions included legal support, auditing, and (with a bare majority) labor market research. On the other hand, nearly 40% of the responding states administered one or more SDA programs.

At the SDA level, program development and administrative functions were usually handled by internal staff. Outside staff or vendors were more often called upon for auditing, research and evaluation, legal

313

support, staff training, and client services. Still, in half of the SDAs the majority of client-oriented functions were performed in-house, with the exception of classroom training. Only 22% of the SDAs indicated that the administrative entity or PIC staff did most of the classroom training.

Among the SDAs that responded concerning their use of outside contractors for service provision, the average percent of contracting out (not weighted by funding) was 56%, and the average number of outside service providers was 21. The percent of contracting out tended to vary by both type of administrative entity and staff size, with the smallest organizations contracting out the largest percentage of their allocation.

Perceived Staff Size Adequacy, Additional Capacity Desired

Over 60% of state directors believed that their staff size was too small in relation to organizational responsibilities, whereas only a quarter of SDA directors were dissatisfied with their staff size. At both levels, however, higher-funded organizations were considerably more likely to feel that their staff size was sufficient.

When state directors were asked what three new positions they would add if their budget expanded, their overwhelming favorite was policy and planning staff. The next tier included monitors and MIS staff. Types of staff mentioned somewhat less frequently included PR/marketing specialists, clerical staff, fiscal/accounting staff, and field liaisons.

SDA directors, naturally enough, showed a greater orientation toward client service staff. The greatest number of mentions was for counselors, and job developers/placement specialists were also mentioned a number of times. Between these two choices, however, SDA directors also mentioned support staff specialities that paralleled most of the state directors' selections. These included planning staff, clerical staff, fiscal/accounting staff, and monitors.

Salary and Benefit Structures

Our survey data indicate that benefits are relatively generous at both the state and local levels. Salaries are another matter, particularly at the SDA level and among the upper echelons of state staff.

According to the staff survey results, 70% of SDA staff respondents earned less than $25,000 annually, while only 8% were paid at least $35,000. Among participating state staff, the corresponding proportions were 27% and 41%, respectively. The disparities persist even when the comparison is restricted to staff performing similar functions, such as directors, chief planners and fiscal managers, fiscal staff, and clerical staff.

Staff Recruitment

When asked how much difficulty they experienced with staff recruitment, state directors gave it a mean rating of 2.7 on a scale of 1 (no problem) to 5 (serious problem). The mean rating among SDA directors was 2.2, indicating more minor difficulty. At the state level, MIS, clerical, policy/planning, and fiscal/accounting staff was identified as the most difficult to recruit, while SDA directors identified fiscal/accounting, clerical, and planning staff as causing them the greatest difficulty in recruitment. The response rates on these specifications were fairly low, however.

The reasons that state directors cited most frequently as contributing to the recruitment difficulties that they did experience were civil service hiring procedures, inadequate salary, and perceived lack of promotional opportunities. For SDA directors, inadequate salary was substantially more important than at the state level. The two other top reasons identified at the SDA level were perceived lack of job security and perceived lack of promotional opportunities.

The influences of funding level, staff size, and recent trends in staff size on the overall rating of recruitment difficulty were either minimal or inconsistent. Funding and staff size did affect the reasons that directors identified as most significant in creating recruitment difficulties, however. Not surprisingly, for example, the proportion selecting perceived lack of promotional opportunities declined with increased funding.

A particular type of hiring problem that can cause frustration across the two levels was mentioned in the case study interviews, and warrants some attention. Some state managers mentioned instances when highly qualified and interested SDA staff had been available to fill openings occurring in mid- or high-level state positions, but the hire had been frustrated -- or made very difficult -- by state civil service rules that made it difficult to bring in someone from outside above the entry level.

Opportunities for Advancement

Advancement opportunities came up repeatedly as a weak area, particularly beyond the associate professional/technical level. Staff sizes that had been eroding for years, combined with low voluntary turnover, meant that advancement often required departure from the organization. In the case studies, a number of directors and managers called the lack of promotional opportunities "the major drawback" of their organization.

Turnover and Vacancies

Despite disadvantages of salary and promotional opportunities, overall staff tenure tends to be high at both the state and SDA levels, and turnover tends to be reasonably low. Median turnover rates at both levels were 10% annually, and substantial proportions of the organizations had staff turnover rates no higher than 5%: one-third at the state level, and a quarter of the SDAs. The surveys also found very low vacancy rates.

Consistent with their turnover rates, directors tended to accord turnover less concern than recruitment. Average ratings on a scale of seriousness (where, again, 1 signified no problem, 5 a serious problem) were 2.1 at the state level, and 1.7 among SDAs. In the surveys, clerical staff was mentioned most frequently as having the highest turnover, but there was little unanimity on this item. Among case study SDAs, intake interviewers and counselors, typically among the lowest-paid staff, were mentioned most frequently as especially prone to turnover.

Both state and SDA directors identified salary and lack of promotional opportunities as the most important contributors to staff turnover. The reason cited third most frequently was internal promotions (which took staff outside the unit) at the state level, whereas at the SDA level it was departure in search of greater job security.

In analyzing the survey data, we found a strong relationship between turnover rates and a cut in staff size over the past few years. This suggests that much turnover, especially excessively high turnover, is either a direct consequence of or a reaction to staff reductions. This in turn suggests than management's ability to control such turnover may be limited.

Management Perceptions of Staffing Issues

Directors and managers tend to see staffing issues as less significant than such other management concerns as funding. Their top staffing concern, staff size, is a function of funding. Among other staffing issues, the lack of advancement opportunities for qualified and experienced staff is widely acknowledged to be a problem. However, many managers and directors also seem to feel that they can rely on staff commitment to the employment and training field to overcome many other disincentives. Recruitment is generally seen as a relatively minor problem, in part because so many organizations need to do so little of it, and turnover is generally seen as still less serious.

317

Directors' staff training priorities are discussed further below, but one aspect of the management perspective on staff training fits in this context. A number of directors and managers in the case studies indicated that if given substantial additional funds, they would buy more staff, not more training.

Qualifications Recommended for State and Local Staff

Qualifications Sought by Management

In the case studies, state directors and section managers consistently emphasized requiring people who were good communicators, good analysts, good with people, capable of working independently, and familiar with "program" -- meaning JTPA specifically and the employment and training field more generally. To obtain the requisite skills, these sources spoke in favor of a Bachelor's degree, but usually without reference to a specific major, combined with experience in the JTPA system.

For some of the more technical units, there were partial exceptions to this pattern. For MIS staff, managers emphasized computer programming skills; for fiscal staff, some accounting background; and some managers sought auditing experience in monitoring staff. But these more specific skill requirements did not necessarily translate into requirements of a more specialized formal education; and managers continued to emphasize reasonable working familiarity with JTPA.

For mid- and higher-level administrative positions within SDAs, much like at the state level, managers emphasized analytic and communication skills and an ability to get along with people. They also strongly favored a Bachelor's degree for such positions. When it came to line staff, however, a number of respondents made the point that degrees were not as important as an appropriate attitude and approach to the participants.

318

Several interview participants mentioned the importance of regarding employment and training as a profession, which implied concern for both clients and the program. In describing what they looked for in hiring new staff, they used such expressions as "sense of responsibility for the program" and "have to be willing to learn -- it takes two years just to figure out JTPA." Other general attributes that they mentioned were good judgment, common sense, and a balance of compassion and objectivity. These were qualities that often did not find their way· into formal job announcements or position statements.

Staff Perspectives on Appropriate Qualifications

At both the state and SDA levels, the skills that staff held to be most important were interpersonal skills and written and oral communication skills. Both levels also produced high rankings for computer skills, skills relating to the respondent's specific position, and organizational/time management skills. State staff gave relatively greater emphasis to analytical skills, while SDA staff gave preference to such more locally oriented skills as counseling and teaching.

Over half of state staff and 49% of SDA staff recommended a Bachelor's degree for their own position. Generally, staff in the clerical, MIS/data processing, and fiscal clusters was more likely to recommend high school, an Associate's degree, or business college/secretarial training. State staff was more likely to recommend administration and accounting majors, while SDA staff tended to favor any of several human service/education majors.

In terms of experience, state staff generally recommended programmatic and public sector experience. SDA respondents also emphasized these areas, but gave relatively more emphasis to working with disadvantaged persons. In addition, a substantial percentage of SDA staff recommended experience in the private sector. At both levels, substantial percentages of staff recommended secretarial experience -- not surprising, since both levels have substantial percentages of secretarial staff who participated in the surveys.

319

At both levels, staff with certain more specialized
responsibilities placed comparatively greater emphasis on job-specific
skills and experience in relation to more general analytic and
interpersonal skills and program knowledge. At the state level, these
categories included fiscal, data processing, MIS, and clerical staff.
At the SDA level, these four groups were accompanied by another: client
service staff.

Backgrounds of Staff Currently Serving in the JTPA System

Most JTPA staff in state agencies and SDA administrative entities
has at least a Bachelor's degree. The majority is very thin at the SDA
level and only somewhat larger at the state level.

However, the percentages are higher for staff in most professional
and technical functions, and especially for staff in these areas that
also has supervisory responsibilities. Among supervisory staff in the
professional/technical clusters, 90% of state staff and three-quarters
of SDA staff has at least a Bachelor's degree.

Percentages with a four-year college degree are markedly lower for
clerical and data entry staff, and tend also to be somewhat lower for
fiscal staff. Overall, the survey data indicate a strong correspondence
between the level of education respondents recommend for their current
position and the level they actually have attained. There is also a
strong similarity between the distributions of recommended and actual
major field of postsecondary education.

Staff at both levels tend to have substantial experience both in
their current position and within the employment and training field. A
majority of both state and SDA staff respondents have been in their
current position for at least three years. More than half of state
staff, and 37% of SDA staff, has worked in the employment and training
field for ten years or more.

Only a minority of the staff belongs to any professional associations. Thirty-one percent of state respondents and 25% of SDA respondents reported belonging to one or more professional associations. At the state level, the organization specified most frequently was the International Association of Personnel in Employment Security (IAPES), while SDA respondents most frequently specified their state or regional employment and training association.

In terms of demographic characteristics, most JTPA staff is white, most is at least 36 years old, and most is female. Three-quarters of state staff respondents and two-thirds of those at the SDA level reported themselves to be white. Similar proportions at each level were at least 36 years of age. Fifty-eight percent of state respondents and 70% of those at the SDA level were women. The clearest patterns of demographic differences across functional clusters are by gender. However, there is also relatively equal representation of the sexes in several professional and technical clusters, especially at the state level.

Case study comments are our source of information on staff skills and overall qualifications, and these are generally highly positive. Managers did express some concern about written and oral communication skills and about the caliber of some clerical staff, especially at the SDA level. Overall, however, directors and managers interviewed for the case studies said that much of their staff had qualifications and skills that exceeded those warranted by their titles, salaries, or promotional opportunities. They credited this profile and the tendency toward long tenure to staff's commitment to the employment and training field.

The comparisons we have been able to draw with other human service systems are fragmentary. Professional positions within the vocational rehabilitation system tend to be more science-oriented than most JTPA positions, and rehabilitation professionals generally have higher educational credentials than professional and technical JTPA staff as a whole. Licensing requirements for teachers vary greatly across states, but at least a four-year degree and some field experience are generally

321

required. With this or greater background, the average classroom teacher today is paid slightly in excess of $31,000 annually. Teacher organizations are moving to establish a national system of voluntary certification based on a common set of standards of teaching quality. However, development of the assessment criteria is expected to take several years. Pay scales in social work appear to be lower, even for personnel with graduate degrees, and may thus be more comparable with current SDA pay scales. (However, our source on child welfare salaries excludes statewide public agencies.)

Staff Development Practices and Training Needs

There appears to be increasing interest in training for JTPA staff, judging by the growth of state training institutes that we encountered in the case study visits and have heard about in other states during the course of this study. In addition, two of the eight case study SDAs were taking steps to increase managerial planning and direction concerning the training their staff receives.

The staff surveys identified a considerable amount of training received by staff between July, 1987, and early 1990. During that period, staff respondents at both the state and SDA levels took an average of almost four training courses each. (The median number of courses was three, again at both the state and SDA levels.) Most of this training either covered JTPA regulations and procedures or was position-specific. Additional substantial percentages of the courses were in general management subjects or offered training in software packages. Staff survey participants rated 90% of their training courses as either very or somewhat useful for the performance of their job.

Despite these indications of training activity and interest, only a minority of state and SDA organizations regularly plan and budget for staff training, and the line items set aside for training in those organizations that have them tend to be tiny in relation to overall staff expenses. A case study respondent with experience in both the private sector and the Federal government commented that both the

322

Federal government and many private sector organizations plan staff training more carefully and budget it more generously.

The main barriers to more deliberate and more widespread provision of staff training in state and local JTPA organizations are cost-related: insufficient administrative funds and excessive administrative costs. Staff coverage is also considered a serious barrier. Other problems cited by both directors and staff include restrictions on out-of-state travel (more of a factor at the state level), inaccessible (which may translate as expensive) location, poor timing, and concerns over the quality of proposed training.

The surveys have uncovered considerable consensus about overall training priorities for the two levels, as well as identified priorities specific to staff performing different types of functions. Without regard to specific rankings, state and SDA directors concur on three-quarters of the top twenty training topics for staff at each level.

State directors' top priorities for their staff include training in monitoring, liaison, and technical assistance; a number of program development/SJTCC support topics; several fiscal topics; practical applications of performance standards; and MIS development and maintenance. But their list also includes three more general management topics (supervisory skills, developing staff competencies, and time management), and three topics concerned with analytic and evaluations skills.

Top priorities for SDA directors include two topics relating to expanding their funding base and another focused on increasing private sector involvement; YECs, performance standards, and EDWAA; meeting employers' needs and marketing services to them; and several topics relating to program development, including RFP development. Two topics are concerned with evaluation approaches, and a single topic is oriented to staff needs: stress management.

Staff, and especially state staff, lays relatively greater emphasis on general skills like computer competency, stress management, and problem-solving strategies. The specific priorities for state staff include, at the top of the list, computer competency. Three topics relate to stress and conflict management. Others include writing and oral presentation skills; several fiscal topics; problem-solving and time management; several JTPA-specific topics (performance standards, monitoring, successful technical assistance, EDWAA, and a general JTPA orientation); and three topics relating to analytical skills and evaluation methods.

The top item for SDA staff is stress management, and dealing with other people's stress is also a priority. More than one-third of the list focuses on understanding, reaching, motivating, and helping participants, including one topic on working with hostile or resistant clients. Computer competency is the third-highest priority. Two topics are JTPA-oriented (performance standards and JTPA orientation), two are geared to the employer community (meeting their needs and marketing services to them), and two focus on learning about and building partnerships with other programs. Five more general topics close out the list: supervisory skills, problem-solving strategies, dealing with the public and effective community relations, and time management.

The staff lists can be expected to be somewhat different from those of their directors, since the latter tend to focus on perceived organization-wide priorities while the staff lists reflect selections from the full spectrum of positions. In addition, there are differences between the two staff levels that clearly reflect their different sets of responsibilities. With these factors in mind, it is especially impressive that state and SDA staff share a third of the twenty priorities, and that state directors and staff are in agreement on half of the top twenty priorities. SDA directors and staff tend to produce relatively distinct lists, with directors stressing overall program development and fiscal responsibilities while staff priorities are either more general or more client-oriented.

FINDINGS CONCERNING SERVICE PROVIDER STAFF

Staff Structures

In our case studies, the staff structures of contractual service providers, and especially the number of their JTPA staff, tended to be small. Only two of the providers had more than five JTPA staffers, and of these only one had more than ten. The norm was a director, one part-time or full-time clerical worker, and one or two program staffers.

Most of the organizations had positions that were specifically designated as JTPA-related, and were known to their incumbents as such. However, several of the organizations spread their JTPA funding throughout the budget in such a way that no staff members identified themselves as "JTPA" staff.

In general, salaries among the nonprofit and for-profit organizations ranged from $18,000 to $28,000, with most staff in the area of $22,000. In the public institutions, staff salaries ranged from $22,000 to $35,000, with most salaries in the neighborhood of $25,000. Benefits were also more generous within the public agencies. Most of the organizations considered their salary and benefit structure competitive with like organizations. They acknowledged that better salaries and benefits available in other types of organizations contributed to turnover, but most did not consider them to be a serious problem.

Staff Recruitment

Recruitment has not been a significant issue for most of the case study providers, because their staff is small and most have not experienced much turnover. Although specific recruitment practices vary, depending on the type of organization, a number of interview respondents mentioned that they make a point of recruiting amply qualified people. As they explained, this minimizes the need for staff training, which they are generally ill able to afford.

Staff Background and Tenure

The overall norm was at least a Bachelor's degree, along with a combination of experience and community familiarity. Counseling or psychology degrees were preferred for assessment and counseling staff, while private sector experience was sought for job developers. Staff in these organizations often had extensive credentials, and most of the staff had been with their organization for years.

Opportunities for Advancement

If this is a weak area at the state and SDA levels, it is even worse among service providers. Generally, advancement requires departure.

Staff Turnover

Most of the case study organizations had experienced little turnover. Representatives of several national organizations of service providers, on the other hand, called staff turnover one of their major staffing issues. For example, one pegged turnover among local managers at around 20% annually. Generally, the staff that works most directly with clients appeared to have the highest turnover. Low salaries and unstable funding were cited as contributing factors, along with paperwork and other "diversions" from what JTPA service staff sees as its proper functions.

Staff Training Practices

Only about half of the case study organizations had a separate budget item to cover staff training and related travel, and in most of these cases the item was no more than $3,000 annually for the entire staff. Often only the director or top management is able to participate in formal training or conferences, and often these organizations are unaware of training that may be publicized to their SDA.

Perceptions about Staffing Issues

None of the case study organizations, nor any of the national organizations with which we conducted interviews, considered staffing issues to be among their top management concerns. Funding, cash flow, and compliance ranked considerably higher.

Among the case study providers, the top staffing issue was declining overall JTPA staff size, an outcome of funding trends. The lack of internal opportunities for advancement was next on the list, but did not appear to be that serious a concern for most of these organizations. Among the national organizations, on the other hand, the greatest concern was expressed about staff turnover and low salaries, and the level of concern did appear to be significant.

Training Priorities

A number of organizations saw little need to provide more training to their staff. Several made the same point we heard in case study states and SDAs: if their budget were substantially expanded, they would buy more staff, not more training. The most commonly expressed need was for training or information-sharing that described innovative and effective programs or procedures for dealing with the specific types of populations that a given provider served.

Our surveys obtained a more comprehensive profile of the perspectives of state and SDA directors concerning service providers' primary training needs. The overall similarity between the two lists is impressive, and the occasional substantial differences are generally attributable to the different experiences and working relationships that the two levels have with local contractors. At the state level, the top-ranked topics were motivating participants, assessment systems and techniques, JTPA fiscal regulations and reporting procedures, and effective outreach and recruitment. The top SDA priorities were motivating participants, effective outreach and recruitment, and orientation to JTPA and related programs.

327

This basic orientation to JTPA, along with training on addressing the performance standards effectively, was given relatively high support at both levels. Other topics finding common support included determining the employer community's training needs, marketing job training services to employers, and understanding the needs of specific client groups and developing service programs that meet these needs. (The groups specified most frequently were dropouts, at-risk youth, and welfare recipients.) The topics that found least support among directors at both levels were in the areas of general managerial and professional skills; MIS, computers, statistical analysis, and research and evaluation; and, to a somewhat lesser extent, policy and administration.

Training Impediments

Lack of training budgets and the press of work are serious barriers to training for service provider staff. Combined, both make it especially difficult to let staff go for extended training, or to leave the area for training. Another impediment is the perception among a number of their managers that their staff really does not require training, or can get it without the assistance of the organization. Finally, many providers were unaware of much of the training available within or through their SDA, and most expressed no awareness of training provided through their state that was potentially available to service providers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Make Use of the "Top Twenty" Rankings of Training Priorities

DOL, national staff training providers, and state and SDA management should review the lists of the top twenty training priorities identified by state directors, SDA directors, state staff, and SDA staff.

Management should take particular note of the fact that directors tend to emphasize JTPA-specific topics, whereas staff is more likely to give priority to general topics such as computer competency and written and oral communication. Directors may indeed be pinpointing overall organizational priorities. However, it may also be that improving staff competence in certain general skills (including analytic, communication, and organizational skills) would contribute substantially to overall organizational functioning.

Managers in specific units, or directors of organizations that are having either performance or turnover problems in specific areas, may also find it useful to review the top-twenty lists developed for specific types of staff, such as fiscal, client service, or clerical staff.

Make More Training Available Locally and at Lower Costs

Cost considerations and coverage problems are the biggest obstacles to more widespread participation in training, although concerns about the quality of many available offerings are also a substantial factor. Both the surveys and the case studies indicate a significant need for more locally available, lower-cost training, and for training that does not remove a person from his or her job for too long a stretch. This would help make more training available below the top managerial layers, and would also increase access to training for service providers. It would also help increase participation by the lowest-funded organizations, for which cost considerations tend to be overwhelming.

We asked a number of organizations about their reaction to video-based training. Responses were not entirely enthusiastic, but the main concern appeared to be that video should not replace conferences, which for many SDAs provide an important opportunity for information-sharing. Some respondents suggested that as a supplement to conference-based training -- in effect, a tool to help conference attenders extend their training to staff that had not been able to attend (or to new staff) -- quality video training could be valuable.

329

Increase Management Direction over Sponsored Staff Training

Survey respondents indicated that supervisors tend to initiate training for their staff (as opposed to staff asking approval for a particular course, which happens less frequently). But the surveys also revealed that there is little organization-wide planning of staff training.

Although we found some organizations that were moving to increase managerial direction of staff training, this still appears to be uncommon. Other managerial priorities and the lack of resources for training may make this difficult. Nevertheless, it would be beneficial to many organizations to manage their staff training more deliberately, especially since so much of their staff tends to have such long tenure.

Remain Open to Generalists and to Alternative Preparation Tracks

We have found little evidence through this study that argues for requiring a narrow range of educational backgrounds or experience in the effort to professionalize JTPA staff. Some types of positions do require specialized skills (for example, fiscal staff, staff that works heavily with computers, and many client service specialists), but managers who commented at greatest length on these positions generally emphasized leaving a variety of avenues open for obtaining the necessary qualifications.

Assist States Interested in Hiring Experienced SDA Staff

It can benefit both a state and its SDAs for the state agency to include staff with substantial SDA experience. At present, however, state civil service procedures often inhibit hiring such staff into a mid- or high-level position. It may be worthwhile for DOL to help states prepare justifications for such hires, when opportunities occur.

Investigate Service Providers' Training Needs More Thoroughly

DOL should sponsor a more systematic investigation of the staff training needs of contractual JTPA service providers. Although our surveys indicate that SDA administrative entity staff provide much direct client service, the contractual providers are major partners in this process. The evidence in this study suggests that they are often unaware of and unable to participate in training that could help their staff do a better job of serving JTPA participants. However, it would be useful to undertake a more detailed assessment of the barriers they face, and of possible approaches to overcoming those barriers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Chetkovich, Carol, Linda Toms-Barker, and Laura Schlichtmann. Evaluation of Services Provided for Individuals with Specific Learning Disabilities: Final Report to the U.S. Department Education, Rehabilitation Services Administration. Oakland: Berkeley Planning Associates, 1989.

CSR, Inc. Practical Guidance for Strengthening Private Industry Councils. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, 1990.

Employment Policies: Looking to the Year 2000. Washington, D.C.: National Alliance of Business, 1986.

Estimates of School Statistics, 1989-90. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1990.

Johnston, William B., and Arnold E. Packer. Workforce 2000: Work and Workers for the Twenty-first Century. Indianapolis: Hudson Institute, 1987.

Kogan, Deborah, Katherine Dickinson, Barbara Means, and Marlene Strong. Improving the Quality of Training under JTPA: Final Report· to the U.S. Department of Labor. Oakland: Berkeley Planning Associates, 1989.

Matkin, Ralph Erle. The Roles and Functions of Rehabilitation Specialists in the Private Sector. Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, Rh.D. 1982.

Maza, Penelope L., and Karin E. Malm. CWLA Salary Study 1987, with Projections for 1988 and 1989. Washington, D.C.: Child Welfare League of America, 1987.

Pelavin, Diane, and Jon Cohen. 1989 National Survey of Personnel Shortages and Training Needs in Vocational Rehabilitation: Final Report to the U.S. Department of Education, Rehabilitation Services Administration. Washington, D.C.: Pelavin Associates, Inc., 1989.

Stein, Sheryl E. Teacher Education Policy in the States: A 50-State Survey of Legislative and Administrative Actions. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1990.

APPENDIX A

COPIES OF SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES

U.S. Department of Labor

January 2, 1990

To: State JTPA Director

From: PATRICIA W. McNEIL
Administrator
Office of Strategic Planning
and Policy Development

The people who administer and deliver JTPA services at the state and local levels are critical to the success of this program, to our nation's competitiveness, and to the well-being of those who look to JTPA for training and employment assistance. Yet in this highly decentralized system, little is known at the national level about the educational background and experience of state and local JTPA staff.

We do know that in order to meet the challenges ahead, the JTPA system must ensure the continued high quality of its staff capacity. In large part, this means offering well-targeted staff training that enhances JTPA staffers' skills and maximizes the system's flexibility to respond to shifting conditions and requirements. It also means fostering information-sharing among organizations throughout the system on common staffing concerns and how managers can confront them most successfully.

To help meet these needs, the U.S. Department of Labor has contracted with Berkeley Planning Associates to conduct a study of staff structures, recruitment and hiring, staff backgrounds, staff turnover, and the needs for staff training and technical assistance at the state and local levels within the JTPA system.

The attached survey is one of the key elements of this study. It is being distributed to the director of every state JTPA program, with a similar survey being sent to the directors of 25% of the nation's SDAs.

I want to emphasize several points about this survey:

1. **It is your opportunity to set priorities for the training and technical assistance made available to your staff with federal as well as state funding.**

2. **Its findings will offer you the chance to compare your organization with the average for others that are similar in size, urban/rural location, or other characteristics.**

3. **Most of the questions call for check-off or short fill-in responses. However, the survey also provides space to write in any comments you may wish to offer on staffing issues.**

4. **The researchers will keep all responses confidential, and will use them exclusively to develop summary statistics.**

If you have any questions about this survey, please contact BPA's project director, Laura Schlichtmann, at (415) 465-7884, or ETA's project officer, Greg Knorr, at (202) 535-0682. Thank you for your participation.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. <u>All answers</u> on this questionnaire will be kept <u>confidential</u>, and will be used <u>only</u> to develop aggregate descriptive profiles of current JTPA staff backgrounds and training needs.

2. A number of the questions on this survey call for information on allocations, numbers of staff positions, and similar budgetary and personnel data. Therefore, we recommend having a member of the staff who can most quickly provide this type of information go through the survey first, and then return it to the director or deputy director for completion.

   <u>Questions that should be reserved for the director</u> (or deputy director) are marked with a <u>"D" in the left margin</u>. A "**(D)**" in the left margin indicates a question that might be answered by another staff member, but which the director should at least review.

3. <u>Definitions</u>: As used in this questionnaire,

   (a) "<u>state agency</u>" refers to a department (typically with "Employment," "Labor," or "Commerce" in its title) that in addition to administering state-level JTPA operations may also contain divisions responsible for such programs as the Job Service, Unemployment Insurance, apprenticeship standards, or related programs; and

   (b) "<u>state JTPA unit</u>" refers to the organizational unit most directly concerned with administering the state's JTPA program. In many cases, this unit is a subunit of the state agency as defined above. Also in many cases, a portion of the state agency's JTPA-funded staff positions are located <u>outside</u> the JTPA unit, in units providing legal, fiscal, audit, and related specialized support.

4. **Please attach a copy of your state JTPA unit's current detailed organization chart to this questionnaire before returning the survey.**

5. We estimate that it will take an average of 90 minutes to complete this survey. If you have any comments regarding this estimate, or any other aspect of the survey, including suggestions for reducing the time needed to respond, send them to the Office of Information Management, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N-1301, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (1205-0291), Washington, D.C. 20503.

PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE BY JANUARY 22, 1990.

ID Code [|]

JTPA STAFFING AND STAFF TRAINING
AT THE STATE AND SDA LEVELS:
STATE JTPA DIRECTOR SURVEY

A. BACKGROUND

A1.   Number of SDAs: In PY89 _____   In PY88 _____

A2.   Major non-JTPA responsibilities of the state agency that contains the state JTPA unit [**Check all that apply**]:

    ___ None besides JTPA   ___ Adult education

    ___ Job Service   ___ K-12 education

    ___ State employment programs(s)   ___ WIN/welfare reform

    ___ Unemployment insurance   ___ Public assistance

    ___ Labor standards   ___ Economic development

    ___ OSHA/industrial safety   ___ Community development

    ___ Vocational rehabilitation   ___ Other [**specify**: _____

    ___ Apprenticeships   _____

    ___ Vocational education   _____]

A3.   Approximate size of state agency that contains state JTPA unit, in staff positions [**Check one**]:

    ___ 0 - 100   ___ 101 - 250   ___ 251 - 500

    ___ 501 - 1,000   ___ 1,001 - 5,000   ___ Above 5,000

A4.   Does the state JTPA agency administer any SDA programs?   ___ No ___ Yes

> **If yes, please note:** THE REMAINDER OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE APPLIES TO THE STATE-LEVEL JTPA PROGRAM ONLY

A5.   PLEASE ATTACH A COPY OF YOUR STATE JTPA UNIT'S CURRENT DETAILED ORGANIZA-
TIONAL CHART TO THIS SURVEY.

B. STAFF STRUCTURE

B1.   Is there a single staff for the SJTCC and the state unit responsible for administering JTPA?

___ Yes   ___ No

B1a. **If no:** What is the number of SJTCC staff positions? _____

(D) B2. What functions are performed or supported by staff of the state agency's JTPA unit vs. SJTCC staff vs. other staff (e.g., staff outside JTPA unit, consultants)?

[Mark "1" if a staff category performs all/most of a function, "2" if the staff performs some of this function. If the staff category has no role in the function, leave the space blank.]

	FUNCTION PERFORMED BY:		
Function	State JTPA unit staff	SJTCC staff	Other staff/ contractors
SJTCC logistical/administrative support	___	___	___
Developing the GCSSP	___	___	___
Target group policies	___	___	___
Designating SDAs/SDA reorganization	___	___	___
Approving SDA plans	___	___	___
Use/allocation of non-78% funds	___	___	___
Developing funding recapture policies	___	___	___
Performance standards policies and adjustment procedures	___	___	___
Planning and program development	___	___	___
Liaison with SDAs (including T.A.)	___	___	___
Public/elected officials liaison	___	___	___
Interagency coordination	___	___	___
Labor market info./research	___	___	___
MIS	___	___	___
Computer operations	___	___	___
Evaluation	___	___	___
Personnel/labor relations	___	___	___
Staff training	___	___	___
Budgeting	___	___	___
Accounting	___	___	___
Contract monitoring	___	___	___
Auditing	___	___	___
Audit resolutions	___	___	___
Other fiscal services	___	___	___
Legal support	___	___	___

B3. JTPA-funded staffing levels in full-time equivalents (FTEs):

	PY89	PY88
Within the state JTPA unit	_____	_____
Elsewhere within the state agency that contains the JTPA unit (e.g., legal office, budget office, audit unit, training unit)	_____	_____

B4. For each of the following sources of JTPA funds, please list the funding levels for staff within the state JTPA unit:

	PY89	PY88
Title IIA 5%	$	$
Title IIA 6%	$	$
Other Title IIA	$	$
Title IIB	$	$
Title III	$	$
Title IV	$	$
Other [specify:_____	$	$
_____	$	$
_____]	$	$

B5. JTPA funding for state JTPA agency staff outside the JTPA unit (e.g., legal office, budget office, audit unit, training unit)

	PY89	PY88
Title IIA 5%	$	$
Title IIA 6%	$	$
Other Title IIA	$	$
Title IIB	$	$
Title III	$	$
Title IV	$	$

B6. Has the number of staff positions funded by Title IIA funds increased or decreased since July 1987 (beginning of PY87)?

___ Increased   ___ Decreased   ___ Remained about the same

B7. Are your staff positions included in a civil service system?   ___ Yes   ___ No

    B7a. **If no**: Have you established a written set of personnel policies?   ___ Yes   ___ No

B8. Are members of your staff represented by employee collec tive bargaining organizations?

___ Yes   ___ No

    B8a. **If yes**: About what percentage are covered by collective bargaining agreements? _____

(D)   B9. About what percentage of the JTPA unit's staff worked for the CETA program (in this organization or elsewhere)?

___ Less than 25%   ___ 25%-49%   ___ 50%-74%   ___ 75% or more

B10. Which of the following benefits do most staff in the JTPA unit receive?   **[Check all that apply]**

___ Paid vacation   ___ Paid sick leave   ___ Retirement plan

___ Employer-paid health insurance   ___ Employer-paid dental insurance

___ Other [**specify:**_____]

B11. Please check off the annual salary range for each of the following generic job titles, and indicate what title the job carries in your state.

If the salary range for a state position overlaps two of the salary categories shown here (e.g., the state position ranges from $23,000 to $28,000, overlapping the second and third categories below), mark the category corresponding to the incumbent's current actual salary. In case of a vacancy, mark the category corresponding to the middle of the position's pay range.

If your state does not have the exact position, indicate the range for the closest position or check N/A for "not applicable."

	Under $15,000	$15,000-$24,999	$25,000-$34,999	$35,000-$44,999	$45,000 or more	N/A
State JTPA Director:	___	___	___	___	___	___
State title: _____						
Chief Planner:	___	___	___	___	___	___
State title: _____						
· **Head of Grant Administration:**	___	___	___	___	___	___
State title: _____						
Field Representative/SDA Monitor/SDA Liaison:	___	___	___	___	___	___
State title: _____						
MIS Manager:	___	___	___	___	___	___
State title: _____						
Performance Policy Manager:	___	___	___	___	___	___
State title: _____						
Business/Fiscal Manager	___	___	___	___	___	___
State title: _____						

C. RECRUITMENT/HIRING/TURNOVER

D   C1. Overall, how much difficulty would you say you have recruiting JTPA staff? **[Circle one number]**

None   Some   A great deal

1 - - - - - - - - - -2 - - - - - - - - - - - - -3 - - - - - - - - - - - 4- - - - - - - - - - - - - -5

(D)   C2. Are there any staff units or job titles for which recruitment is an especially serious problem?

___ Yes [**specify:** _____ _____

_____ . _____]

___ No, recruitment is not difficult or difficulty is about the same for all positions.

(D)   C3. Check off below the **three** most common reasons for any recruitment difficulties, and indicate next
to the checked categories the staff unit(s) or job title(s) for which each is most relevant (if any).

Staff unit(s) or job
title(s) for which this .
reason is most relevant:

___ Salary too low	__ _____
___ Poor benefits	__ _____
___ Skills rare in labor market area	__ _____
___ Skills in great demand in labor market area	__ _____
___ Job tenure too unsure	__ _____
___ Perceived lack of promotional opportunities	__ _____
___ Working conditions (e.g, frequent overtime, travel required)	__ _____
___ Civil service hiring procedures	__ _____
___ Other [**specify:**_____	__ _____
_____]	

D   C4. Do you feel that you have a sufficient number of staff to run an effective program?
___ Yes ___ No

D   C5. If you could add any three new staff positions tomorrow, what would they be, and what functions
would they perform?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

C6. How many Title IIA employees were promoted within your organization in PY88? (As used here, "promoted" means advanced to a higher position or staff classification; it does **not** include periodic "step increases" within a given position, nor lateral transfers into equivalent staff classifications.) _____

C7. How many Title IIA employees left the organization in PY88? _____

C8. How many Titles IIA and III positions are currently vacant in the following categories?

Management/administration: _____   Junior professional: _____
Senior professional: _____   Support/clerical: _____

D C9. How serious a problem is staff turnover for your organization? **[Circle one number]**

Not serious   Somewhat serious   Very serious

1 - - - - - - - - - -2 - - - - - - - - - - -3 - - - - - - - - - - -4 - - - - - - - - - - - -5

(D) C10. Are there any staff units or job titles for which turnover is an especially serious problem?

___ Yes [**specify:** _____

_____]

___ No, turnover is not a problem or is equally serious throughout the staff

C11. Check off below the **five** most frequent reasons departing employees cite for leaving their jobs, and indicate next to the checked categories the staff unit(s) or job title(s) for which each is most relevant (if any).

Staff unit or job title for which
this reason is most relevant

___ Salary too low   _____

___ Poor benefits   _____

___ Location not convenient   _____

___ Staff reduction due to declining funds   _____

___ Burnout   _____

___ Fired for cause   _____

___ Retired   _____

___ Personal/family reasons   _____

___ Internal promotions   _____

___ Perceived lack of internal promotional opportunities _____

___ Staffer sought greater job security   _____

___ Staffer sought greater job responsibility   _____

___ Other [**specify:** _____   _____

_____]

D. STAFF DEVELOPMENT

D1. Does the state agency have an annual budget for staff training and development for its JTPA staff?

___ Yes   ___ No   ___ Varies from year to year

D1a. **If yes in PY89**: What is the budget for PY89?

Training: $_____

Training-related travel: $_____

D1b. **If yes in PY89**: From what funding source? **[Check one]**

___ JTPA IIA 6%   ___ JTPA IIA 5%   ___ JTPA other

___ Non-JTPA funds **[specify:** _____ **]**

___ Combination of funding sources **[specify:** _____

_____ **]**

(D)   D2. Does your organization prepare individual staff training/development plans for <u>new employees</u>?
         ___ Yes   ___ No

D2a. For <u>newly promoted employees</u>?
         ___ Yes   ___ No

D2b. For <u>current employees</u> on a regular basis?
         ___ Yes   ___ No

D3. What kinds of training does the state offer on a continuing basis (when funds are available)?
[Check all that apply]

___ Professional association conferences

___ JTPA-specific conferences (e.g., NAB)

___ Training sessions under 1 day in length

___ 1-2 day training sessions

___ 3-5 day training sessions

___ In-service training (in-house staff development activities during regular working hours)

___ Courses at community colleges, colleges/ universities, or proprietary schools

___ University extension courses

___ Other **[specify:** _____ **]**

___ NA -- this state has never paid for training

-8-

D4. How is the staff time covered when staff attend training? [Check **all that apply**]

___ Release time policy   ___ Staff use vacation time

___ Flexible staff scheduling
      accommodates courses

___ Staff take time off without pay

___ Other [specify: _____]

___ Training occurs/courses are
      scheduled outside regular work hours

___ NA -- this state has never sent staff to training

(D) D5. In your state, who would you say **initiates most** of the staff training that occurs in the JTPA system?

      ___ State (including state-funded training institute)

      ___ SDAs

      ___ Service providers

(D) D6. · In your agency, who would you say initiates most of the staff training that occurs?

      ___ Supervisor   ___ Supervised staff

(D) D7. Does your state offer regular training courses/sessions for SDAs?   ___ Yes   ___ No

D7a. For contractual service providers?   ___ Yes   ___ No

D D8. Have there been training opportunities that you or your staff wanted to take advantage of, but could not?
      ___ Yes   ___ No

      D8a. **If yes:** What were the primary impediments to attending training? [Check off **up to 5**]

___ Insufficient administrative funds to
      pay for training or staff time

___ Timing of training (month or days
      of week a problem)

___ Travel costs too high

___ Training location not easily accessible

___ Restrictions on out-of-state travel

___ Subjects offered not exactly what needed

___ Coverage of staff responsibilities
      a problem

___ Level of training too simple

___ Level of training too complex

___ Duration too long

___ Not convinced of quality of training offered

___ Duration too short

___ Other [specify: _____]

D   D9.   On the following chart, please check off **up to 20** training topics that you believe would be most
beneficial to the performance of <u>each</u> of the following groups:

- State JTPA staff;

- SDA staff; and

- Staff of JTPA contractual service providers.

[Check <u>up to 20</u> <u>per column</u>; and please scan all 3 pages before starting]

	State JTPA Staff	SDA Staff	JTPA Service Providers
JTPA -- Structure and Principles			
Orientation to JTPA and related programs	____	____	____
EDWAA	____	____	____
Performance standards: practical applications	____	____	____
Other: _____	____	____	____
Policy and Administration			
Providing effective support for the SJTCC	____	____	____
Providing effective support for the PIC	____	____	____
Goal-setting at the state and local levels	____	____	____
Planning and program development	____	____	____
Developing the GCSSP	____	____	____
Target group policies	____	____	____
Developing service programs to meet client needs	____	____	____
Establishing Youth Employment Competencies	____	____	____
Developing strategies to meet performance standards	____	____	____
Effective use of non-78% JTPA funds	____	____	____
Funding recapture policies	____	____	____
Effective SDA liaison and monitoring	____	____	____
Developing successful T.A. programs	____	____	____
Evaluating proposals	____	____	____
Effective monitoring of programs and contractors	____	____	____
Cutback management	____	____	____
Other: _____	____	____	____
Fiscal/Contracts			
JTPA fiscal regulations and reporting procedures	____	____	____
Securing diversified funding/effective grantsmanship	____	____	____
Income-generating activities under JTPA	____	____	____
Preparing successful funding/program proposals	____	____	____
Preparing effective RFPs	____	____	____
Cost allocation under JTPA	____	____	____
Effective budget management	____	____	____
Negotiating successful contracts	____	____	____
Developing performance-based contracts for different programs/populations	____	____	____
Auditing within the JTPA system	____	____	____
Other: _____	____	____	____
MIS/Computers/Statistics/Research/Evaluation			
Establishing/updating the MIS	____	____	____
Selecting computer hardware	____	____	____
Selecting software for program management	____	____	____

	State JTPA Staff	SDA Staff	JTPA Service Providers
Selecting educational software	____	____	____
Developing and using labor market information	____	____	____
Conducting post-program follow-up	____	____	____
Analyzing and reporting statistical information	____	____	____
Methods of program evaluation	____	____	____
Other: _____	____	____	____

Partnerships/Community Relations

	State JTPA Staff	SDA Staff	JTPA Service Providers
Determining training needs in the employer community	____	____	____
Marketing job training services to employers	____	____	____
Marketing techniques (ads, video, phone, etc.)	____	____	____
Effective liaison with elected officials	____	____	____
Effective public/community relations	____	____	____
Securing private sector involvement in JTPA	____	____	____
Building partnerships with other agencies/programs	____	____	____
Cross-training about related programs (K-12, AFDC, etc.)	____	____	____
Other: _____	____	____	____

Client Services

Understanding/identifying the needs of:

	State JTPA Staff	SDA Staff	JTPA Service Providers
Displaced homemakers	____	____	____
Displaced workers	____	____	____
Dropouts/potential dropouts	____	____	____
Ex-offenders	____	____	____
Handicapped persons	____	____	____
Homeless persons	____	____	____
Minorities	____	____	____
Pregnant/parent teenagers	____	____	____
Refugees/immigrants	____	____	____
Rural workers/jobseekers	____	____	____
Youth	____	____	____
Welfare recipients/applicants	____	____	____
Effective outreach and recruitment	____	____	____
Eligibility verification procedures	____	____	____
Interpreting (bilingual/ASL)	____	____	____
Motivating participants	____	____	____
Getting clients to believe in themselves	____	____	____
Working with hostile/resistant clients	____	____	____
Assessment systems and techniques	____	____	____
Functional and vocational testing	____	____	____
Vocational counseling -- individual and group	____	____	____
Personal/life skills counseling	____	____	____

	State JTPA Staff	SDA Staff	JTPA Service Providers
Helping clients set personal goals	——	——	——
Helping clients solve their own problems	——	——	——
Crisis intervention	——	——	——
Determining supportive service needs	——	——	——
Developing EDPs	——	——	——
Accessing client support services	——	——	——
Developing/selecting vocational curricula	——	——	——
Developing/selecting basic/remedial skills programs	——	——	——
Effective teaching techniques	——	——	——
Competency-based instruction	——	——	——
Computer-assisted instruction	——	——	——
Work maturity preparation	——	——	——
Dislocated worker program approaches	——	——	——
Designing job clubs/job search workshops	——	——	——
Supervising individual job search	——	——	——
Helping clients manage their own job search	——	——	——
Preparing clients for job interviews	——	——	——
Job development techniques	——	——	——
Developing OJT slots/contracts	——	——	——
Effective use of work experience activities	——	——	——
Entrepreneurship development	——	——	——
Other: _____	——	——	——

General Managerial and Professional Skills

	State JTPA Staff	SDA Staff	JTPA Service Providers
Establishing personnel procedures	——	——	——
Developing staff competencies	——	——	——
Supervisory skills/motivating staff	——	——	——
Staff performance appraisals	——	——	——
Managing conflict	——	——	——
Analytical skills and methods	——	——	——
Problem-solving strategies	——	——	——
Writing	——	——	——
Computer competency	——	——	——
Oral presentation skills	——	——	——
Effective meetings/facilitation skills	——	——	——
Dealing with the public	——	——	——
Time management	——	——	——
Stress management/preventing burnout	——	——	——
Dealing with other people's stress	——	——	——
Other: _____	——	——	——

D D10. Are there any other issues concerning staffing or staff training that you would like to comment on?

*** THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION ***

Please attach a copy of your current organization chart to this survey, enclose the survey in the accompanying return envelope, and mail it by January 22, 1990.

U.S. Department of Labor   Employment and Training Administration
200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20210

January 2, 1990

To: SDA Director

From: PATRICIA W. McNEIL
        Administrator
        Office of Strategic Planning
        and Policy Development

The people who administer and deliver JTPA services at the state and local levels are critical to the success of this program, to our nation's competitiveness, and to the well-being of those who look to JTPA for training and employment assistance. Yet in this highly decentralized system, little is known at the national level about the educational background and experience of state and local JTPA staff.

We do know that in order to meet the challenges ahead, the JTPA system must ensure the continued high quality of its staff capacity. In large part, this means offering well-targeted staff training that enhances JTPA staffers' skills and maximizes the system's flexibility to respond to shifting conditions and requirements. It also means fostering information-sharing among organizations throughout the system on common staffing concerns and how managers can confront them most successfully.

To help meet these needs, the U.S. Department of Labor has contracted with Berkeley Planning Associates to conduct a study of staff structures, recruitment and hiring, staff backgrounds, staff turnover, and the needs for staff training and technical assistance at the state and local levels within the JTPA system.

The attached survey is one of the key elements of this study. It is being distributed to the directors of 25% of the nation's SDAs, with a similar survey being sent to the director of every state JTPA program.

I want to emphasize several points about this survey:

1. **It is your opportunity to set priorities for the training and technical assistance made available to your staff with federal and state funding.**

2. **Its findings will offer you the chance to compare your organization with the average for others that are similar in size, urban/rural location, or other characteristics.**

3. **Most of the questions call for check-off or short fill-in responses. However, the survey also provides space to write in any comments you may wish to offer on staffing issues.**

4. **The researchers will keep all responses confidential, and will use them exclusively to develop summary statistics.**

If you have any questions about this survey, please contact BPA's project director, Laura Schlichtmann, at (415) 465-7884, or ETA's project officer, Greg Knorr, at (202) 535-0682. Thank you for your participation.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. All answers on this questionnaire will be kept confidential, and will be used only to develop aggregate descriptive profiles of current JTPA staff backgrounds and training needs.

2. A number of the questions on this survey call for information on allocations, numbers of staff positions, and similar budgetary and personnel data. Therefore, we recommend having a member of the staff who can most quickly provide this type of information go through the survey first, and then return it to the director or deputy director for completion.

   Questions that should be reserved for the director (or deputy director) are marked with a "D" in the left margin. A "(D)" in the left margin indicates a question that might be answered by another staff member, but which the director should at least review.

3. **Please attach a copy of your organization's current detailed organization chart to this questionnaire before returning the survey.**

4. We estimate that it will take an average of 90 minutes to complete this survey. If you have any comments regarding this estimate, or any other aspect of the survey, including suggestions for reducing the time needed to respond, send them to the Office of Information Management, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N-1301, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (1205-0291), Washington, D.C. 20503.

PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE BY JANUARY 22, 1990.

ID Code

JTPA STAFFING AND STAFF TRAINING
AT THE STATE AND SDA LEVELS:
<u>SDA DIRECTOR SURVEY</u>

A. BACKGROUND

A1.   PY<u>88</u> Title IIA (78% and 6%) allocation: $_____

A2.   Other JTPA funds in PY<u>88:</u>

   Other IIA (e.g., 3%) $_____

   IIB $_____

   III $_____

   IV $_____

A3.   Title IIA (78% and 6%) dollars spent on outside contracting in PY<u>88</u>: $_____

A4.   Number of outside service providers in PY<u>88</u>: _____

A5.   Is this a multijurisdictional SDA?

   ___ Yes [Specify # of jurisdictions: ____]   ___ No

A6.   What type of organization is the Administrative Entity?

   ___ PIC ___ Government ___ CBO ___ Other [specify:_____]

A7.   Was this SDA a Prime Sponsor under CETA? ___ Yes   ___ No

A8.   PLEASE ATTACH A COPY OF YOUR ORGANIZATION'S CURRENT DETAILED ORGANIZATIONAL CHART TO THIS SURVEY.

B. STAFF STRUCTURE

B1. Is there a single staff for the Administrative Entity (AE) and the PIC?

   ___ Yes ___ No

   B1a. **If no:** What is the number of separate PIC staff positions? _____

(D) B2. What functions are performed by Administrative Entity staff vs. PIC staff vs. other agencies or outside vendors (e.g., service providers, consultants)?

[Mark "1" if a staff category performs all/most of a function, "2" if the staff performs some of this function. If the staff category has no role in the function, leave the space blank.]

FUNCTION PERFORMED BY:

Function	Administrative Entity staff*	Separate PIC staff	Outside vendors or other public agency
Program development	_____	_____	_____
Program management	_____	_____	_____
Public/private sector involvement	_____	_____	_____
Employer relations	_____	_____	_____
Developing RFPs and contracts	_____	_____	_____
Contract monitoring	_____	_____	_____
Budgeting	_____	_____	_____
Accounting	_____	_____	_____
Auditing	_____	_____	_____
Misc. fiscal/procurement	_____	_____	_____
Management information system (MIS)	_____	_____	_____
Computer operations	_____	_____	_____
Research/statistics (incl. LMI)/evaluation	_____	_____	_____
Personnel/labor relations	_____	_____	_____
Staff training	_____	_____	_____
Legal support	_____	_____	_____
Outreach, recruitment, and intake	_____	_____	_____
Assessment and counseling	_____	_____	_____
Job development/placement (incl. job search)	_____	_____	_____
On-the-job training (incl. work experience)	_____	_____	_____
Classroom training/education	_____	_____	_____

Includes staff serving a PIC that is designated as the SDA's Administrative Entity.

B3. Staff supported by JTPA <u>administrative</u> funding **[exclude temporary Title IIB positions]**

	Dollars		PY89 Staff Positions in Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs)
	PY89	PY88	
Within the Administrative Entity	$	?	
On separate PIC staff (if any)	$	$	
Outside AE/PIC staff (e.g., city finance department, county personnel department)	$	$	

B4. Staff supported by JTPA <u>service</u> funding **[exclude temporary Title IIB positions]**

	Dollars		PY89 Staff Positions in Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs)
	PY89	PY88	
Within the Administrative Entity	$	$	
On separate PIC staff (if any)	$	$	

B5. Is the Administrative Entity responsible for programs besides JTPA? ___ Yes ___ No

B5a. **If yes:** Please specify other programs: _____

_____

B6. Total staffing levels within the Administrative Entity

	<u>Positions, in full-time equivalents (FTEs)</u>	
	PY89	PY88
· All JTPA staff <u>except</u> in temporary Title IIB positions **[Should equal the total of AE FTEs in B3 and B4]**		
Temporary Title IIB staff		
Non-JTPA staff		

┌───┐
│ **NOTE:** ALL REMAINING QUESTIONS IN SECTIONS B AND │
│ C APPLY TO JTPA STAFF WITHIN THE │
│ ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY ONLY. │
└───┘

B7. Excluding temporary Title IIB staff, has the number of staff positions increased or decreased since July 1987 (beginning of PY87)?

___ Increased ___ Decreased ___ Remained about the same

B8. Are your staff positions included in a civil service system?

___ Yes ___ No

B7a. **If no:** Have you established a written set of personnel policies? ___ Yes ___ No

B9. Are members of your staff represented by employee collective bargaining organizations?

___ Yes ___ No

- 3 -

B9a. **If yes:** About what percentage are covered by collective bargaining agreements? _____

(D) B10. About what percentage of your current staff worked for the CETA program (in this organization or elsewhere)?

___ Less than 25%   ___ 25%-49%   ___ 50%-74%   ___ 75% or more

B11. Which of the following benefits do most staff receive? **[Check all that apply]**

___ Paid vacation   ___ Paid sick leave   ___ Retirement plan

___ Employer-paid health insurance   ___ Employer-paid dental insurance

___ Other **[specify:** _____]

B12. Please check off the annual salary range for each of the following generic job titles, and indicate what title the job carries in your SDA.

If the salary range for an SDA position overlaps two of the salary categories shown here (e.g., the SDA position ranges from $23,000 to $28,000, overlapping the second and third categories below), mark the category corresponding to the incumbent's current actual salary. In case of a vacancy, mark the category corresponding to the middle of the position's pay range.

If your SDA does not have the exact position, indicate the range for the closest position or check N/A for "not applicable."

	Under $15,000	$15,000- $24,999	$25,000- $34,999	$35,000- $44,999	$45,000 or more	N/A
SDA Director:	___	___	___	___	___	___
SDA title: _____						
Chief Planner:	___	___	___	___	___	___
SDA title: _____						
Fiscal Manager:	___	___	___	___	___	___
SDA title: _____						
MIS Manager:	___	___	___	___	___	___
SDA title: _____						

B12. (continued]

	Under $15,000	$15,000-$24,999	$25,000-$34,999	$35,000-$44,999	$45,000 or more	N/A
Director of OJT/ CRT Services:	___	___	___	___	___	___

SDA title: _____

Job Developer:	___	___	___	___	___	___

SDA title: _____

Intake Worker:	___	___	___	___	___	___

SDA title: _____

Vocational Counselor:	___	___	___	___	___	___

SDA title: _____

C. RECRUITMENT/HIRING/TURNOVER

D C1. Overall, how much difficulty would you say you have recruiting staff? **[Circle one number]**

None   Some   A great deal

1- - - - - - - - - -2 - - - - - - - - - - - - -3- - - - - - - - - - -4- - - - - - - - - - - - - -5

(D) C2. Are there any staff units or job titles for which recruitment is an especially serious problem?

___ Yes [**specify:** _____

_____]

___ No, recruitment is not difficult or difficulty is about the same for all positions

- 5 -

(D) C3. Check off below the **three** most common reasons for any recruitment difficulties, and specify the staff unit(s) or job title(s) for which each is most relevant (if any).

Staff unit(s) or job
title(s) for which this
reason is most relevant:

___ Salary too low

___ Poor benefits

___ Skills rare in labor market area

___ Skills in great demand in labor market area

___ Job tenure too unsure

___ Perceived lack of promotional opportunities

___ Working conditions (e.g., frequent overtime, travel required)

___ Civil service hiring procedures

___ Other [specify:_____

_____]

D C4. Do you feel that you have a sufficient number of staff to run an effective program?

___ Yes ___ No

D C5. If you could add any three new JTPA staff positions tomorrow, what would they be?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

C6. How many JTPA employees were promoted within your organization in PY88? (As used here, "promoted" means advanced to a higher position or staff classification; it does **not** include periodic "step increases" within a given position, nor lateral transfers into equivalent classifications.) ____

C7. How many JTPA employees left the organization in PY88? ____

C8. How many JTPA positions are currently vacant in the following categories?

Management/administration:____   Junior professional: ____

Senior professional: ____   Support/clerical: ____

-6-

D   C9. How serious a problem is staff turnover for your organization? **[Circle one number]**

Not serious   Somewhat serious   Very serious

1- - - - - - - - - - -2 - - - - - - - - - - - - -3- - - - - - - - - - - -4- - - - - - - - - - - - - 5

(D)   C10. Are there any staff units or job titles for which turnover is an especially serious problem?

___ Yes [**specify:** _____

_____]

___ No, turnover is not a problem or is equally serious throughout the staff

(D)   C11. Check off below the **five** most frequent reasons departing employees cite for leaving their jobs, and indicate next to the checked categories the staff unit(s) or job title(s) for which each is most relevant (if any).

Staff unit or job title for
which this reason is most relevant:

___ Salary too low	_____
___ Poor benefits	_____
___ Location not convenient	_____
___ Staff reduction due to declining funds	_____
___ Burnout	_____
___ Fired for cause	_____
___ Retired	_____
___ Personal/family reasons	_____
___ Internal promotions	_____
___ Perceived lack of internal promotional opportunities	_____
___ Staffer sought greater job security	_____
___ Staffer sought greater job responsibility	_____
___ Other [**specify**: _____	_____
_____]	_____

D. STAFF DEVELOPMENT

D1. Does your organization have an annual budget for staff training and development?

___ Yes   ___ No   ___ Varies from year to year

D1a. **If yes in PY89:** What is the budget for PY89?

Training: $_____

Training-related travel: $_____

D1b. **If yes in PY89:** From what funding source? **[Check one]**

___ JTPA IIA

___ JTPA other

___ Non-JTPA funds [**specify:** _____]

___ Combination of funding sources [**specify:**_____

_____]

(D)   D2. Does your organization prepare individual staff training/development plans for new employees?

___ Yes ___ No

D2a. For newly promoted employees?   ___ Yes   ___ No

D2b. For current employees on a regular basis?   ___ Yes   ___ No

D3. What kinds of training does the SDA offer on a continuing basis (when funds are available)?
[Check all that apply]

___ Professional association conferences

___ JTPA-specific conferences (e.g., NAB)

___ Training sessions under 1 day in length

___ 1-2 day training sessions

___ 3-5 day training sessions

___ In-service training (in-house staff
development activities during
regular working hours)

___ Courses at community colleges, colleges/
universities, or proprietary schools

___ University extension courses

___ Other [**specify:**_____

_____]

___ NA – this SDA has never paid for training

D4. How is the staff time covered when staff attend training? **[Check all that apply]**

___ Release time policy

___ Flexible staff scheduling accommodates
courses

___ Training occurs/courses are scheduled
outside regular work hours

___ Staff use vacation time

___ Staff take time off without pay

___ Other [**specify:** _____

_____]

___ NA -- this SDA has never sent staff to training

- 8 -

(D) D5. In your state, who would you say **initiates most** of the staff training that occurs in the JTPA system?

___ State (including state-funded training institute)

___ SDAs

___ Service providers

(D) D6. In your SDA, who would you say initiates most of the staff training that occurs?

___ Supervisors

___ Supervised staff

___ Service providers

(D) D7. Does your state offer regular training courses/sessions for SDAs?   ___ Yes   ___ No

D7a. For contractual service providers?   ___ Yes   ___ No

(D) D8. Has your SDA offered training courses/sessions for contractual service providers?

___ Yes   ___ No

D D9. Have there been training opportunities that you or your staff wanted to take advantage of, but could not?

___ Yes   ___ No

D9a. **If yes:** What were the primary impediments to attending training? [**Check off up to 5**]

___ Insufficient administrative funds to pay for training or staff time

___ Travel costs too high

___ Restrictions on out-of-state travel

___ Coverage of staff responsibilities a problem

___ Duration too long

___ Duration too short

___ Timing of training (month or days of week a problem)

___ Training location not easily accessible

___ Subjects offered not exactly what needed

___ Level of training too simple

___ Level of training too complex

___ Not convinced of quality of training offered

___ Other [**specify:** _____

_____]

- 9 -

D D10. On the following chart, please check off **up to 20** training topics that you believe would be most beneficial to the performance of **each** of the following groups:

- State JTPA staff;

- SDA staff; and

- Staff of JTPA contractual service providers.

[Check up to 20 per column; and please scan all 4 pages before starting]

	State JTPA Staff	SDA Staff	JTPA Service Providers
JTPA – Structure and Principles			
Orientation to JTPA and related programs	——	——	——
EDWAA	——	——	——
Performance standards: practical applications	——	——	——
Other: _____	——	——	——
Policy and Administration			
Providing effective support for the SJTCC	——	——	——
Providing effective support for the PIC	——	——	——
Goal-setting at the state and local levels	——	——	——
Planning and program development	——	——	——
Developing the GCSSP	——	——	——
Target group policies	——	——	——
Developing service programs to meet client needs	——	——	——
Establishing Youth Employment Competencies	——	——	——
Developing strategies to meet performance standards	——	——	——
Effective use of non-78% JTPA funds	——	——	——
Funding recapture policies	——	——	——
Effective SDA liaison and monitoring	——	——	——
Developing successful T.A. programs	——	——	——
Evaluating proposals	——	——	——
Effective monitoring of programs and contractors	——	——	——
Cutback management	——	——	——
Other: _____	——	——	——
Fiscal/Contracts			
JTPA fiscal regulations and reporting procedures	——	——	——
Securing diversified funding/effective grantsmanship	——	——	——
Income-generating activities under JTPA	——	——	——
Preparing successful funding/program proposals	——	——	——
Preparing effective RFPs	——	——	——
Cost allocation under JTPA	——	——	——
Effective budget management	——	——	——

	State JTPA Staff	SDA Staff	JTPA Service Providers
Negotiating successful contracts	____	____	____
Developing performance-based contracts for different programs/populations	____	____	____
Auditing within the JTPA system	____	____	____
Other: _____	____	____	____

MIS/Computers/Statistics/Research/Evaluation

	State JTPA Staff	SDA Staff	JTPA Service Providers
Establishing/updating the MIS	____	____	____
Selecting computer hardware	____	____	____
Selecting software for program management	____	____	____
Selecting educational software	____	____	____
Developing and using labor market information	____	____	____
Conducting post-program follow-up	____	____	____
Analyzing and reporting statistical information	____	____	____
Methods of program evaluation	____	____	____
Other: _____	____	____	____

Partnerships/Community Relations

	State JTPA Staff	SDA Staff	JTPA Service Providers
Determining training needs in the employer community	____	____	____
Marketing job training services to employers	____	____	____
Marketing techniques (ads, video, phone, etc.)	____	____	____
Effective liaison with elected officials	____	____	____
Effective public/community relations	____	____	____
Securing private sector involvement in JTPA	____	____	____
Building partnerships with other agencies/programs	____	____	____
Cross-training about related programs (K-12, AFDC, etc.)	____	____	____
Other: _____	____	____	____

Client Services

Understanding/identifying the needs of:

	State JTPA Staff	SDA Staff	JTPA Service Providers
Displaced homemakers	____	____	____
Displaced workers	____	____	____
Dropouts/potential dropouts	____	____	____
Ex-offenders	____	____	____
Handicapped persons	____	____	____
Homeless persons	____	____	____
Minorities	____	____	____
Pregnant/parent teenagers	____	____	____
Refugees/immigrants	____	____	____
Rural workers/jobseekers	____	____	____
Youth	____	____	____
Welfare recipients/applicants	____	____	____

	State JTPA Staff	SDA Staff	JTPA Service Providers
Effective outreach and recruitment	___	___	___
Eligibility verification procedures	___	___	___
Interpreting (bilingual/ASL)	___	___	___
Motivating participants	___	___	___
Getting clients to believe in themselves	___	___	___
Working with hostile/resistant clients	___	___	___
Assessment systems and techniques	___	___	___
Functional and vocational testing	___	___	___
Vocational counseling -- individual and group	___	___	___
Personal/life skills counseling	___	___	___
Helping clients set personal goals	___	___	___
Helping clients solve their own problems	___	___	___
Crisis intervention	___	___	___
Determining supportive service needs	___	___	___
Developing EDPs	___	___	___
Accessing client support services	___	___	___
Developing/selecting vocational curricula	___	___	___
Developing/selecting basic/remedial skills programs	___	___	___
Effective teaching techniques	___	___	___
Competency-based instruction	___	___	___
Computer-assisted instruction	___	___	___
Work maturity preparation	___	___	___
Dislocated worker program approaches	___	___	___
Designing job clubs/job search workshops	___	___	___
Supervising individual job search	___	___	___
Helping clients manage their own job search	___	___	___
Preparing clients for job interviews	___	___	___
Job development techniques	___	___	___
Developing OJT slots/contracts	___	___	___
Effective use of work experience activities	___	___	___
Entrepreneurship development	___	___	___
Other: _____	___	___	___

General Managerial And Professional Skills

	State JTPA Staff	SDA Staff	JTPA Service Providers
Establishing personnel procedures	___	___	___
Developing staff competencies	___	___	___
Supervisory skills/motivating staff	___	___	___
Staff performance appraisals	___	___	___
Managing conflict	___	___	___
Analytical skills and methods	___	___	___
Problem-solving strategies	___	___	___

	State JTPA Staff	SDA Staff	JTPA Service Providers
Writing	___	___	___
Computer competency	___	___	___
Oral presentation skills	___	___	___
Effective meetings/facilitation skills	___	___	___
Dealing with the public	___	___	___
Time management	___	___	___
Stress management/preventing burnout	___	___	___
Dealing with other people's stress	___	___	___
Other: _____	___	___	___

D   D11. Are there any other issues concerning staffing or staff training that you would like to comment on?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.

> **Please attach a copy of your current organization chart to this survey, enclose the survey in the accompanying return envelope, and mail it by January 22, 1990.**

U.S. Department of Labor

January 22, 1990

To: State JTPA Staff

From: PATRICIA W. McNEIL
Administrator
Office of Strategic Planning
and Policy Development

Patricia W. McNeil

The people who administer and deliver JTPA services at the state and local levels are critical to the success of this program, to our nation's competitiveness, and to the well-being of those who look to JTPA for training and employment assistance. Yet in this highly decentralized system, little is known at the national level about the educational background and experience of state and local JTPA staff.

We do know that in order to meet the challenges ahead, the JTPA system must ensure the continued high quality of its staff capacity. In large part, this means offering well-targeted staff training that enhances JTPA staffers' skills and maximizes the system's flexibility to respond to shifting conditions and requirements.

To help identify the most useful staff training as well as profile typical staffing patterns, the U.S. Department of Labor has contracted with Berkeley Planning Associates to conduct a study of staff structures, recruitment and hiring, staff backgrounds, staff turnover, and the needs for staff training and technical assistance at the state and local levels within the JTPA system.

The attached survey is one of the key elements of this study. It is being distributed to the staffs of 8 state JTPA programs, and a similar survey is being distributed to the staffs of 5% of the nation's SDAs.

I want to emphasize several points about this survey:

1. **It is your opportunity to influence the content and format of training and technical assistance made available to JTPA staff with federal and state funding.**

2. **Its findings will identify major training needs common to specific categories of JTPA staff, such as MIS specialists or monitors.**

3. **Most of the questions call for check-off or short fill-in responses. However, the survey also provides space to comment on the value of training you have received in the past, as well as space for additional comments.**

4. **The researchers will keep all responses confidential, and will use them exclusively to develop summary statistics.**

If you have any questions about this survey, please contact BPA's project director, Laura Schlichtmann, at (415) 465-7884, or ETA's project officer, Greg Knorr, at (202) 535-0682. Thank you for your participation.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. All answers on this questionnaire will be kept confidential, and will be used only to develop aggregate descriptive profiles of current JTPA staff backgrounds and training needs.

2. When you have completed the questionnaire, please seal it in the accompanying envelope and return it to the staff representative designated by your director as responsible for returning survey forms to BPA.

3. We estimate that it will take an average of 25 minutes to complete this survey. If you have any comments regarding this estimate, or any other aspect of the survey, including suggestions for reducing the time needed to respond, send them to the Office of Information Management, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N-1301, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (1205-0291), Washington, D.C. 20503.

ID Code [| | | | |]

JTPA STAFFING AND STAFF TRAINING
AT THE STATE AND SDA LEVELS:
SURVEY OF STATE JTPA STAFF

A. POSITION AND BACKGROUND

A1. Job title (e.g., Director):_____

A2. Personnel classification (e.g., Career Executive III):_____

_____

A3. Staff unit: _____

A4. How many hours are you scheduled to work per week?

___ 40 or more   ___ 30-39   ___ 20-29   ___ Less than 20

A5. How many hours are supported by JTPA Title II or Title III (EDWAA)?

___ 40 or more   ___ 30-39   ___ 20-29   ___ 10-19   ___ Less than 10

A6. What is your current annual salary? [If you work part-time, indicate your **actual** annual salary, not the full-time equivalent.]

___ Under $15,000   ___ $15,000 to $24,999   ___ $25,000 to $34,999

___ $35,000 to $44,999   ___ $45,000 or more

A7. Number of positions formally reporting to you, including those supervised by persons whom you supervise or who report to you [Enter 0 if none; include vacant positions]: _____

A8. Number of persons you directly supervise [Enter 0 if none; include vacant positions]: _____

A9. Types of staff you supervise [Check all that apply]

___ Not applicable

___ SJTCC support	___ MIS	___ Audit resolution
___ Policy/program development	___ SDA liaison	___ Other fiscal services
___ Public information	___ Contract monitoring	___ Personnel/labor relations
___ Elected official liaison	___ Budgeting	___ Staff training
___ Evaluation	___ Accounting	___ Legal support
___ LMI/statistics/research	___ Auditing	___ Clerical support

___ Other [specify: _____]

A10. How long have you been employed in your <u>current</u> position?

   ___ Less than 6 months   ___ 6-12 months   ___ 1-2 years

   ___ 3-4 years   ___ 5 or more years

A11. How long have you been employed in <u>any JTPA or CETA</u> position?

   ___ Less than 6 months   ___ 6-12 months   ___ 1-2 years

   ___ 3-4 years   ___ 5-9 years   ___ 10 or more years

A12. How long have you been employed in <u>any public sector or nonprofit job training</u> position, including JTPA, CETA, MDTA, ES, WIN, vocational education, or vocational rehabilitation?

   ___ Less than 6 months   ___ 6-12 months   ___ 1-2 years

   ___ 3-4 years   ___ 5-9 years   ___ 10 or more years

A13. What other JTPA/CETA/related positions have you held in the past (e.g., job developer, computer programmer, labor market analyst, budget analyst)?

A14. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

   ___ Did not finish high school

   ___ High school diploma/GED

   ___ Some college

   ___ Associate's degree [**specify major:** _____]

   ___ Bachelor's degree [**specify major:**_____]

   ___ Master's degree [**specify major:**_____]

   ___ Doctoral degree [**specify major:**_____]

   ___ Other [**specify:**_____]

A15. Are you currently enrolled in an additional degree program?

   ___ Yes [**specify degree and major:** _____]

   ___ No

A16. Do you belong to any professional associations?

_____ No

_____ Yes [**specify:**] _____

_____

A17. What is your age group? ___ 18-25 ___ 26-35 ___ 36-45 ___ 46-55 ___ 56 or older

A18. What is your sex? ___ Female ___ Male

A19. What is your ethnicity?

___ American Indian/Alaskan native   ___ Asian/Pacific Islander

___ Black, not of Hispanic origin   ___ Hispanic

___ White, not of Hispanic origin   ___ Other [**specify:** _____]

A20. Please check off the functions you regularly perform as part of your job. [**Check all that apply**]

SJTCC SUPPORT
___ Orienting SJTCC
___ Developing GCSSP, target group policies
___ Designating SDAs
___ SDA reorganizations
___ Approving SDA plans
___ Use and allocation of non-78% funds
___ Other [**specify:** _____]
SUPPORT FOR STATE POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION
___ Policy on funding recapture
___ Policy on performance-based contracting
___ Policy on SDA liaison, monitoring, T.A.
___ Policy on conducting post-program follow-up
___ Content and organization of MIS
___ Other [**specify:** _____]
SUPPORT FOR PERFORMANCE STANDARDS POLICY
___ Additional state standards
___ Procedures for adjusting SDA performance standards
___ 6% performance awards policy
___ Sanctions policy
___ Other [**specify:** _____]

MIS/COMPUTERS
___ Establishing and updating MIS
___ Compilation of JASR data
___ Manual filing systems
___ Computer hardware/software
___ Data entry
___ Other [**specify:** _____]
RESEARCH/STATISTICS/EVALUATION
___ Collecting labor market information
___ Analyzing and reporting statistical information
___ Program evaluation
___ Other [**specify:** _____]
FISCAL
___ Budgeting
___ Accounting
___ Auditing
___ Audit resolutions
___ Contract monitoring
___ Procurement
___ Other [**specify:** _____]

[continued]

- 3 -

A20. (continued)

STATE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

___ Goal-setting

___ Planning and program development

___ Field rep./SDA monitoring/liaison

___ Provision of T.A. to SDAs

___ Liaison with elected officials

___ Public information

___ Employer relations

___ Coordination with other agencies

___ Contract negotiation

___ Establishing personnel policies

___ Other [specify: _____]

PERSONNEL/LABOR RELATIONS

___ Personnel

___ Labor relations

___ Affirmative action/equal opportunity

___ Staff development

___ Staff evaluation

___ Other [specify: _____]

SUPPORT

___ Clerical/secretarial

___ Legal

___ Other [specify: _____]

A21. If you could advise someone about how best to prepare for your current job, what recommendations would you make in the following areas:

Skills needed?

Educational background?

Experience?

B. STAFF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

B1. Please indicate below the kinds of training and staff development you have received since _July, 1987_. Include classes, conferences, etc., attended with state support (paid time and/or tuition), whether offered inside or outside the state.

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Type of training</u> (e.g., outside seminar, conference, or in- service training)	<u>How useful was it</u> <u>for the work you do?</u>
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		

B2. What are the biggest barriers to your attending training programs? **[Check up to 5 most important]**

___ Insufficient funds available to support training

___ Travel costs too high

___ Restrictions on out-of-state travel

___ Coverage of your responsibilities a problem

___ Supervisor will not release time for training

___ Duration too long

___ Duration too short

___ Timing of training (month or days of week a problem)

___ Training location not easily accessible

___ Subjects offered not exactly what needed

___ Level of training too simple

___ Level of training too complex

___ Not convinced of quality of training offered

___ Other [**specify:**_____]

B3. How is most training initiated in your organization?

___ Formal training plan developed for the individual

___ Supervisor/management decision

___ Interest of staff person

B4. On the following list, please check off up to 20 training topics that you believe would be most beneficial to your future job performance.

JTPA -- STRUCTURE AND PRINCIPLES
___ Orientation to JTPA and related programs
___ EDWAA
___ Performance standards: practical applications
___ Other: _____

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION
___ Providing effective support for the SJTCC
___ Providing effective support for the PIC
___ Goal-setting at the state and local levels
___ Planning and program development
___ Developing the GCSSP
___ Target group policies
___ Developing service programs to meet client needs
___ Establishing Youth Employment Competencies
___ Developing strategies to meet performance standards
___ Effective use of non-78% JTPA funds
___ Funding recapture policies
___ Effective SDA liaison and monitoring
___ Developing successful T.A. programs
___ Evaluating proposals
___ Effective monitoring of programs and contractors
___ Cutback management
___ Other: _____

FISCAL/CONTRACTS
___ JTPA fiscal regulations and reporting procedures
___ Securing diversified funding/effective grantsmanship
___ Income-generating activities under JTPA
___ Preparing successful funding/program proposals
___ Preparing effective RFPs
___ Cost allocation under JTPA
___ Effective budget management
___ Negotiating successful contracts
___ Developing performance-based contracts for
    different programs/populations
___ Auditing within the JTPA system
___ Other: _____

MIS/COMPUTERS/STATISTICS/RESEARCH/EVALUATION
___ Establishing/updating the MIS
___ Selecting computer hardware
___ Selecting software for program management
___ Selecting educational software
___ Developing and using labor market information
___ Conducting post-program follow-up
___ Analyzing and reporting statistical information
___ Methods of program evaluation
___ Other: _____

PARTNERSHIPS/COMMUNITY RELATIONS
___ Determining training needs in the employer community
___ Marketing job training services to employers
___ Marketing techniques (ads, video, phone, etc.)
___ Effective liaison with elected officials
___ Effective public/community relations
___ Securing private sector involvement in JTPA
___ Building partnerships with other agencies/programs
___ Cross-training about related programs
    (K-12, AFDC, etc.)
___ Other: _____

CLIENT SERVICES
Understanding/identifying the needs of:
___ Displaced homemakers
___ Displaced workers
___ Dropouts/potential dropouts
___ Ex-offenders
___ Handicapped persons
___ Homeless persons
___ Minorities
___ Pregnant/parent teenagers
___ Refugees/immigrants
___ Rural workers/jobseekers
___ Youth
___ Welfare recipients/applicants
___ Effective outreach and recruitment
___ Eligibility verification procedures
___ Interpreting (bilingual/ASL)
___ Motivating participants
___ Getting clients to believe in themselves
___ Working with hostile/resistant clients
___ Assessment systems and techniques
___ Functional and vocational testing
___ Vocational counseling -- individual and group
___ Personal/life skills counseling
___ Helping clients set personal goals
___ Helping clients solve their own problems'
___ Crisis intervention
___ Determining supportive service needs
___ Developing EDPs
___ Accessing client support services
___ Developing/selecting vocational curricula
___ Developing/selecting basic/remedial skills programs
___ Effective teaching techniques
___ Competency-based instruction
___ Computer-assisted instruction
___ Work maturity preparation
___ Dislocated worker program approaches
___ Designing job clubs/job search workshops
___ Supervising individual job search
___ Helping clients manage their own
    job search
___ Preparing clients for job interviews
___ Job development techniques
___ Developing OJT slots/contracts
___ Effective use of work experience activities
___ Entrepreneurship development
___ Other: _____

GENERAL MANAGERIAL AND PROFESIONAL SKILLS
___ Establishing personnel procedures
___ Developing staff competencies
___ Supervisory skills/motivating staff
___ Staff performance appraisals
___ Managing conflict
___ Analytical skills and methods
___ Problem-solving strategies
___ Writing
___ Computer competency
___ Oral presentation skills
___ Effective meetings/facilitation skills
___ Dealing with the public
___ Time management
___ Stress management/preventing burnout
___ Dealing with other people's stress
___ Other: _____

B5. In your experience, what are the top training needs of:

Other state JTPA staff?

SDA staff?

Staff of JTPA service providers?

B6. Are there any other issues concerning staffing or staff training that you would like to comment on?

*** *THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION* ***

U.S. Department of Labor

January 22, 1990

To: SDA Staff

From: PATRICIA W. McNEIL
Administrator
Office of Strategic Planning
and Policy Development

The people who administer and deliver JTPA services at the state and local levels are critical to the success of this program, to our nation's competitiveness, and to the well-being of those who look to JTPA for training and employment assistance. Yet in this highly decentralized system, little is known at the national level about the educational background and experience of state and local JTPA staff.

We do know that in order to meet the challenges ahead, the JTPA system must ensure the continued high quality of its staff capacity. In large part, this means offering well-targeted staff training that enhances JTPA staffers' skills and maximizes the system's flexibility to respond to shifting conditions and requirements.

To help identify the most useful staff training as well as profile typical staffing patterns, the U.S. Department of Labor has contracted with Berkeley Planning Associates to conduct a study of staff structures, recruitment and hiring, staff backgrounds, staff turnover, and the needs for staff training and technical assistance at the state and local levels within the JTPA system.

The attached survey is one of the key elements of this study. It is being distributed to the staffs of 5% of the nation's SDAs, while a similar survey is being distributed to the JTPA staffs of 8 states.

I want to emphasize several points about this survey:

1. It is your opportunity to influence the content and format of training and technical assistance made available to JTPA staff with federal and state funding.

2. Its findings will identify major training needs common to specific categories of JTPA staff, such as MIS specialists or monitors.

3. Most of the questions call for check-off or short fill-in responses. However, the survey also provides space to comment on the value of training you have received in the past, as well as space for additional comments.

4. The researchers will keep all responses confidential, and will use them exclusively to develop summary statistics.

If you have any questions about this survey, please contact BPA's project director, Laura Schlichtmann, at (415) 465-7884, or ETA's project officer, Greg Knorr, at (202) 535-0682. Thank you for your participation.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. <u>All answers</u> on this questionnaire will be kept <u>confidential</u>, and will be used <u>only</u> to develop aggregate descriptive profiles of current JTPA staff backgrounds and training needs.

2. When you have completed the questionnaire, please seal it in the accompanying envelope and return it to the staff representative designated by your director as responsible for returning survey forms to BPA.

3. We estimate that it will take an average of 25 minutes to complete this survey. If you have any comments regarding this estimate, or any other aspect of the survey, including suggestions for reducing the time needed to respond, send them to the Office of Information Management, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N-1301, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (1205-0291), Washington, D.C. 20503.

ID Code [| | | | | | | |]

JTPA STAFFING AND STAFF TRAINING
AT THE STATE AND SDA LEVELS:
<u>SURVEY OF SDA STAFF</u>

A. POSITION AND BACKGROUND

A1. Job title (e.g., Director): _____

A2. Personnel classification (e.g., Manager III): _____

_____

A3. Staff unit: _____

A4. How many hours are you scheduled to work per week?

___ 40 or more   ___ 30-39   ___ 20-29   ___ Less than 20

A5. How many hours are supported by JTPA Title II or Title III (EDWAA)?

___ 40 or more   ___ 30-39   ___ 20-29   ___ 10-19   ___ Less than 10

A6. What is your current annual salary? [If you work part-time, indicate your <u>actual</u> annual salary, not the full-time equivalent.]

___ Under $15,000   ___ $15,000 to $24,999   ___ $25,000 to $34,999

___ $35,000 to $44,999   ___ $45,000 or more

A7. Number of positions <u>formally reporting</u> to you, including those supervised by persons whom you supervise or who report to you [Enter 0 if none; <u>include vacant positions</u>]: _____

A8. Number of persons you <u>directly supervise</u> [Enter 0 if none; <u>include vacant positions</u>]: _____

A9. Types of staff you supervise [Check all that apply]

___ Not applicable   ___ Assessment/counseling   ___ LMI/research/evaluation

___ Program development   ___ Job developers/job search   ___ Personnel/labor relations

___ Program/administrative   ___ Training/education   ___ Staff training
     management

___ Public/elected official liason   ___ Contract monitoring/vendor   ___ Clerical support
                                          liason

___ Employer relations   ___ Audit

___ Recruitment/outreach   ___ Fiscal/budget

___ Intake   ___ MIS

___ Other [specify: _____]

A10. How long have you been employed in your <u>current</u> position?

     ___ Less than 6 months   ___ 6-12 months   ___ 1-2 years

     ___ 3-4 years   ___ 5 or more years

A11. How long have you been employed in <u>any JTPA or CETA</u> position?

     ___ Less than 6 months   ___ 6-12 months   ___ 1-2 years

     ___ 3-4 years   ___ 5-9 years   ___ 10 or more years

A12. How long have you been employed in <u>any public sector or nonprofit job training</u> position, including JTPA, CETA, MDTA, ES, WIN, vocational education, or vocational rehabilitation?

     ___ Less than 6 months   ___ 6-12 months   ___ 1-2 years

     ___ 3-4 years   ___ 5-9 years   ___ 10 or more years

A13. What other JTPA/CETA/related positions have you held in the past (e.g., job developer, computer programmer, labor market analyst, budget analyst)?

A14. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

     ___ Did not finish high school

     ___ High school diploma/GED

     ___ Some college

     ___ Associate's degree [specify major: _____]

     ___ Bachelor's degree [specify major:_____]

     ___ Master's degree [specify major:_____]

     ___ Doctoral degree [specify major:_____]

     ___ Other [specify:_____]

A15. Are you currently enrolled in an additional degree program?

     ___ Yes [specify degree and major: _____]

     ___ No

A16. Do you belong to any professional associations?

_____ No

_____ Yes [specify:] _____

_____

A17. What is your age group? ___ 18-25 ___ 26-35 ___ 36-45 ___ 46-55 ___ 56 or older

A18. What is your sex? ___ Female ___ Male

A19. What is your ethnicity?

___ American Indian/Alaskan native   ___ Asian/Pacific Islander

___ Black, not of Hispanic origin   ___ Hispanic

___ White, not of Hispanic origin   ___ Other [specify: _____]

A20. Please check off the functions you regularly perform as part of your job. [Check all that apply]

SDA PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT
___ Program design
___ Developing new service approaches
___ Developing service systems
___ Developing performance standards policy
___ Long-range planning
___ Using labor market information
___ Conducting population analysis
___ Proposal writing
___ RFP writing
___ Other [specify: _____]

SDA PROGRAM MANAGEMENT
___ Evaluating proposals
___ Assessing program performance
___ Managing overall performance goals
___ Monitoring client systems (intake, assessment, follow-up)
___ Monitoring contractors
___ Establishing personnel policies
___ Relationships with business
___ Relationships with community
___ Liaison with state
___ Other [specify: _____]

FISCAL AND PROCUREMENT
___ Cost-reimbursement contracting
___ Performance-based contracting
___ Fiscal monitoring
___ Cost allocation
___ RFP and contract development
___ Budgeting
___ Accounting
___ Auditing
___ Audit resolutions
___ Procurement of supplies, equipment, facilities
___ Other [specify: _____]

MIS/COMPUTERS
___ Establishing and updating MIS
___ Compilation of JASR data
___ Manual filing systems
___ Computer hardware/software
___ Data entry
___ Other [specify: _____]

[continued]

-3-

A20. (continued)

PUBLIC/PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT
(PIC SUPPORT)

___ Liaison with local elected officials

___ Recruiting PIC members

___ Oversight of PIC organization and roles

___ Monitoring PIC liability issues

___ Public/community relations

___ Coordination with other agencies

___ Economic development

___ Other [specify: _____]

EMPLOYER RELATIONS

___ Determining training needs

___ Marketing job training services to employers

___ Developing and serving employer accounts

___ Determining local employer personnel needs

___ Other [specify: _____]

OUTREACH, RECRUITMENT, AND INTAKE

___ Marketing to participants

___ Orientation

___ Eligibility determination

___ Other [specify: _____]

ASSESSMENT AND COUNSELING

___ Motivating and working with participants

___ Functional and vocational testing

___ Development of EDPs

___ Individual and group counseling

___ Life skills counseling

___ Personal goal-setting

___ Crisis intervention

___ Determining supportive services needs

___ Assignment/referral to services

___ Interpreting (bilingual/ASL)

___ Other [specify: _____]

RESEARCH/STATISTICS/EVALUATION

___ Collecting labor market information

___ Analyzing and reporting statistical information

___ Program/contract evaluation

___ Other [specify: _____]

PERSONNEL/LABOR RELATIONS

___ Personnel

___ Labor relations

___ Affirmative action/equal opportunity

___ Staff development

___ Staff evaluation

___ Other [specify: _____]

SUPPORT

___ Clerical/secretarial

___ Legal

___ Other [specify: _____]

JOB DEVELOPMENT/PLACEMENT

___ Job search supervision

___ Conducting job clubs

___ Contacting employers

___ Matching clients and jobs

___ Client follow-up

___ Other [specify: _____]

ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

___ OJT contracting

___ Upgrading and retraining contracts

___ Developing work experience slots

___ Other [specify: _____]

CLASSROOM TRAINING/EDUCATION

___ Curriculum development

___ Provision of basic skills remediation

___ Designing computer-assisted instruction

___ Provision of occupational skills training

___ Other [specify: _____]

A21. If you could advise someone about how best to prepare for your current job, what recommendations would you make in the following areas:

Skills needed?

Educational background?

Experience?

B. STAFF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

.B1. Please indicate below the kinds of training and staff development you have received since July, 1987. Include classes, conferences, etc., attended with state support (paid time and/or tuition), whether offered inside or outside the state.

Topic	Type of training (e.g., outside seminar, conference, or in-service training)	How useful was it for the work you do?
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

[continued]

-5-

B1. (continued)

Topic	Type of training (e.g., outside seminar, conference, or in-service training)	How useful was it for the work you do?
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		

B2. What are the biggest barriers to your attending training programs? **[Check up to 5 most important]**

___ Insufficient funds available to support training   ___ Timing of training (month or days of week a problem)

___ Travel costs too high   ___ Training location not easily accessible

___ Restrictions on out-of-state travel   ___ Subjects offered not exactly what needed

___ Coverage of your responsibilities a problem   ___ Level of training too simple

___ Supervisor will not release time for training   ___ Level of training too complex

___ Duration too long   ___ Not convinced of quality of training offered

___ Duration too short   ___ Other [specify:_____]

B3. How is most training initiated in your organization?

___ Formal training plan developed for the individual

___ Supervisor/management decision

___ Interest of staff person

B4. On the following list, please check off up to 20 training topics that you believe would be most beneficial to your future job performance.

JTPA – STRUCTURE AND PRINCIPLES
___ Orientation to JTPA and related programs
___ EDWAA
___ Performance standards: practical applications
___ Other: _____

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION
___ Providing effective support for the SJTCC
___ Providing effective support for the PIC
___ Goal-setting at the state and local levels
___ Planning and program development
___ Developing the GCSSP
___ Target group policies
___ Developing service programs to meet client needs
___ Establishing Youth Employment Competencies
___ Developing strategies to meet performance standards
___ Effective use of non-78% JTPA funds
___ Funding recapture policies
___ Effective SDA liaison and monitoring
___ Developing successful T.A. programs
___ Evaluating proposals
___ Effective monitoring of programs and contractors
___ Cutback management
___ Other: _____

FISCAL/CONTRACTS
___ JTPA fiscal regulations and reporting procedures
___ Securing diversified funding/effective grantsmanship
___ Income-generating activities under JTPA
• ___ Preparing successful funding/program proposals
___ Preparing effective RFPs
___ Cost allocation under JTPA
___ Effective budget management
___ Negotiating successful contracts
___ Developing performance-based contracts for
different programs/populations
___ Auditing within the JTPA system
___ Other: _____

MIS/COMPUTERS/STATISTICS/RESEARCH/EVALUATION
___ Establishing/updating the MIS
___ Selecting computer hardware
___ Selecting software for program management
___ Selecting educational software
___ Developing and using labor market information
___ Conducting post-program follow-up
___ Analyzing and reporting statistical information
___ Methods of program evaluation
___ Other: _____

PARTNERSHIPS/COMMUNITY RELATIONS
___ Determining training needs in the employer community
___ Marketing job training services to employers
___ Marketing techniques (ads, video, phone, etc.)
___ Effective liaison with elected officials
___ Effective public/community relations
___ Securing private sector involvement in JTPA
___ Building partnerships with other agencies/programs
___ Cross-training about related programs
(K-12, AFDC, etc.)
___ Other: _____

CLIENT SERVICES
Understanding/identifying the needs of:
___ Displaced homemakers
___ Displaced workers
___ Dropouts/potential dropouts
___ Ex-offenders
___ Handicapped persons
___ Homeless persons
___ Minorities
___ Pregnant/parent teenagers
___ Refugees/immigrants
___ Rural workers/jobseekers
___ Youth
___ Welfare recipients/applicants
___ Effective outreach and recruitment
___ Eligibility verification procedures
___ Interpreting (bilingual/ASL)
___ Motivating participants
___ Getting clients to believe in themselves
___ Working with hostile/resistant clients
___ Assessment systems and techniques
___ Functional and vocational testing
___ Vocational counseling – individual and group
___ Personal/life skills counseling
___ Helping clients set personal goals
___ Helping clients solve their own problems
___ Crisis intervention
___ Determining supportive service needs
___ Developing EDPs
___ Accessing client support services
___ Developing/selecting vocational curricula
___ Developing/selecting basic/remedial skills programs
___ Effective teaching techniques
___ Competency-based instruction
___ Computer-assisted instruction
___ Work maturity preparation
___ Dislocated worker program approaches
___ Designing job clubs/job search workshops
___ Supervising individual job search
___ Helping clients manage their own
job search
___ Preparing clients for job interviews
___ Job development techniques
___ Developing OJT slots/contracts
___ Effective use of work experience activities
___ Entrepreneurship development
___ Other: _____

GENERAL MANAGERIAL AND PROFESIONAL SKILLS
___ Establishing personnel procedures
___ Developing staff competencies
___ Supervisory skills/motivating staff
___ Staff performance appraisals
___ Managing conflict
___ Analytical skills and methods
___ Problem-solving strategies
___ Writing
___ Computer competency
___ Oral presentation skills
___ Effective meetings/facilitation skills
___ Dealing with the public
___ Time management
___ Stress management/preventing burnout
___ Dealing with other people's stress
___ Other: _____

B5. In your experience, what are the top training needs of:

Other SDA staff?

State JTPA staff?

Staff of JTPA service providers?

B6. Are there any other issues concerning staffing or staff training that you would like to comment on?

*** THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION ***

> Please seal this questionnaire in the envelope provided with this form and return it by _____
> to the staff representative responsible for returning the survey to BPA.

APPENDIX B

SUPPLEMENTARY CROSS-TABULATIONS
FOR CHAPTER IV

Table B-1

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY TOTAL STATE FUNDS IN PY 88

	PY88 STATE FUNDS			All Responses
	LESS THAN $500,000	$500,000 TO $2 MILLION	MORE THAN $2 MILLION	
Recommended Skills				
PERSONAL	20%	29%	22%	25%
COMMUNICATION	22%	19%	22%	21%
ANALYSIS	7%	16%	17%	16%
COMPUTER	18%	10%	8%	9%
MANAGEMENT	16%	8%	9%	9%
JOB-SPECIFIC	9%	8%	10%	9%
QUANTITATIVE	9%	5%	8%	7%
PROGRAM	0%	6%	4%	5%
CLIENT	0%	1%	0%	1%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(45)	(264)	(408)	(717)

Table B-2

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY NUMBER OF STATE JTPA STAFF

	TOTAL STAFF IN PY88			All Responses
	1 - 20	21 - 60	61 +	
Recommended Skills				
PERSONAL	27%	28%	22%	25%
COMMUNICATION	23%	18%	22%	21%
ANALYSIS	7%	16%	17%	16%
COMPUTER	13%	10%	8%	9%
MANAGEMENT	13%	8%	9%	9%
JOB-SPECIFIC	6%	8%	10%	9%
QUANTITATIVE	6%	5%	8%	7%
PROGRAM	6%	5%	4%	5%
CLIENT	0%	1%	0%	1%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(70)	(239)	(408)	(717)

Table B-3

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER

	Functional Cluster									All Responses
	POL./ ADMIN.	PUB. CONTACT	LMI	MONITOR	MIS	FISCAL	PERSON EL	LEGAL	CLERICAL	
Recommended Skills										
PERSONAL	25%	25%	23%	26%	22%	30%	30%	0%	30%	26%
COMMUNICATION	21%	21%	21%	22%	17%	17%	19%	29%	20%	20%
ANALYSIS	20%	16%	21%	19%	12%	13%	13%	43%	3%	16%
MANAGEMENT	11%	13%	7%	11%	5%	10%	16%	29%	4%	11%
COMPUTER	7%	7%	9%	6%	17%	9%	6%	0%	13%	8%
QUANTITATIVE	7%	7%	11%	7%	8%	10%	6%	0%	1%	7%
JOB-SPECIFIC	3%	4%	4%	2%	14%	3%	5%	0%	27%	6%
PROGRAM	5%	6%	4%	6%	5%	6%	4%	0%	2%	5%
CLIENT	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(521)	(406)	(56)	(288)	(197)	(175)	(187)	(7)	(156)	(1993)

Table B-4

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER BY SUPERVISORY OR NOT

	Functional Cluster									Total
	POL./ ADMIN.	PUB. CONTACT	LMI	MONITOR	MIS	FISCAL	PERSON EL	LEGAL	CLERICAL	
SUPERVISORY										
PERSONAL	28%	31%	25%	28%	30%	35%	32%	0%	45%	31%
COMMUNICATION	20%	19%	25%	18%	21%	20%	17%	50%	21%	19%
MANAGEMENT	16%	19%	8%	17%	11%	16%	19%	50%	16%	17%
ANALYSIS	15%	11%	8%	17%	11%	10%	12%	0%	3%	13%
QUANTITATIVE	7%	6%	17%	6%	10%	6%	7%	0%	0%	6%
PROGRAM	5%	6%	0%	6%	1%	7%	5%	0%	0%	5%
COMPUTER	5%	4%	8%	4%	8%	4%	4%	0%	0%	4%
JOB-SPECIFIC	3%	3%	8%	2%	7%	2%	3%	0%	16%	4%
CLIENT	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(210)	(160)	(12)	(121)	(71)	(82)	(139)	(2)	(38)	(835)
NOT SUPERVISORY										
PERSONAL	23%	21%	19%	25%	19%	26%	27%	0%	25%	23%
COMMUNICATION	22%	22%	19%	24%	15%	16%	25%	20%	19%	21%
ANALYSIS	23%	20%	28%	20%	12%	16%	15%	60%	3%	18%
COMPUTER	8%	8%	8%	7%	22%	11%	13%	0%	17%	11%
JOB-SPECIFIC	3%	5%	3%	2%	18%	5%	10%	0%	31%	8%
QUANTITATIVE	8%	7%	8%	8%	7%	14%	2%	0%	2%	7%
MANAGEMENT	7%	9%	8%	7%	2%	6%	6%	20%	1%	6%
PROGRAM	5%	7%	6%	5%	6%	5%	2%	0%	3%	5%
CLIENT	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(301)	(238)	(36)	(165)	(124)	(87)	(48)	(5)	(118)	(1122)

Table B-5

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION

	HIGHEST LEVEL OF ED COMPLETED								All Responses
	DID NOT FINISH HS	HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA/ GED	SOME COLLEGE	ASSOCIATE DEGREE	BACHELOR DEGREE	MASTER'S DEGREE	DOCTORAL DEGREE	OTHER	
Recommended Skills									
PERSONAL	0%	33%	21%	22%	28%	21%	20%	27%	25%
COMMUNICATION	0%	13%	21%	22%	22%	19%	20%	15%	20%
ANALYSIS	0%	0%	10%	8%	18%	22%	47%	15%	16%
COMPUTER	50%	8%	16%	14%	7%	7%	7%	12%	9%
MANAGEMENT	0%	8%	5%	2%	11%	12%	7%	4%	9%
JOB-SPECIFIC	50%	33%	18%	18%	3%	3%	0%	15%	9%
QUANTITATIVE	0%	3%	6%	10%	6%	9%	0%	4%	7%
PROGRAM	0%	5%	1%	4%	5%	7%	0%	8%	5%
CLIENT	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(2)	(40)	(131)	(50)	(300)	(151)	(15)	(26)	(715)

Table B-6

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN CURRENT POSITION

	HOW LONG EMPLOYED CURRENT POS					All Responses
	LESS THAN 6 MOS	6 - 12 MOS	1 - 2 YEARS	3 - 4 YEARS	5 OR MORE YEARS	
Recommended Skills						
PERSONAL	24%	21%	24%	24%	27%	25%
COMMUNICATION	21%	18%	19%	22%	21%	20%
ANALYSIS	15%	15%	19%	14%	16%	16%
COMPUTER	11%	10%	9%	11%	8%	9%
MANAGEMENT	4%	12%	11%	10%	7%	9%
JOB-SPECIFIC	12%	14%	7%	6%	10%	9%
QUANTITATIVE	6%	8%	5%	8%	7%	7%
PROGRAM	6%	1%	6%	5%	4%	5%
CLIENT	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(84)	(73)	(184)	(144)	(230)	(715)

Table B-7

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN ANY JTPA OR CETA POSITION

	HOW LONG ANY JTPA/CETA POS						All Responses
	LESS THAN 6 MOS	6 - 12 MOS	1 - 2 YEARS	3 - 4 YEARS	5 - 9 YEARS	10 OR MORE YEARS	
Recommended Skills							
PERSONAL	15%	16%	22%	26%	21%	29%	24%
COMMUNICATION	24%	16%	17%	17%	23%	21%	20%
ANALYSIS	15%	14%	20%	14%	15%	17%	16%
COMPUTER	15%	16%	13%	13%	9%	6%	9%
MANAGEMENT	0%	14%	7%	5%	10%	11%	9%
JOB-SPECIFIC	20%	14%	11%	8%	10%	5%	9%
QUANTITATIVE	10%	8%	6%	8%	7%	5%	7%
PROGRAM	2%	3%	4%	8%	4%	5%	5%
CLIENT	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(41)	(37)	(83)	(98)	(163)	(276)	(698)

Table B-8

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY LENGTH OF EMPLOY IN ANY PUBLIC SECTOR OR NONPROFIT JOB TRNING POSITION

	HOW LONG ANY PUB SECTOR POS						All Responses
	LESS THAN 6 MOS	6 - 12 MOS	1 - 2 YEARS	3 - 4 YEARS	5 - 9 YEARS	10 OR MORE YEARS	
Recommended Skills							
PERSONAL	12%	16%	23%	24%	23%	27%	24%
COMMUNICATION	24%	16%	15%	17%	19%	22%	20%
ANALYSIS	14%	5%	19%	9%	18%	18%	16%
COMPUTER	14%	21%	17%	16%	7%	6%	9%
MANAGEMENT	2%	11%	6%	9%	6%	11%	9%
JOB-SPECIFIC	21%	26%	13%	11%	11%	4%	8%
QUANTITATIVE	10%	5%	4%	9%	6%	6%	7%
PROGRAM	2%	0%	4%	4%	8%	4%	5%
CLIENT	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%
All Responses	100% (42)	100% (19)	100% (48)	100% (75)	100% (108)	100% (401)	100% (693)

B-8

Table B-9

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF BY AGE

Recommended Skills	AGE GROUP					All Responses
	18 - 25	26 - 35	36 - 45	46 - 55	56 OR OLDER	
PERSONAL	11%	27%	27%	20%	24%	25%
COMMUNICATION	22%	17%	21%	22%	21%	20%
ANALYSIS	0%	11%	16%	20%	16%	16%
COMPUTER	22%	12%	8%	11%	7%	10%
MANAGEMENT	0%	6%	10%	11%	6%	9%
JOB-SPECIFIC	33%	16%	7%	5%	9%	9%
QUANTITATIVE	0%	6%	6%	8%	10%	7%
PROGRAM	11%	5%	5%	3%	7%	5%
CLIENT	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%
All Responses	100% (9)	100% (139)	100% (327)	100% (168)	100% (70)	100% (713)

Table B-10

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF BY ETHNICITY

	ETHNICITY					All Responses
	AMERICAN INDIAN/AL ASKAN NATIVE	BLACK, NON-HISPA NIC	WHITE, NON-HISPA NIC	ASIAN/PAC IFIC ISLANDER	HISPANIC	
Recommended Skills						
PERSONAL	13%	18%	26%	21%	22%	24%
COMMUNICATION	25%	20%	21%	21%	19%	20%
ANALYSIS	25%	13%	15%	37%	22%	16%
COMPUTER	25%	12%	9%	11%	8%	10%
MANAGEMENT	0%	7%	10%	0%	14%	9%
JOB-SPECIFIC	13%	20%	7%	5%	6%	9%
QUANTITATIVE	0%	6%	7%	5%	8%	7%
PROGRAM	0%	3%	5%	0%	0%	5%
CLIENT	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(8)	(90)	(555)	(19)	(36)	(708)

Table B-11

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY SEX

	GENDER		All Responses
	FEMALE	MALE	
Recommended Skills			
PERSONAL	24%	25%	25%
COMMUNICATION	20%	22%	21%
ANALYSIS	13%	20%	16%
COMPUTER	11%	8%	9%
MANAGEMENT	8%	11%	9%
JOB-SPECIFIC	13%	4%	9%
QUANTITATIVE	6%	8%	6%
PROGRAM	5%	4%	5%
CLIENT	1%	0%	1%
	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(400)	(316)	(716)

Table B-12

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF BY AGE BY SEX

Recommended Skills	AGE GROUP									All Responses
	18 - 25	26 - 35		36 - 45		46 - 55		56 OR OLDER		
	FEMALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	
PERSONAL	11%	27%	26%	25%	30%	18%	21%	29%	22%	25%
COMMUNICATION	22%	17%	18%	20%	21%	25%	21%	13%	27%	21%
ANALYSIS	0%	8%	18%	16%	17%	15%	23%	13%	18%	16%
COMPUTER	22%	12%	13%	9%	6%	15%	8%	8%	7%	10%
MANAGEMENT	0%	4%	10%	9%	12%	11%	11%	0%	9%	9%
JOB-SPECIFIC	33%	21%	3%	10%	3%	7%	4%	13%	7%	9%
QUANTITATIVE	0%	4%	10%	6%	6%	7%	8%	8%	9%	6%
PROGRAM	11%	6%	3%	4%	5%	2%	4%	17%	2%	5%
CLIENT	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	1%
All Responses	100% (9)	100% (100)	100% (39)	100% (206)	100% (121)	100% (61)	100% (107)	100% (24)	100% (45)	100% (712)

Table B-13

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF BY ETHNICITY BY SEX

	AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKAN NATIVE		BLACK, NON-HISPANIC		WHITE, NON-HISPANIC		ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER		HISPANIC		All Responses
	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	
Recommended Skills											
PERSONAL	0%	25%	17%	21%	26%	25%	25%	14%	20%	24%	24%
COMMUNICATION	25%	25%	20%	21%	20%	22%	17%	29%	20%	19%	21%
ANALYSIS	25%	25%	12%	17%	12%	18%	25%	57%	20%	24%	16%
COMPUTER	25%	25%	12%	13%	10%	8%	17%	0%	13%	5%	10%
MANAGEMENT	0%	0%	6%	8%	8%	12%	0%	0%	13%	14%	9%
JOB-SPECIFIC	25%	0%	24%	8%	11%	4%	8%	0%	7%	5%	9%
QUANTITATIVE	0%	0%	3%	13%	6%	8%	8%	0%	7%	10%	7%
PROGRAM	0%	0%	5%	0%	6%	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%
CLIENT	0%	0%	2%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(4)	(4)	(66)	(24)	(302)	(252)	(12)	(7)	(15)	(21)	(707)

Table B-14

**SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY SDA ALLOCATION IN PY 88**

	PY88 IIA ALLOCATION			All Responses
	BELOW $1 MILLION	$1-1.9 MILLION	$2-6.9 MILLION	
Recommended Skills				
PERSONAL	35%	41%	38%	38%
COMMUNICATION	15%	17%	15%	16%
CLIENT	13%	6%	8%	8%
QUANTITATIVE	10%	8%	7%	8%
COMPUTER	4%	8%	8%	8%
MANAGEMENT	8%	7%	7%	7%
JOB-SPECIFIC	4%	6%	7%	6%
ANALYSIS	3%	4%	6%	5%
PROGRAM	6%	3%	4%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(206)	(417)	(894)	(1517)

Table B-15

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY NUMBER OF SDA STAFF

| | II-A STAFF SIZE IN 88 | | | All Responses |
	1 - 10	11 - 30	31 +	
Recommended Skills				
PERSONAL	32%	39%	40%	38%
COMMUNICATION	13%	19%	15%	16%
CLIENT	6%	8%	9%	8%
QUANTITATIVE	14%	8%	6%	8%
COMPUTER	10%	5%	8%	8%
MANAGEMENT	9%	8%	7%	7%
JOB-SPECIFIC	5%	5%	7%	6%
ANALYSIS	8%	4%	5%	5%
PROGRAM	4%	3%	4%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(250)	(481)	(786)	(1517)

Table B-16

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY

	ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE			All Responses
	PIC	GOVERNMEN	CBO/OTHER	
Recommended Skills				
PERSONAL	41%	36%	39%	38%
COMMUNICATION	15%	16%	13%	16%
CLIENT	9%	8%	3%	8%
QUANTITATIVE	6%	9%	11%	8%
COMPUTER	7%	8%	15%	8%
MANAGEMENT	7%	8%	7%	7%
JOB-SPECIFIC	7%	6%	5%	6%
ANALYSIS	3%	6%	3%	5%
PROGRAM	5%	3%	3%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(521)	(935)	(61)	(1517)

Table B-17

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER

| | Functional Cluster | | | | | | | | | | | | All Responses |
Recommended Skills	POL./ ADMIN.	CLIENT SVC.	CLASS TRAIN	INTERP RETING	MONITO R	MIS/ JASR	DATA PROC.	FISCAL	PROCUR EMENT	PERSON NEL	LEGAL	CLERIC AL	
PERSONAL	40%	43%	40%	48%	40%	32%	34%	33%	38%	40%	43%	34%	39%
COMMUNICATION	17%	17%	17%	19%	18%	13%	14%	17%	13%	18%	13%	11%	16%
MANAGEMENT	9%	8%	9%	3%	10%	9%	6%	10%	11%	14%	13%	5%	9%
QUANTITATIVE	7%	5%	4%	4%	8%	12%	9%	14%	10%	8%	0%	5%	8%
CLIENT	9%	10%	17%	13%	8%	6%	5%	4%	4%	5%	0%	6%	8%
COMPUTER	5%	5%	4%	5%	4%	13%	14%	8%	8%	4%	4%	15%	7%
ANALYSIS	6%	5%	3%	0%	7%	6%	5%	7%	6%	6%	4%	2%	5%
JOB-SPECIFIC	2%	3%	1%	4%	1%	7%	10%	4%	7%	2%	13%	19%	5%
PROGRAM	4%	5%	5%	6%	4%	2%	3%	3%	5%	3%	9%	2%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(1069)	(1115)	(339)	(80)	(672)	(232)	(604)	(551)	(240)	(473)	(23)	(376)	(5774)

Table B-18

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER BY SUPERVISORY OR NOT

	Functional Cluster												Total
	POL./ ADMIN.	CLIENT SVC.	CLASS TRAIN	INTERP RETING	MONITO R	MIS/ JASR	DATA PROC.	FISCAL	PROCUR EMENT	PERSON NEL	LEGAL	CLERIC AL	
SUPERVISORY													
PERSONAL	40%	42%	39%	43%	41%	35%	36%	35%	39%	41%	50%	40%	39%
COMMUNICATION	16%	17%	18%	14%	18%	13%	15%	17%	13%	17%	7%	13%	16%
MANAGEMENT	16%	15%	17%	10%	15%	18%	12%	16%	17%	18%	21%	12%	16%
QUANTITATIVE	9%	7%	6%	0%	10%	12%	10%	13%	9%	8%	0%	5%	9%
CLIENT	5%	7%	8%	14%	6%	4%	4%	3%	3%	5%	0%	5%	5%
ANALYSIS	5%	4%	2%	0%	5%	6%	4%	7%	7%	4%	0%	0%	5%
COMPUTER	3%	3%	5%	10%	3%	6%	9%	3%	3%	3%	0%	8%	4%
PROGRAM	3%	4%	4%	10%	3%	2%	3%	4%	6%	3%	14%	4%	4%
JOB-SPECIFIC	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	4%	6%	1%	4%	1%	7%	12%	2%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	458	379	126	(21)	306	108	205	267	145	350	(14)	(99)	2478
NOT SUPERVISORY													
PERSONAL	41%	43%	42%	51%	39%	28%	33%	32%	36%	41%	33%	32%	38%
COMMUNICATION	18%	17%	16%	21%	19%	13%	13%	16%	9%	22%	22%	11%	16%
CLIENT	10%	12%	21%	11%	9%	8%	6%	5%	5%	3%	0%	6%	9%
COMPUTER	6%	5%	2%	4%	6%	19%	16%	12%	16%	10%	11%	17%	9%
QUANTITATIVE	6%	5%	2%	5%	7%	13%	8%	16%	11%	8%	0%	5%	7%
JOB-SPECIFIC	3%	3%	1%	4%	2%	9%	12%	6%	13%	5%	22%	21%	7%
ANALYSIS	7%	5%	4%	0%	8%	6%	5%	7%	4%	11%	11%	3%	6%
PROGRAM	6%	6%	6%	5%	5%	2%	3%	2%	4%	1%	0%	2%	4%
MANAGEMENT	4%	4%	5%	0%	5%	2%	3%	4%	3%	0%	0%	3%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(560)	(681)	(204)	(57)	(340)	(116)	(377)	(253)	(80)	(93)	(9)	(270)	(3040)

Table B-19

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION

	HIGHEST LEVEL OF ED COMPLETED								All Responses
	DID NOT FINISH HS	HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA/ GED	SOME COLLEGE	ASSOCIATE DEGREE	BACHELOR DEGREE	MASTER'S DEGREE	DOCTORAL DEGREE	OTHER	
Recommended Skills									
PERSONAL	50%	34%	39%	31%	42%	36%	50%	20%	38%
COMMUNICATION	0%	11%	15%	16%	17%	17%	0%	20%	16%
CLIENT	17%	3%	7%	6%	10%	10%	0%	0%	8%
QUANTITATIVE	0%	9%	9%	8%	8%	6%	0%	0%	8%
COMPUTER	8%	16%	11%	14%	4%	3%	0%	13%	8%
MANAGEMENT	0%	1%	3%	6%	7%	18%	25%	7%	7%
JOB-SPECIFIC	25%	20%	9%	13%	1%	0%	0%	40%	6%
ANALYSIS	0%	1%	5%	2%	6%	7%	25%	0%	5%
PROGRAM	0%	3%	3%	4%	6%	3%	0%	0%	4%
All Responses	100% (12)	100% (152)	100% (393)	100% (112)	100% (567)	100% (255)	100% (4)	100% (15)	100% (1510)

Table B-20

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN CURRENT POSITION

| | HOW LONG EMPLOYED CURRENT POS | | | | | All Responses |
	LESS THAN 6 MOS	6 - 12 MOS	1 - 2 YEARS	3 - 4 YEARS	5 OR MORE YEARS	
Recommended Skills						
PERSONAL	40%	40%	37%	41%	37%	38%
COMMUNICATION	18%	16%	16%	14%	16%	16%
CLIENT	6%	10%	9%	7%	8%	8%
QUANTITATIVE	3%	6%	7%	9%	10%	8%
COMPUTER	6%	5%	10%	8%	7%	8%
MANAGEMENT	8%	7%	7%	8%	8%	7%
JOB-SPECIFIC	6%	5%	7%	6%	6%	6%
ANALYSIS	4%	7%	5%	5%	4%	5%
PROGRAM	8%	5%	2%	3%	4%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(173)	(176)	(378)	(279)	(504)	(1510)

Table B-21

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN ANY JTPA OR CETA POSITION

	HOW LONG ANY JTPA/CETA POS						All Responses
	LESS THAN 6 MOS	6 - 12 MOS	1 - 2 YEARS	3 - 4 YEARS	5 - 9 YEARS	10 OR MORE YEARS	
Recommended Skills							
PERSONAL	39%	38%	38%	40%	39%	37%	38%
COMMUNICATION	17%	20%	16%	13%	17%	15%	16%
CLIENT	7%	7%	11%	8%	7%	8%	8%
QUANTITATIVE	6%	2%	5%	9%	8%	10%	8%
COMPUTER	10%	7%	10%	7%	8%	5%	8%
MANAGEMENT	3%	4%	6%	7%	7%	10%	7%
JOB-SPECIFIC	10%	8%	9%	7%	3%	4%	6%
ANALYSIS	4%	7%	3%	5%	5%	6%	5%
PROGRAM	3%	7%	3%	5%	5%	3%	4%
All Responses	100% (99)	100% (107)	100% (258)	100% (239)	100% (312)	100% (478)	100% (1493)

Table B-22

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY LENGTH OF EMPLOY IN ANY PUBLIC SECTOR OR NONPROFIT JOB TRNING POSITION

| | HOW LONG ANY PUB SECTOR POS | | | | | | All Responses |
	LESS THAN 6 MOS	6 - 12 MOS	1 - 2 YEARS	3 - 4 YEARS	5 - 9 YEARS	10 OR MORE YEARS	
Recommended Skills							
PERSONAL	41%	40%	37%	40%	39%	38%	38%
COMMUNICATION	18%	21%	16%	13%	16%	16%	16%
CLIENT	3%	9%	10%	7%	7%	8%	8%
QUANTITATIVE	4%	2%	5%	8%	8%	10%	8%
COMPUTER	13%	6%	11%	8%	8%	5%	7%
MANAGEMENT	3%	1%	7%	6%	6%	10%	7%
JOB-SPECIFIC	13%	7%	10%	8%	3%	4%	6%
ANALYSIS	4%	9%	2%	5%	5%	6%	5%
PROGRAM	4%	5%	2%	4%	6%	3%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(79)	(82)	(219)	(253)	(294)	(564)	(1491)

Table B-23

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF BY AGE

| | AGE GROUP | | | | | All Responses |
	18 - 25	26 - 35	36 - 45	46 - 55	56 OR OLDER	
Recommended Skills						
PERSONAL	32%	37%	39%	40%	40%	38%
COMMUNICATION	17%	14%	16%	16%	17%	16%
CLIENT	7%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%
QUANTITATIVE	3%	10%	8%	7%	8%	8%
COMPUTER	10%	10%	6%	7%	6%	8%
MANAGEMENT	3%	5%	10%	8%	6%	7%
JOB-SPECIFIC	16%	6%	4%	6%	8%	6%
ANALYSIS	5%	6%	5%	4%	4%	5%
PROGRAM	6%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%
All Responses	100% (115)	100% (408)	100% (590)	100% (244)	100% (157)	100% (1514)

Table B-24

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF BY ETHNICITY

	ETHNICITY						All Responses
	AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKAN NATIVE	BLACK, NON-HISPANIC	WHITE, NON-HISPANIC	ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER	HISPANIC	OTHER	
Recommended Skills							
PERSONAL	37%	37%	38%	33%	48%	41%	38%
COMMUNICATION	7%	20%	15%	16%	20%	15%	16%
CLIENT	4%	7%	8%	11%	5%	7%	8%
QUANTITATIVE	15%	7%	8%	11%	5%	0%	8%
COMPUTER	17%	5%	8%	9%	4%	15%	8%
MANAGEMENT	4%	8%	8%	7%	5%	4%	7%
JOB-SPECIFIC	11%	7%	6%	4%	4%	15%	6%
ANALYSIS	4%	6%	5%	5%	6%	0%	5%
PROGRAM	0%	4%	4%	5%	1%	4%	4%
All Responses	100% (46)	100% (223)	100% (1062)	100% (57)	100% (95)	100% (27)	100% (1510)

Table B-25

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY SEX

	GENDER		All Responses
	FEMALE	MALE	
Recommended Skills			
PERSONAL	38%	39%	38%
COMMUNICATION	14%	19%	16%
CLIENT	9%	6%	8%
QUANTITATIVE	7%	9%	8%
COMPUTER	9%	4%	8%
MANAGEMENT	6%	12%	7%
JOB-SPECIFIC	8%	1%	6%
ANALYSIS	5%	6%	5%
PROGRAM	4%	4%	4%
	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(1087)	(426)	(1513)

Table B-26

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF BY AGE BY SEX

| | AGE GROUP | | | | | | | | | | All Responses |
| | 18 - 25 | | 26 - 35 | | 36 - 45 | | 46 - 55 | | 56 OR OLDER | | |
	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	
Recommended Skills											
PERSONAL	30%	47%	36%	43%	41%	36%	40%	40%	39%	43%	38%
COMMUNICATION	15%	33%	12%	19%	16%	16%	15%	22%	12%	25%	16%
CLIENT	8%	0%	9%	5%	9%	7%	9%	7%	8%	8%	8%
QUANTITATIVE	4%	0%	10%	9%	7%	10%	5%	12%	9%	4%	8%
COMPUTER	11%	0%	11%	5%	7%	5%	9%	2%	10%	0%	8%
MANAGEMENT	4%	0%	5%	6%	8%	14%	6%	14%	2%	13%	7%
JOB-SPECIFIC	18%	0%	8%	0%	5%	1%	8%	0%	12%	0%	6%
ANALYSIS	5%	7%	5%	9%	5%	7%	4%	3%	5%	2%	5%
PROGRAM	5%	13%	4%	3%	4%	3%	5%	0%	4%	6%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(100)	(15)	(315)	(93)	(382)	(207)	(186)	(58)	(101)	(53)	1510

Table B-27

SKILLS RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF BY ETHNICITY BY SEX

	AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKAN NATIVE		BLACK, NON-HISPANIC		WHITE, NON-HISPANIC		ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER		HISPANIC		OTHER		All Responses
	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	
Recommended Skills													
PERSONAL	38%	25%	34%	44%	38%	38%	39%	24%	48%	49%	35%	57%	38%
COMMUNICATION	5%	25%	18%	24%	13%	19%	17%	14%	18%	23%	15%	14%	16%
CLIENT	5%	0%	7%	7%	9%	7%	17%	0%	7%	3%	10%	0%	8%
QUANTITATIVE	14%	25%	7%	5%	7%	10%	6%	19%	8%	0%	0%	0%	8%
COMPUTER	17%	25%	7%	0%	9%	4%	8%	10%	7%	0%	15%	14%	8%
MANAGEMENT	5%	0%	6%	12%	6%	11%	3%	14%	2%	11%	0%	14%	7%
JOB-SPECIFIC	12%	0%	9%	0%	8%	1%	3%	5%	7%	0%	20%	0%	6%
ANALYSIS	5%	0%	6%	7%	5%	5%	6%	5%	3%	11%	0%	0%	5%
PROGRAM	0%	0%	5%	2%	5%	4%	3%	10%	0%	3%	5%	0%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(42)	(4)	(161)	(59)	(764)	(297)	(36)	(21)	(60)	(35)	(20)	(7)	(1506)

Table B-28

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY TOTAL STATE FUNDS IN PY 88

	PY88 STATE FUNDS			All Responses
	LESS THAN $500,000	$500,000 TO $2 MILLION	MORE THAN $2 MILLION	
Recommended Education				
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	13%	33%	18%	24%
ACCOUNTING	40%	13%	24%	21%
MISCELLANEOUS	20%	11%	25%	19%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	7%	19%	19%	18%
COMPUTER/MIS	13%	10%	11%	11%
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	7%	14%	3%	8%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(15)	(83)	(105)	(203)

Table B-29

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY NUMBER OF STATE JTPA STAFF

	TOTAL STAFF IN PY88			All Responses
	1 - 20	21 - 60	61 +	
Recommended Education				
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	20%	33%	18%	24%
ACCOUNTING	32%	12%	24%	21%
MISCELLANEOUS	12%	12%	25%	19%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	16%	18%	19%	18%
COMPUTER/MIS	8%	11%	11%	11%
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	12%	14%	3%	8%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(25)	(73)	(105)	(203)

Table B-30

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER

	Functional Cluster									All Responses
	POL./ ADMIN.	PUB. CONTACT	LMI	MONITOR	MIS	FISCAL	PERSONNEL	LEGAL	CLERICAL	
Recommended Education										
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	22%	25%	28%	26%	16%	20%	27%	0%	31%	24%
MISCELLANEOUS	19%	24%	28%	20%	13%	12%	24%	100%	26%	20%
ACCOUNTING	17%	11%	11%	23%	22%	37%	18%	100%	26%	20%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	21%	23%	11%	18%	18%	20%	21%	0%	17%	19%
COMPUTER/MIS	11%	8%	11%	3%	27%	5%	5%	0%	14%	10%
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	10%	9%	11%	11%	4%	6%	5%	0%	0%	8%
All Responses	100% (157)	100% (106)	100% (18)	100% (97)	100% (55)	100% (65)	100% (62)	100% (2)	100% (35)	100% (597)

Table B-31

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER BY SUPERVISORY OR NOT

	Functional Cluster									Total
	POL./ ADMIN.	PUB. CONTACT	LMI	MONITOR	MIS	FISCAL	PERSONNEL	LEGAL	CLERICAL	
SUPERVISORY										
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	27%	30%	33%	29%	24%	27%	29%	0%	36%	28%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	23%	26%	0%	20%	29%	27%	24%	0%	27%	24%
MISCELLANEOUS	19%	20%	33%	22%	19%	15%	16%	100%	36%	20%
ACCOUNTING	16%	13%	0%	18%	5%	27%	20%	0%	0%	16%
COMPUTER/MIS	9%	7%	33%	2%	24%	0%	6%	0%	0%	7%
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	7%	4%	0%	9%	0%	3%	4%	0%	0%	5%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(70)	(46)	(3)	(45)	(21)	(33)	(49)	(1)	(11)	(279)
NOT SUPERVISORY										
ACCOUNTING	18%	10%	14%	25%	30%	43%	8%	0%	25%	21%
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	18%	22%	29%	24%	12%	13%	23%	0%	29%	20%
MISCELLANEOUS	19%	25%	21%	18%	9%	10%	54%	100%	21%	20%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	20%	20%	14%	16%	12%	13%	8%	0%	4%	16%
COMPUTER/MIS	14%	8%	7%	4%	30%	10%	0%	0%	21%	12%
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	12%	14%	14%	14%	6%	10%	8%	0%	0%	11%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(85)	(59)	(14)	(51)	(33)	(30)	(13)	(1)	(24)	(310)

Table B-32

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION

	HIGHEST LEVEL OF ED COMPLETED							All Responses
	HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA/ GED	SOME COLLEGE	ASSOCIATE DEGREE	BACHELOR DEGREE	MASTER'S DEGREE	DOCTORAL DEGREE	OTHER	
Recommended Education								
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	80%	27%	16%	25%	21%	0%	0%	24%
ACCOUNTING	20%	42%	42%	16%	11%	0%	67%	21%
MISCELLANEOUS	0%	15%	26%	23%	12%	40%	0%	19%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	0%	0%	5%	20%	26%	40%	33%	18%
COMPUTER/MIS	0%	15%	5%	10%	14%	0%	0%	11%
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	0%	0%	5%	6%	16%	20%	0%	8%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(5)	(26)	(19)	(88)	(57)	(5)	(3)	(203)

Table B-33

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN CURRENT POSITION

	HOW LONG EMPLOYED CURRENT POS					All Responses
	LESS THAN 6 MOS	6 - 12 MOS	1 - 2 YEARS	3 - 4 YEARS	5 OR MORE YEARS	
Recommended Education						
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	31%	14%	19%	33%	21%	24%
ACCOUNTING	19%	57%	11%	17%	24%	21%
MISCELLANEOUS	15%	0%	31%	13%	17%	19%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	19%	7%	19%	17%	21%	18%
COMPUTER/MIS	12%	14%	9%	13%	10%	11%
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	4%	7%	11%	7%	8%	8%
All Responses	100% (26)	100% (14)	100% (54)	100% (46)	100% (63)	100% (203)

Table B-34

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN ANY JTPA OR CETA POSITION

	HOW LONG ANY JTPA/CETA POS						All Responses
	LESS THAN 6 MOS	6 - 12 MOS	1 - 2 YEARS	3 - 4 YEARS	5 - 9 YEARS	10 OR MORE YEARS	
Recommended Education							
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	17%	22%	19%	26%	24%	23%	23%
ACCOUNTING	25%	67%	19%	30%	19%	14%	21%
MISCELLANEOUS	17%	0%	19%	11%	19%	24%	19%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	17%	11%	24%	11%	19%	20%	18%
COMPUTER/MIS	25%	0%	14%	19%	10%	8%	11%
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	0%	0%	5%	4%	10%	11%	8%
All Responses	100% (12)	100% (9)	100% (21)	100% (27)	100% (42)	100% (87)	100% (198)

B-34

Table B-35

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY LENGTH OF EMPLOY IN ANY PUBLIC SECTOR OR NONPROFIT JOB TRNING POSITION

| | HOW LONG ANY PUB SECTOR POS | | | | | | All Responses |
	LESS THAN 6 MOS	6 - 12 MOS	1 - 2 YEARS	3 - 4 YEARS	5 - 9 YEARS	10 OR MORE YEARS	
Recommended Education							
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	20%	25%	23%	25%	27%	23%	24%
ACCOUNTING	20%	75%	23%	25%	24%	15%	20%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	20%	0%	15%	10%	24%	19%	19%
MISCELLANEOUS	20%	0%	23%	15%	11%	22%	19%
COMPUTER/MIS	20%	0%	15%	25%	8%	8%	11%
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	12%	8%
All Responses	100% (10)	100% (4)	100% (13)	100% (20)	100% (37)	100% (113)	100% (197)

Table B-36

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF BY AGE

	AGE GROUP					All Responses
	18 - 25	26 - 35	36 - 45	46 - 55	56 OR OLDER	
Recommended Education						
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	50%	26%	24%	20%	22%	23%
ACCOUNTING	0%	24%	19%	22%	22%	21%
MISCELLANEOUS	50%	21%	15%	24%	11%	19%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	0%	11%	25%	12%	22%	18%
COMPUTER/MIS	0%	18%	10%	7%	17%	11%
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	0%	0%	7%	15%	6%	8%
All Responses	100% (2)	100% (38)	100% (84)	100% (59)	100% (18)	100% (201)

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF BY ETHNICITY

	ETHNICITY				All Responses
	BLACK, NON-HISPANIC	WHITE, NON-HISPANIC	ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER	HISPANIC	
Recommended Education					
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	41%	22%	0%	15%	24%
ACCOUNTING	22%	21%	25%	23%	21%
MISCELLANEOUS	15%	17%	25%	46%	19%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	11%	19%	0%	15%	18%
COMPUTER/MIS	11%	10%	50%	0%	11%
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	0%	10%	0%	0%	8%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(27)	(155)	(4)	(13)	(199)

Table B-38

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY SEX

	GENDER		All Responses
	FEMALE	MALE	
Recommended Education			
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	28%	20%	24%
ACCOUNTING	23%	18%	20%
MISCELLANEOUS	16%	21%	19%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	16%	20%	18%
COMPUTER/MIS	12%	10%	11%
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	5%	10%	8%
	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(93)	(109)	(202)

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF BY AGE BY SEX

	AGE GROUP									Total
	18 - 25	26 - 35		36 - 45		46 - 55		56 OR OLDER		
	FEMALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	
Recommended Education										
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	50%	29%	21%	28%	20%	26%	18%	20%	25%	24%
ACCOUNTING	0%	29%	14%	21%	17%	21%	23%	20%	17%	21%
MISCELLANEOUS	50%	17%	29%	12%	20%	26%	23%	0%	17%	19%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	0%	8%	14%	26%	24%	5%	15%	20%	25%	18%
COMPUTER/MIS	0%	17%	21%	9%	10%	5%	8%	40%	8%	11%
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	0%	0%	0%	5%	10%	16%	15%	0%	8%	8%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(2)	(24)	(14)	(43)	(41)	(19)	(40)	(5)	(12)	(200)

Table B-40

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF BY ETHNICITY BY SEX

	BLACK, NON-HISPANIC		WHITE, NON-HISPANIC		ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER	HISPANIC		Total
	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	FEMALE	MALE	
Recommended Education								
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	41%	40%	26%	19%	0%	29%	0%	24%
ACCOUNTING	24%	20%	23%	18%	25%	14%	33%	21%
MISCELLANEOUS	12%	20%	15%	19%	25%	29%	67%	19%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	12%	10%	17%	21%	0%	29%	0%	18%
COMPUTER/MIS	12%	10%	11%	10%	50%	0%	0%	11%
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	0%	0%	8%	12%	0%	0%	0%	8%
All Responses	100% (17)	100% (10)	100% (65)	100% (89)	100% (4)	100% (7)	100% (6)	100% (198)

Table B-41

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY SDA ALLOCATION IN PY 88

	PY88 IIA ALLOCATION			All Responses
	BELOW $1 MILLION	$1-1.9 MILLION	$2-6.9 MILLION	
Recommended Education				
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	51%	45%	48%	48%
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	13%	19%	16%	17%
MISCELLANEOUS	8%	8%	12%	10%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	8%	13%	7%	9%
ACCOUNTING	13%	7%	9%	9%
COMPUTER/MIS	8%	7%	7%	7%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(53)	(121)	(196)	(370)

Table B-42

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY NUMBER OF SDA STAFF

	II-A STAFF SIZE IN 88			All Responses
	1 - 10	11 - 30	31 +	
Recommended Education				
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	21%	50%	54%	48%
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	27%	15%	15%	17%
MISCELLANEOUS	7%	11%	11%	10%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	20%	11%	5%	9%
ACCOUNTING	13%	7%	9%	9%
COMPUTER/MIS	13%	6%	6%	7%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(56)	(123)	(191)	(370)

Table B-43
EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY

	ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE			All Responses
	PIC	GOVERNMEN	CBO/OTHER	
Recommended Education				
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	52%	46%	36%	48%
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	16%	17%	27%	17%
MISCELLANEOUS	14%	9%	0%	10%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	5%	12%	0%	9%
ACCOUNTING	7%	10%	18%	9%
COMPUTER/MIS	7%	7%	18%	7%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(133)	(226)	(11)	(370)

Table B-44

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER

	Functional Cluster												All Responses
	POL./ ADMIN.	CLIENT SVC.	CLASS TRAIN	INTERP RETING	MONITO R	MIS/ JASR	DATA PROC.	FISCAL	PROCUR EMENT	PERSON NEL	LEGAL	CLERIC AL	
Recommended Education													
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	49%	61%	68%	79%	51%	27%	38%	27%	34%	44%	29%	39%	47%
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	18%	14%	11%	11%	17%	18%	16%	22%	23%	22%	29%	16%	17%
MISCELLANEOUS	12%	12%	15%	5%	9%	5%	8%	9%	8%	8%	14%	11%	10%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	11%	7%	2%	5%	13%	9%	6%	16%	8%	14%	0%	7%	10%
ACCOUNTING	7%	3%	1%	0%	5%	18%	17%	20%	18%	8%	14%	11%	9%
COMPUTER/MIS	3%	3%	3%	0%	5%	23%	15%	5%	8%	4%	14%	18%	6%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(268)	(274)	(95)	(19)	(164)	(56)	(132)	(148)	(71)	(133)	(7)	(57)	(1424)

Table B-45

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER BY SUPERVISORY OR NOT

	Functional Cluster												Total
	POL./ ADMIN.	CLIENT SVC.	CLASS TRAIN	INTERP RETING	MONITOR	MIS/ JASR	DATA PROC.	FISCAL	PROCUR EMENT	PERSON NEL	LEGAL	CLERIC AL	
SUPERVISORY													
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	42%	55%	56%	100%	51%	28%	42%	28%	38%	42%	33%	52%	44%
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	25%	20%	17%	0%	20%	28%	19%	29%	29%	27%	33%	17%	23%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	13%	10%	5%	0%	12%	14%	7%	16%	13%	13%	0%	13%	12%
ACCOUNTING	8%	3%	2%	0%	5%	10%	14%	16%	11%	9%	17%	9%	8%
MISCELLANEOUS	8%	8%	15%	0%	7%	3%	9%	9%	4%	5%	0%	9%	8%
COMPUTER/MIS	3%	5%	5%	0%	5%	17%	9%	1%	4%	5%	17%	0%	5%
	100% (130)	100% (102)	100% (41)	100% (7)	100% (83)	100% (29)	100% (57)	100% (75)	100% (45)	100% (104)	100% (6)	100% (23)	100% (702)
NOT SUPERVISORY													
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	57%	66%	78%	67%	52%	26%	36%	27%	32%	57%	0%	29%	52%
MISCELLANEOUS	14%	14%	15%	8%	10%	7%	7%	8%	9%	19%	100%	12%	12%
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	12%	11%	6%	17%	12%	7%	13%	12%	9%	0%	0%	15%	11%
ACCOUNTING	5%	3%	0%	0%	5%	26%	18%	26%	32%	5%	0%	12%	9%
COMPUTER/MIS	2%	2%	2%	0%	5%	30%	21%	11%	18%	0%	0%	29%	8%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	9%	6%	0%	8%	15%	4%	6%	17%	0%	19%	0%	3%	8%
	100% (127)	100% (160)	100% (54)	100% (12)	100% (73)	100% (27)	100% (72)	100% (66)	100% (22)	100% (21)	100% (1)	100% (34)	100% (669)

B-45

Table B-46

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION

	HIGHEST LEVEL OF ED COMPLETED								All Responses
	DID NOT FINISH HS	HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA/ GED	SOME COLLEGE	ASSOCIATE DEGREE	BACHELOR DEGREE	MASTER'S DEGREE	DOCTORAL DEGREE	OTHER	
Recommended Education									
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	67%	23%	32%	44%	54%	50%	50%	0%	48%
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	0%	8%	21%	22%	18%	13%	0%	0%	17%
MISCELLANEOUS	0%	8%	10%	11%	11%	10%	0%	0%	10%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	0%	8%	5%	0%	7%	19%	50%	0%	9%
ACCOUNTING	0%	15%	16%	15%	6%	7%	0%	0%	9%
COMPUTER/MIS	33%	38%	16%	7%	3%	1%	0%	100%	7%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(3)	(13)	(62)	(27)	(175)	(84)	(2)	(1)	(367)

Table B-47

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN CURRENT POSITION

	HOW LONG EMPLOYED CURRENT POS					All Responses
	LESS THAN 6 MOS	6 - 12 MOS	1 - 2 YEARS	3 - 4 YEARS	5 OR MORE YEARS	
Recommended Education						
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	54%	58%	45%	47%	44%	48%
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	14%	16%	16%	20%	17%	17%
MISCELLANEOUS	14%	11%	12%	8%	9%	10%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	3%	13%	16%	5%	7%	9%
ACCOUNTING	3%	0%	7%	11%	13%	9%
COMPUTER/MIS	11%	2%	3%	8%	9%	7%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(35)	(45)	(86)	(74)	(127)	(367)

Table B-48

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN ANY JTPA OR CETA POSITION

	HOW LONG ANY JTPA/CETA POS						All Responses
	LESS THAN 6 MOS	6 - 12 MOS	1 - 2 YEARS	3 - 4 YEARS	5 - 9 YEARS	10 OR MORE YEARS	
Recommended Education							
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	64%	54%	46%	48%	57%	38%	48%
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	14%	14%	16%	14%	14%	22%	17%
MISCELLANEOUS	0%	18%	12%	9%	8%	12%	10%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	7%	7%	14%	9%	9%	8%	9%
ACCOUNTING	0%	4%	6%	11%	4%	15%	9%
COMPUTER/MIS	14%	4%	6%	9%	9%	6%	7%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(14)	(28)	(69)	(56)	(79)	(120)	(366)

B-48

Table B-49

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY LENGTH OF EMPLOY IN ANY PUBLIC SECTOR OR NONPROFIT JOB TRNING POSITION

| | HOW LONG ANY PUB SECTOR POS | | | | | | All Responses |
	LESS THAN 6 MOS	6 - 12 MOS	1 - 2 YEARS	3 - 4 YEARS	5 - 9 YEARS	10 OR MORE YEARS	
Recommended Education							
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	55%	55%	45%	45%	61%	40%	48%
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	18%	15%	15%	15%	12%	22%	17%
MISCELLANEOUS	0%	15%	11%	11%	9%	10%	10%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	9%	10%	17%	8%	6%	9%	9%
ACCOUNTING	0%	5%	8%	8%	4%	13%	8%
COMPUTER/MIS	18%	0%	4%	13%	9%	5%	7%
All Responses	100% (11)	100% (20)	100% (53)	100% (62)	100% (82)	100% (134)	100% (362)

Table B-50
EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF BY AGE

	AGE GROUP					All Responses
	18 - 25	26 - 35	36 - 45	46 - 55	56 OR OLDER	
Recommended Education						
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	40%	52%	46%	48%	46%	48%
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	10%	18%	18%	14%	17%	17%
MISCELLANEOUS	15%	7%	11%	16%	6%	10%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	15%	8%	11%	7%	6%	9%
ACCOUNTING	0%	8%	9%	9%	14%	9%
COMPUTER/MIS	20%	7%	5%	7%	·11%	7%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(20)	(106)	(151)	(58)	(35)	(370)

Table B-51

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF BY ETHNICITY

	ETHNICITY						All Responses
	AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKAN NATIVE	BLACK, NON-HISPANIC	WHITE, NON-HISPANIC	ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER	HISPANIC	OTHER	
Recommended Education							
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	17%	52%	49%	50%	53%	20%	48%
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	17%	17%	17%	14%	7%	20%	17%
MISCELLANEOUS	0%	11%	10%	7%	20%	20%	10%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	17%	7%	9%	7%	20%	0%	9%
ACCOUNTING	25%	7%	8%	21%	0%	20%	9%
COMPUTER/MIS	25%	6%	7%	0%	0%	20%	7%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(12)	(54)	(270)	(14)	(15)	(5)	(370)

Table B-52

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY SEX

	GENDER		All Responses
	FEMALE	MALE	
Recommended Education			
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	51%	40%	48%
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	15%	21%	17%
MISCELLANEOUS	9%	14%	10%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	7%	14%	9%
ACCOUNTING	8%	10%	9%
COMPUTER/MIS	9%	2%	7%
All Responses	100% (253)	100% (116)	100% (369)

Table B-53

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF BY AGE BY SEX

	AGE GROUP										All Responses
	18 - 25		26 - 35		36 - 45		46 - 55		56 OR OLDER		
	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	
Recommended Education											
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	47%	20%	55%	42%	52%	37%	51%	36%	40%	53%	48%
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	13%	0%	18%	19%	13%	25%	15%	9%	15%	20%	17%
MISCELLANEOUS	13%	20%	1%	23%	12%	10%	13%	27%	10%	0%	10%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	7%	40%	9%	8%	9%	14%	4%	18%	0%	13%	9%
ACCOUNTING	0%	0%	9%	8%	8%	12%	9%	9%	15%	13%	9%
COMPUTER/MIS	20%	20%	9%	0%	7%	2%	9%	0%	20%	0%	7%
All Responses	100% (15)	100% (5)	100% (80)	100% (26)	100% (91)	100% (59)	100% (47)	100% (11)	100% (20)	100% (15)	100% (369)

B-53

Table B-54

EDUCATION RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF BY ETHNICITY BY SEX

	AMERICAN INDIAN /ALASKAN NATIVE	BLACK, NON-HISPANIC		WHITE, NON-HISPANIC		ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER		HISPANIC		OTHER		All Responses
	FEMALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	
Recommended Education												
HMN SERVICE/EDUC	17%	50%	56%	53%	39%	70%	0%	56%	50%	33%	0%	48%
BUS AD/PERSONNEL	17%	16%	19%	15%	22%	10%	25%	11%	0%	0%	50%	17%
MISCELLANEOUS	0%	8%	19%	9%	13%	10%	0%	22%	17%	0%	50%	10%
PUB ADMIN/POLICY	17%	8%	6%	6%	15%	10%	0%	11%	33%	0%	0%	9%
ACCOUNTING	25%	11%	0%	7%	10%	0%	75%	0%	0%	33%	0%	9%
COMPUTER/MIS	25%	8%	0%	9%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	7%
All Responses	100% (12)	100% (38)	100% (16)	100% (181)	100% (88)	100% (10)	100% (4)	100% (9)	100% (6)	100% (3)	100% (2)	100% (369)

Table B-55

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY TOTAL STATE FUNDS IN PY 88 ·

	PY88 STATE FUNDS			All Responses
	LESS THAN $500,000	$500,000 TO $2 MILLION	MORE THAN $2 MILLION	
Recommended Experience				
PROGRAM	20%	41%	44%	41%
FISCAL	27%	13%	14%	15%
PUBLIC SECTOR	13%	14%	13%	13%
SECRETARIAL	7%	9%	10%	10%
SUPRVSRY/PERSONNEL	20%	7%	7%	8%
HUMAN SERVICE	0%	12%	5%	7%
COMPUTER/MIS	13%	2%	7%	5%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(15)	(97)	(163)	(275)

Table B-56

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY NUMBER OF STATE JTPA STAFF

	TOTAL STAFF IN PY88			All Responses
	1 - 20	21 - 60	61 +	
Recommended Experience				
PROGRAM	30%	41%	44%	41%
FISCAL	19%	14%	14%	15%
PUBLIC SECTOR	19%	13%	13%	13%
SECRETARIAL	4%	11%	10%	10%
SUPRVSRY/PERSONNEL	15%	7%	7%	8%
HUMAN SERVICE	7%	12%	5%	7%
COMPUTER/MIS	7%	2%	7%	5%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(27)	(85)	(163)	(275)

Table B-57

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER

	Functional Cluster									All Responses
	POL./ ADMIN.	PUB. CONTACT	LMI	MONITOR	MIS	FISCAL	PERSONNEL	LEGAL	CLERICAL	
Recommended Experience										
PROGRAM	49%	50%	50%	46%	32%	38%	47%	33%	11%	43%
FISCAL ➔	14%	11%	7%	20%	15%	30%	15%	33%	13%	16%
PUBLIC SECTOR	16%	16%	14%	16%	13%	17%	12%	33%	7%	15%
SUPRVSRY/PERSONNEL	7%	8%	7%	8%	9%	8%	12%	0%	13%	9%
HUMAN SERVICE	9%	11%	14%	8%	5%	4%	5%	0%	4%	7%
SECRETARIAL	0%	3%	0%	0%	12%	0%	5%	0%	44%	5%
COMPUTER/MIS	4%	2%	7%	2%	15%	4%	4%	0%	9%	5%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(202)	(158)	(14)	(123)	(82)	(84)	(81)	(3)	(55)	(802)

Table B-58

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER BY SUPERVISORY OR NOT

	Functional Cluster									Total
	POL./ ADMIN.	PUB. CONTACT	LMI	MONITOR	MIS	FISCAL	PERSONNEL	LEGAL	CLERICAL	
SUPERVISORY										
PROGRAM	52%	52%	67%	52%	41%	44%	49%	0%	25%	48%
FISCAL	14%	13%	0%	17%	9%	24%	15%	50%	13%	15%
SUPRVSRY/PERSONNEL	12%	13%	33%	13%	16%	15%	15%	0%	25%	14%
PUBLIC SECTOR	14%	12%	0%	11%	16%	15%	12%	50%	6%	13%
COMPUTER/MIS	4%	3%	0%	4%	13%	0%	3%	0%	6%	4%
HUMAN SERVICE	4%	6%	0%	4%	3%	2%	3%	0%	0%	4%
SECRETARIAL	0%	1%	0%	0%	3%	0%	2%	0%	25%	2%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(94)	(69)	(3)	(54)	(32)	(41)	(59)	(2)	(16)	(370)
NOT SUPERVISORY										
PROGRAM	47%	48%	45%	41%	27%	33%	41%	100%	5%	38%
PUBLIC SECTOR	19%	19%	18%	21%	12%	18%	14%	0%	8%	17%
FISCAL	14%	9%	9%	22%	18%	35%	14%	0%	13%	16%
HUMAN SERVICE	13%	15%	18%	12%	6%	5%	9%	0%	5%	11%
SECRETARIAL	1%	3%	0%	0%	18%	0%	14%	0%	51%	8%
COMPUTER/MIS	4%	1%	9%	1%	16%	8%	5%	0%	10%	5%
SUPRVSRY/PERSONNEL	3%	4%	0%	3%	2%	3%	5%	0%	8%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(107)	(89)	(11)	(68)	(49)	(40)	(22)	(1)	(39)	(426)

Table B-59

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF

By Level of Education

	HIGHEST LEVEL OF ED COMPLETED							All Responses
	HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA/ GED	SOME COLLEGE	ASSOCIATE DEGREE	BACHELOR DEGREE	MASTER'S DEGREE	DOCTORAL DEGREE	OTHER	
Recommended Experience								
PROGRAM	11%	31%	26%	50%	45%	83%	20%	41%
FISCAL	5%	21%	11%	16%	11%	0%	20%	15%
PUBLIC SECTOR	5%	5%	16%	14%	19%	17%	20%	13%
SECRETARIAL	47%	24%	21%	1%	0%	0%	30%	10%
SUPRVSRY/PERSONNEL	16%	2%	5%	10%	6%	0%	10%	8%
HUMAN SERVICE	0%	7%	5%	6%	15%	0%	0%	7%
COMPUTER/MIS	16%	10%	16%	3%	3%	0%	0%	5%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(19)	(42)	(19)	(117)	(62)	(6)	(10)	(275)

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN CURRENT POSITION

	HOW LONG EMPLOYED CURRENT POS					All Responses
	LESS THAN 6 MOS	6 - 12 MOS	1 - 2 YEARS	3 - 4 YEARS	5 OR MORE YEARS	
Recommended Experience						
PROGRAM	41%	30%	40%	44%	45%	41%
FISCAL	16%	11%	13%	15%	16%	15%
PUBLIC SECTOR	14%	19%	17%	9%	12%	13%
SECRETARIAL	8%	26%	13%	7%	5%	10%
SUPRVSRY/PERSONNEL	5%	7%	9%	13%	6%	8%
HUMAN SERVICE	11%	0%	4%	9%	9%	7%
COMPUTER/MIS	5%	7%	4%	4%	7%	5%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(37)	(27)	(70)	(55)	(86)	(275)

Table B-61

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN ANY JTPA OR CETA POSITION

	HOW LONG ANY JTPA/CETA POS						All Responses
	LESS THAN 6 MOS	6 - 12 MOS	1 - 2 YEARS	3 - 4 YEARS	5 - 9 YEARS	10 OR MORE YEARS	
Recommended Experience							
PROGRAM	26%	20%	26%	26%	50%	54%	42%
FISCAL	21%	13%	19%	15%	17%	10%	14%
PUBLIC SECTOR	16%	20%	13%	18%	9%	12%	13%
SECRETARIAL	21%	20%	26%	13%	7%	2%	10%
SUPRVSRY/PERSONNEL	0%	13%	6%	10%	7%	8%	8%
HUMAN SERVICE	11%	7%	3%	8%	9%	7%	7%
COMPUTER/MIS	5%	7%	6%	10%	2%	6%	6%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(19)	(15)	(31)	(39)	(58)	(107)	(269)

Table B-62

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY LENGTH OF EMPLOY IN ANY PUBLIC SECTOR OR NONPROFIT JOB TRNING POSITION

	HOW LONG ANY PUB SECTOR POS						All Responses
	LESS THAN 6 MOS	6 - 12 MOS	1 - 2 YEARS	3 - 4 YEARS	5 - 9 YEARS	10 OR MORE YEARS	
Recommended Experience							
PROGRAM	19%	22%	10%	15%	37%	54%	41%
FISCAL	25%	22%	25%	15%	17%	12%	15%
PUBLIC SECTOR	13%	0%	10%	22%	20%	12%	14%
SECRETARIAL	25%	33%	35%	19%	12%	2%	10%
SUPRVSRY/PERSONNEL	0%	0%	5%	15%	10%	8%	8%
HUMAN SERVICE	13%	11%	5%	4%	2%	8%	7%
COMPUTER/MIS	6%	11%	10%	11%	2%	3%	5%
All Responses	100% (16)	100% (9)	100% (20)	100% (27)	100% (41)	100% (156)	100% (269)

Table B-63

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF BY AGE

	AGE GROUP					All Responses
	18 - 25	26 - 35	36 - 45	46 - 55	56 OR OLDER	
Recommended Experience						
PROGRAM	25%	20%	47%	45%	50%	41%
FISCAL	0%	20%	15%	15%	8%	15%
PUBLIC SECTOR	0%	24%	9%	15%	15%	14%
SECRETARIAL	50%	20%	8%	5%	4%	10%
SUPRVSRY/PERSONNEL	0%	8%	9%	6%	8%	8%
HUMAN SERVICE	0%	4%	8%	6%	15%	7%
COMPUTER/MIS	25%	6%	5%	8%	0%	5%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(4)	(51)	(131)	(62)	(26)	(274)

Table B-64

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF BY ETHNICITY

	ETHNICITY					All Responses
	AMERICAN INDIAN/AL ASKAN NATIVE	BLACK, NON-HISPA NIC	WHITE, NON-HISPA NIC	ASIAN/PAC IFIC ISLANDER	HISPANIC	
Recommended Experience						
PROGRAM	33%	29%	43%	57%	45%	41%
FISCAL	0%	29%	13%	14%	9%	15%
PUBLIC SECTOR	33%	18%	14%	0%	0%	14%
SECRETARIAL	33%	12%	9%	14%	9%	10%
SUPRVSRY/PERSONNEL	0%	3%	9%	0%	9%	8%
HUMAN SERVICE	0%	3%	7%	0%	27%	7%
COMPUTER/MIS	0%	6%	6%	14%	0%	5%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(3)	(34)	(218)	(7)	(11)	(273)

Table B-65

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF
BY SEX

	GENDER		All Responses
	FEMALE	MALE	
Recommended Experience			
PROGRAM	36%	48%	41%
FISCAL	15%	14%	15%
PUBLIC SECTOR	11%	17%	13%
SECRETARIAL	18%	0%	10%
SUPRVSRY/PERSONNEL	8%	8%	8%
HUMAN SERVICE	5%	10%	7%
COMPUTER/MIS	7%	4%	5%
	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(151)	(124)	(275)

Table B-66

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF BY AGE BY SEX

	AGE GROUP									Total
	18 - 25	26 - 35		36 - 45		46 - 55		56 OR OLDER		
	FEMALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	
Recommended Education										
PROGRAM	25%	24%	7%	45%	49%	27%	55%	38%	56%	41%
FISCAL	0%	14%	36%	14%	16%	27%	8%	13%	6%	15%
PUBLIC SECTOR	0%	14%	50%	9%	10%	5%	20%	38%	6%	14%
SECRETARIAL	50%	27%	0%	14%	0%	14%	0%	13%	0%	10%
SUPRVSRY/PERSONNEL	0%	11%	0%	9%	10%	5%	8%	0%	11%	8%
HUMAN SERVICE	0%	3%	7%	6%	10%	9%	5%	0%	22%	7%
COMPUTER/MIS	25%	8%	0%	4%	6%	14%	5%	0%	0%	5%
All Responses	100% (4)	100% (37)	100% (14)	100% (80)	100% (51)	100% (22)	100% (40)	100% (8)	100% (18)	100% (274)

Table B-67

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY STATE STAFF BY ETHNICITY BY SEX

	AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKAN NATIVE		BLACK, NON-HISPANIC		WHITE, NON-HISPANIC		ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER		HISPANIC		Total
	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	
Recommended Education											
PROGRAM	0%	50%	30%	27%	38%	48%	0%	80%	50%	43%	41%
FISCAL	0%	0%	22%	45%	15%	10%	0%	20%	0%	14%	15%
PUBLIC SECTOR	0%	50%	13%	27%	11%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%
SECRETARIAL	100%	0%	17%	0%	16%	0%	50%	0%	25%	0%	10%
SUPRVSRY/PERSONNEL	0%	0%	4%	0%	9%	9%	0%	0%	0%	14%	8%
HUMAN SERVICE	0%	0%	4%	0%	5%	10%	0%	0%	25%	29%	7%
COMPUTER/MIS	0%	0%	9%	0%	6%	5%	50%	0%	0%	0%	5%
All Responses	100% (1)	100% (2)	100% (23)	100% (11)	100% (120)	100% (98)	100% (2)	100% (5)	100% (4)	100% (7)	100% (273)

Table B-68

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY SDA ALLOCATION IN PY 88

	PY88 IIA ALLOCATION			All Responses
	BELOW $1 MILLION	$1-1.9 MILLION	$2-6.9 MILLION	
Recommended Experience				
HUMAN SERVICE	29%	29%	23%	26%
PROGRAM	19%	18%	24%	22%
PUBLIC SECTOR	18%	25%	18%	20%
SECRETARIAL	7%	8%	10%	9%
SUPVSRY/PERSNNL	6%	9%	6%	7%
PRIVATE SECTOR	11%	4%	7%	7%
FISCAL	8%	3%	7%	6%
COMPUTER/MIS	1%	4%	5%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(72)	(186)	(346)	(604)

Table B-69

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY NUMBER OF SDA STAFF

	II-A STAFF SIZE IN 88			All Responses
	1 - 10	11 - 30	31 +	
Recommended Experience				
HUMAN SERVICE	15%	30%	26%	26%
PROGRAM	26%	19%	21%	22%
PUBLIC SECTOR	21%	25%	17%	20%
SECRETARIAL	5%	7%	11%	9%
SUPVSRY/PERSNNL	7%	8%	6%	7%
PRIVATE SECTOR	9%	4%	7%	7%
FISCAL	11%	3%	6%	6%
COMPUTER/MIS	5%	3%	5%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(99)	(195)	(310)	(604)

Table B-70

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY TYPE OF ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY

	ADMINISTRATIVE ENTITY TYPE			All Responses
	PIC	GOVERNMEN	CBO/OTHER	
Recommended Experience				
HUMAN SERVICE	27%	25%	28%	26%
PROGRAM	23%	21%	24%	22%
PUBLIC SECTOR	16%	23%	17%	20%
SECRETARIAL	9%	9%	7%	9%
SUPVSRY/PERSNNL	8%	6%	7%	7%
PRIVATE SECTOR	8%	6%	3%	7%
FISCAL	5%	6%	10%	6%
COMPUTER/MIS	4%	4%	3%	4%
All Responses	100% (204)	100% (371)	100% (29)	100% (604)

Table B-71

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER

	Functional Cluster												All Responses
	POL./ ADMIN.	CLIENT SVC.	CLASS TRAIN	INTERP RETING	MONITO R	MIS/ JASR	DATA PROC.	FISCAL	PROCUR EMENT	PERSON NEL	LEGAL	CLERIC AL	
Recommended Experience													
HUMAN SERVICE	27%	32%	40%	45%	22%	15%	20%	16%	15%	17%	10%	18%	24%
PUBLIC SECTOR	23%	22%	24%	13%	21%	22%	22%	19%	21%	23%	40%	17%	22%
PROGRAM	24%	22%	15%	16%	26%	16%	15%	27%	22%	26%	30%	13%	22%
SUPVSRY/PERSNNL	9%	7%	5%	6%	11%	7%	6%	10%	13%	13%	0%	6%	9%
PRIVATE SECTOR	8%	7%	9%	10%	7%	10%	7%	8%	8%	10%	10%	6%	8%
SECRETARIAL	2%	5%	1%	6%	4%	8%	16%	4%	7%	3%	0%	31%	7%
FISCAL	5%	3%	1%	0%	6%	10%	7%	12%	11%	6%	0%	3%	6%
COMPUTER/MIS	3%	3%	4%	3%	3%	13%	8%	3%	3%	3%	10%	7%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(443)	(455)	(147)	(31)	(281)	(101)	(238)	(237)	(110)	(211)	(10)	(139)	(2403)

Table B-72

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY FUNCTIONAL CLUSTER BY SUPERVISORY OR NOT

	Functional Cluster												Total
	POL./ ADMIN.	CLIENT SVC.	CLASS TRAIN	INTERP RETING	MONITO R	MIS/ JASR	DATA PROC.	FISCAL	PROCUR EMENT	PERSON NEL	LEGAL	CLERIC AL	
SUPERVISORY													
PROGRAM	28%	28%	20%	33%	28%	26%	17%	30%	27%	27%	25%	22%	26%
PUBLIC SECTOR	23%	24%	25%	11%	23%	18%	25%	21%	18%	23%	50%	20%	23%
HUMAN SERVICE	17%	21%	22%	22%	14%	16%	15%	11%	18%	16%	13%	12%	16%
SUPVSRY/PERSNNL	13%	12%	12%	11%	16%	12%	11%	14%	16%	14%	0%	20%	13%
PRIVATE SECTOR	9%	9%	13%	11%	9%	10%	13%	12%	9%	10%	13%	10%	10%
FISCAL	7%	4%	3%	0%	9%	8%	8%	11%	7%	7%	0%	0%	7%
COMPUTER/MIS	2%	2%	3%	11%	1%	8%	5%	2%	3%	2%	0%	5%	3%
SECRETARIAL	1%	2%	2%	0%	1%	2%	7%	1%	1%	1%	0%	12%	2%
	100% (208)	100% (169)	100% (60)	100% (9)	100% (140)	100% (50)	100% (88)	100% (130)	100% (67)	100% (162)	100% (8)	100% (41)	100% (1132)
NOT SUPERVISORY													
HUMAN SERVICE	36%	39%	53%	53%	34%	15%	24%	26%	14%	24%	0%	21%	33%
PUBLIC SECTOR	22%	21%	24%	16%	18%	22%	19%	17%	25%	19%	0%	15%	20%
PROGRAM	20%	19%	13%	11%	23%	7%	13%	21%	11%	22%	50%	10%	17%
SECRETARIAL	4%	7%	1%	5%	6%	13%	21%	8%	19%	11%	0%	38%	11%
COMPUTER/MIS	3%	3%	4%	0%	5%	20%	11%	5%	3%	8%	50%	7%	6%
PRIVATE SECTOR	7%	6%	6%	11%	5%	11%	4%	3%	8%	8%	0%	4%	6%
FISCAL	3%	2%	0%	0%	5%	13%	7%	16%	19%	3%	0%	4%	5%
SUPVSRY/PERSNNL	4%	2%	0%	5%	5%	0%	1%	3%	0%	5%	0%	0%	3%
	100% (214)	100% (261)	100% (80)	100% (19)	100% (130)	100% (46)	100% (142)	100% (95)	100% (36)	100% (37)	100% (2)	100% (94)	100% (1156)

Table B-73

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY LEVEL OF EDUCATION

	HIGHEST LEVEL OF ED COMPLETED								All Responses
	DID NOT FINISH HS	HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA/ GED	SOME COLLEGE	ASSOCIATE DEGREE	BACHELOR DEGREE	MASTER'S DEGREE	DOCTORAL DEGREE	OTHER	
Recommended Experience									
HUMAN SERVICE	25%	11%	23%	34%	29%	27%	0%	13%	26%
PROGRAM	0%	18%	19%	8%	22%	29%	50%	13%	21%
PUBLIC SECTOR	25%	20%	19%	18%	21%	19%	50%	25%	20%
SECRETARIAL	25%	38%	15%	18%.	1%	0%	0%	50%	9%
SUPVSRY/PERSNNL	0%	0%	6%	3%	8%	13%	0%	0%	7%
PRIVATE SECTOR	0%	4%	3%	8%	9%	7%	0%	0%	7%
FISCAL	0%	2%	9%	5%	6%	3%	0%	0%	6%
COMPUTER/MIS	25%	7%	6%	5%	3%	2%	0%	0%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(4)	(45)	(144)	(38)	(257)	(103)	(2)	(8)	(601)

Table B-74

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN CURRENT POSITION

	HOW LONG EMPLOYED CURRENT POS					All Responses
	LESS THAN 6 MOS	6 - 12 MOS	1 - 2 YEARS	3 - 4 YEARS	5 OR MORE YEARS	
Recommended Experience						
HUMAN SERVICE	40%	34%	25%	26%	20%	26%
PROGRAM	30%	19%	20%	19%	22%	21%
PUBLIC SECTOR	7%	20%	23%	22%	22%	20%
SECRETARIAL	9%	9%	10%	9%	8%	9%
SUPVSRY/PERSNNL	4%	8%	7%	7%	8%	7%
PRIVATE SECTOR	3%	6%	5%	5%	10%	7%
FISCAL	3%	0%	6%	7%	7%	6%
COMPUTER/MIS	3%	3%	5%	5%	4%	4%
All Responses	100% (67)	100% (64)	100% (150)	100% (111)	100% (209)	100% (601)

Table B-75

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN ANY JTPA OR CETA POSITION

	HOW LONG ANY JTPA/CETA POS						All Responses
	LESS THAN 6 MOS	6 - 12 MOS	1 - 2 YEARS	3 - 4 YEARS	5 - 9 YEARS	10 OR MORE YEARS	
Recommended Experience							
HUMAN SERVICE	39%	29%	32%	31%	26%	18%	26%
PROGRAM	25%	21%	18%	19%	16%	28%	21%
PUBLIC SECTOR	6%	18%	19%	23%	25%	21%	20%
SECRETARIAL	14%	15%	13%	10%	7%	5%	9%
SUPVSRY/PERSNNL	3%	9%	6%	8%	7%	8%	7%
PRIVATE SECTOR	3%	6%	2%	2%	11%	9%	7%
FISCAL	3%	0%	6%	6%	2%	10%	6%
COMPUTER/MIS	8%	3%	6%	1%	6%	3%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(36)	(34)	(108)	(90)	(130)	(198)	(596)

Table B-76

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF

BY LENGTH OF EMPLOY IN ANY PUBLIC SECTOR OR NONPROFIT JOB TRNING POSITION

	HOW LONG ANY PUB SECTOR POS						All Responses
	LESS THAN 6 MOS	6 - 12 MOS	1 - 2 YEARS	3 - 4 YEARS	5 - 9 YEARS	10 OR MORE YEARS	
Recommended Experience							
HUMAN SERVICE	37%	24%	26%	33%	33%	19%	26%
PROGRAM	27%	20%	20%	18%	14%	27%	22%
PUBLIC SECTOR	3%	16%	18%	18%	24%	23%	20%
SECRETARIAL	17%	16%	14%	12%	7%	5%	9%
SUPVSRY/PERSNNL	3%	8%	7%	8%	6%	8%	7%
PRIVATE SECTOR	3%	8%	3%	2%	8%	9%	7%
FISCAL	3%	0%	7%	5%	2%	8%	6%
COMPUTER/MIS	7%	8%	6%	3%	6%	2%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(30)	(25)	(90)	(92)	(125)	(232)	(594)

Table B-77

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF BY AGE

Recommended Experience	AGE GROUP					All Responses
	18 - 25	26 - 35	36 - 45	46 - 55	56 OR OLDER	
HUMAN SERVICE	25%	23%	27%	32%	21%	26%
PROGRAM	32%	20%	21%	15%	32%	22%
PUBLIC SECTOR	5%	24%	21%	23%	18%	20%
SECRETARIAL	25%	11%	5%	9%	9%	9%
SUPVSRY/PERSNNL	2%	6%	9%	6%	4%	7%
PRIVATE SECTOR	0%	6%	8%	6%	9%	7%
FISCAL	2%	6%	6%	7%	7%	6%
COMPUTER/MIS	9%	6%	4%	1%	0%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(44)	(161)	(248)	(94)	(56)	(603)

Table B-78

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF BY ETHNICITY

	AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKAN NATIVE	BLACK, NON-HISPANIC	WHITE, NON-HISPANIC	ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER	HISPANIC	OTHER	All Responses
Recommended Experience							
HUMAN SERVICE	0%	24%	28%	25%	24%	8%	26%
PROGRAM	23%	24%	21%	20%	22%	23%	22%
PUBLIC SECTOR	31%	17%	20%	20%	24%	15%	20%
SECRETARIAL	15%	13%	7%	10%	11%	15%	9%
SUPVSRY/PERSNNL	0%	9%	7%	5%	3%	8%	7%
PRIVATE SECTOR	0%	7%	7%	15%	5%	8%	7%
FISCAL	15%	4%	6%	5%	11%	0%	6%
COMPUTER/MIS	15%	1%	4%	0%	0%	23%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(13)	(90)	(430)	(20)	(37)	(13)	(603)

Table B-79

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF
BY SEX

	GENDER		All Responses
	FEMALE	MALE	
Recommended Experience			
HUMAN SERVICE	30%	16%	26%
PROGRAM	19%	27%	21%
PUBLIC SECTOR	19%	22%	20%
SECRETARIAL	12%	1%	9%
SUPVSRY/PERSNNL	4%	14%	7%
PRIVATE SECTOR	5%	10%	7%
FISCAL	5%	8%	6%
COMPUTER/MIS	5%	3%	4%
	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(416)	(185)	(601)

Table B-80

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF BY AGE BY SEX

| | AGE GROUP | | | | | | | | | | All Responses |
| | 18 - 25 | | 26 - 35 | | 36 - 45 | | 46 - 55 | | 56 OR OLDER | | |
	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	
Recommended Experience											
HUMAN SERVICE	29%	11%	25%	18%	35%	12%	35%	22%	19%	26%	26%
PROGRAM	31%	33%	20%	21%	16%	29%	11%	26%	34%	30%	22%
PUBLIC SECTOR	3%	11%	23%	26%	19%	22%	24%	22%	16%	17%	20%
SECRETARIAL	29%	11%	14%	0%	7%	1%	11%	0%	16%	0%	9%
SUPVSRY/PERSNNL	0%	11%	4%	13%	5%	16%	4%	13%	3%	4%	7%
PRIVATE SECTOR	0%	0%	3%	13%	7%	10%	7%	4%	6%	13%	7%
FISCAL	0%	11%	5%	8%	5%	7%	6%	13%	6%	9%	6%
COMPUTER/MIS	9%	11%	7%	3%	5%	3%	1%	0%	0%	0%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
All Responses	(35)	(9)	(122)	(39)	(155)	(91)	(71)	(23)	(32)	(23)	(600)

Table B-81

EXPERIENCE RECOMMENDED BY SDA STAFF BY ETHNICITY BY SEX

Recommended Experience	AMERICAN INDIAN /ALASKAN NATIVE	BLACK, NON-HISPANIC		WHITE, NON-HISPANIC		ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER		HISPANIC		OTHER		All Responses
	FEMALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	
HUMAN SERVICE	0%	24%	27%	33%	17%	33%	13%	39%	0%	11%	0%	26%
PROGRAM	23%	27%	18%	18%	27%	17%	25%	13%	36%	11%	50%	22%
PUBLIC SECTOR	31%	15%	18%	19%	23%	25%	13%	26%	21%	22%	0%	20%
SECRETARIAL	15%	18%	0%	11%	0%	8%	13%	13%	7%	22%	0%	9%
SUPVSRY/PERSNNL	0%	4%	23%	4%	13%	8%	0%	0%	7%	0%	25%	7%
PRIVATE SECTOR	0%	6%	9%	5%	9%	8%	25%	0%	14%	11%	0%	7%
FISCAL	15%	4%	5%	4%	8%	0%	13%	9%	14%	0%	0%	6%
COMPUTER/MIS	15%	1%	0%	5%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	22%	25%	4%
All Responses	100% (13)	100% (67)	100% (22)	100% (291)	100% (137)	100% (12)	100% (8)	100% (23)	100% (14)	100% (9)	100% (4)	100% (600)