

GAO

Report to the Chairman, Subcommittee
on Employment and Productivity,
Committee on Labor and Human
Resources, U.S. Senate

150723

January 1994

MULTIPLE EMPLOYMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS

Conflicting Requirements Hamper Delivery of Services





United States
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548

Health, Education, and
Human Services Division

B-253138

January 28, 1994

The Honorable Paul Simon, Chairman
Subcommittee on Employment and Productivity
Committee on Labor and Human Resources
United States Senate

Dear Mr. Chairman:

For many years, administrators and clients have struggled to navigate through the increasing multitude of federal employment training programs. Our analysis of the President's proposed fiscal year 1994 budget identified at least 154 programs¹ that provide about \$25 billion in funding for employment training assistance for adults and out-of-school youth.² Many of the 154 programs provide similar or complementary services to the same target populations. To promote coordination among these programs, the Congress has required some agencies to jointly plan their activities, and, in some instances, has provided funding to facilitate coordination efforts. In addition, several states have taken steps to better coordinate service delivery at the local level. However, differences in program requirements often hamper efforts to coordinate the delivery of services to help people find jobs.

This report responds to your request that we identify how programs serving the same target populations differ concerning (1) eligibility requirements and (2) annual operating cycles.³ Our review focused on 38 programs providing employment training assistance to four target groups—economically disadvantaged, older, younger, and dislocated workers—at a cost of \$8.1 billion.⁴ In our analysis of each program, we reviewed the statutes, regulations, and agency documents. We also held discussions with state and local administrators regarding program requirements.

¹As used in this report, "employment training program" refers to those programs and related funding streams that provide assistance to adults and out-of-school youth that enhances individual skills or employment opportunities. Appendix I lists each of the 154 programs and their proposed funding for fiscal year 1994.

²Multiple Employment Programs: National Employment Training Strategy Needed (GAO/T-HRD-93-27, June 18, 1993).

³The original request asked that we also look at differences in performance measures; however, because of the limited number of programs with specific performance measure definitions, it was agreed that we would drop this issue from our analysis.

⁴Appendix II shows the 38 programs by target population and their proposed funding levels for fiscal year 1994.

In addition to this report, we are issuing another report concerning problems with the current fragmented "system" of multiple employment training programs. That report, Multiple Employment Training Programs: Overlapping Programs Can Add Unnecessary Administrative Costs (GAO/HEHS-94-80, Jan. 28, 1994), concerns the extent to which programs overlap in the populations they target, in the services they provide, and in the administrative structures they create to deliver those services. We also have other ongoing work that (1) concerns the extent to which federal agencies know whether their employment training programs are effective in helping participants compete in the workforce and (2) addresses the need for a major overhaul of the entire federal employment training system.

Background

In 1992, at least 9.4 million people of work age were unemployed during some part of the year. At the same time, others were trying to enter the workforce for the first time. While many of these people were successful at finding jobs, others had more difficulty. Among those groups with the highest unemployment were youth, with an unemployment rate almost three times the national average. On average, over 1.3 million youth between the ages of 16 and 19 were unemployed each month in 1992. Large numbers of economically disadvantaged workers also had difficulty finding jobs. Of the 4.8 million families on Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC) each month, about 8 percent of the adults worked in 1992. Other groups, such as Native Americans, migrants, and older workers, also had a difficult time finding a job.

To help people from these groups find a place in the workforce, the federal government has created a variety of programs. Many of these programs target the same populations. Our work identified 10 groups that were the focus of most federal employment training programs—economically disadvantaged, older workers, youth, dislocated workers, Native Americans, refugees, migrants, the homeless, women and minorities, and veterans.

These programs often provide the same target population similar or complementary services in the same five basic areas: (1) counseling and assessment, (2) remedial education, (3) vocational skills training, (4) placement assistance, and (5) support services. To make the most of the limited resources available in each program, it is important that these programs work together as they deliver services at the local level.

Results in Brief

Conflicting eligibility requirements and differences in annual operating cycles are hampering the ability of programs to provide participants needed services. Despite decades of efforts to better coordinate employment training programs, conflicting requirements continue to make it difficult for program staff to coordinate activities and share resources. One state administrator stated the problem especially clearly: "The aim of case management is to access various programs in order to deliver the best services possible to clients. However, conflicting requirements turn coordination into a jigsaw puzzle...."

Differences in eligibility criteria make determining who is eligible for which program a complex process that confuses clients and frustrates administrators. For example, the nine programs targeting the economically disadvantaged use several different standards for measuring income level, for defining family or household, and for defining what is included in income. Programs targeting older workers create confusion because they use differing age requirements to define "older worker." Programs targeting youth differ in age criteria at both the lower age limit and the upper age limit. Dislocated worker programs differ in their criteria for what constitutes an eligible "job loss" such as in the recognition of pending layoff notices, definitions of dates of employment, voluntary separations, and reduced hours or wages.

Within each target group, differences in annual operating cycles also hamper the ability of program administrators to plan together to ensure that participants receive the services they need. For example, the 16 programs that target youth have four different operating cycles. Some programs serving the same target population will have completed their planning process and begun operation on January 1, while other programs will not complete their planning until the following July. As a result, administrators may not be able to coordinate their plans to ensure that the resources needed to serve their clients are available.

Differences in Eligibility Criteria Hamper Delivery of Services

Reconciling definitions for eligibility among programs attempting to serve the same target populations can help programs share resources and coordinate activities. However, we found significant differences in the eligibility criteria in each of the four target groups we analyzed. For example, not all programs targeting the economically disadvantaged used the same definition of "economically disadvantaged." We found that six different standards were used for defining income eligibility levels, five for defining family or household, and five for defining what is included in

income. As a result, a member of a family of four with an income of \$20,040 would be considered "disadvantaged" and eligible for services from one program, but the same \$20,040 income exceeds another program's definition of "disadvantaged," making the family member ineligible for services from that program. With the need for programs to be able to share resources to meet all their clients' needs, this could mean that some clients may not be able to obtain needed services. See appendix III for more information on the different standards used in each of the programs that targeted the economically disadvantaged.

Given the confusion created by the differing eligibility requirements, it is not surprising that a recent survey of state and local administrators showed that administrators frequently recommended standardizing the term "economically disadvantaged." Most of those surveyed wanted to standardize all terms related to income definitions, such as what constitutes family income or personal income, how to establish ownership of resources, and what is included in income disregards. One benefit that the administrators felt could be achieved by developing standard definitions and criteria was that the same intake form could be used across programs, which would facilitate coordination efforts and improve service delivery.⁶


Income criteria are not the only eligibility concern. Programs targeting older workers differ in how they define "older worker." Some used a minimum age of 55 years, while others used a minimum of 60 years. Programs targeting youth also differ in their age limits. Lower age limits for youth programs ranged from 11 to 16 years of age, while upper age limits ranged from 19 to 27. See appendixes IV and V, respectively, for more information on the age criteria used by older worker programs and youth programs. As mentioned earlier, dislocated worker programs differ in their criteria for what constitutes an eligible "job loss." See appendix V for more information on each program's definition of what constitutes a job loss. These differences, according to state and local administrators, not only make it difficult for case managers to determine eligibility of clients, but clients themselves feel confused and discriminated against.

⁶Streamlining and Integrating Human Resource Development Services for Adults, National Governors' Association, Training and Employment Program (Center for Policy Research, 1991).

Differences in Operating Cycles Also Hamper Coordination

Differences in program operating cycles also make it difficult for administrators attempting to coordinate their programs through joint planning. Matching available funding with estimates of the number of those seeking assistance is more complex, if not impossible, when operating cycles do not match. However, as shown in figure 1, we found that programs within each of the four target groups operate on different annual cycles. Most programs (20) operated on the basis of a program year (July 1-June 30); 12 programs operated on the federal fiscal year (October 1-September 30); 4 programs operated on an academic year (September 1-August 31); and 2 programs operated on a calendar year (January 1-December 31). See appendix VII for more information on the operating cycles for each program in our analysis.

Figure 1: Programs Differ in Definition of Annual Operating Cycle



This problem is compounded for program administrators who need to integrate program operating cycles into state and local operating time frames. One state administrator, for example, indicated that his state operates on a September to August time frame, while some federal programs operate on the federal fiscal year (October 1 to September 30), and others operate on a program year (July 1 to June 30).

To accomplish joint planning, agencies must resort to several circuitous strategies. According to local administrators, some officials set low estimates of the number of clients from other programs they can serve or others only commit resources they know will be available but contribute additional resources if they become available at a later time. Other agencies make such commitments contingent on expected funding so they are not held to prior commitments when their expected funding levels are not realized. Unfortunately, these methods can result in the underutilization of available resources or crisis planning when resources are available.

Conclusion

Programs are increasingly being directed to coordinate activities and share resources to ensure that anyone who needs help can get it. Nevertheless, program administrators, as well as those people needing employment training assistance, continue to face a fragmented "system" of categorical programs characterized by differences in eligibility requirements and annual operating cycles. Differences in eligibility criteria and operating cycles among programs serving the same target populations act as barriers to coordinating program services and impede the effective delivery of needed services and the efficient use of program resources. As a result, people in need of employment training assistance may not have access to the services they need to help them find jobs.

Our work was conducted between April and September 1993 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. As you requested, agency comments on this report were not obtained, but copies will be sent to those involved and other interested parties. Should you have any questions or wish to discuss the information provided, please call me at (202) 512-7014. Other major contributors are listed in appendix VIII.

Sincerely yours,



Linda G. Morra
Director, Education
and Employment Issues

Contents

Letter

Appendix I
Federal Employment
and Training
Programs Proposed
Funding Levels by
Agency (Fiscal Year
1994)

Appendix II
Four Target Groups
Included in Analysis

Appendix III
Eligibility Standards
for the Economically
Disadvantaged

Appendix IV
Age Requirements in
Older Worker
Programs

Appendix V
Lower and Upper Age
Limits for Youth
Programs

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|----|
| <hr/> | | |
| Appendix VI | | 29 |
| Definitions of Job | | |
| Loss Among | | |
| Dislocated Worker | | |
| Programs | | |
| <hr/> | | |
| Appendix VII | | 31 |
| Program Annual | | |
| Operating Cycles | | |
| <hr/> | | |
| Appendix VIII | | 34 |
| Major Contributors to | | |
| This Report | | |
| <hr/> | | |
| Tables | Table III.1: Different Standards for Measuring Income Used by Programs Targeting Economically Disadvantaged | 21 |
| | Table III.2: Different Standards for Defining a Family or Household Used by Programs Targeting Economically Disadvantaged | 22 |
| | Table III.3: Income Definitions for Programs Targeting the Economically Disadvantaged | 23 |
| | Table IV.1: Older Worker Programs Differ in Age Requirements | 25 |
| | Table V.1: Lower and Upper Age Limits for Youth Programs | 28 |
| | Table VI.1: Definitions of Job Loss Among Dislocated Worker Programs | 29 |
| | Table VII.1: Programs Within Four Target Groups Differ in Definition of Annual Operating Cycle | 32 |
| <hr/> | | |
| Figures | Figure 1: Programs Differ in Definition of Annual Operating Cycle | 5 |
| | Figure V.1: Lower and Upper Age Limits Differ Among Youth Programs | 27 |

Contents

Abbreviations

| | |
|-------|---|
| AFDC | Aid to Families With Dependent Children |
| EDWAA | Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance |
| IRS | Internal Revenue Service |
| JOBS | Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training |
| JTPA | Job Training Partnership Act |
| OPM | Office of Personnel Management |
| LLSL | Lower Living Standard Income Level |
| SCSEP | Senior Community Service Employment Program |
| SSI | Supplemental Security Income |
| TAA | Trade Adjustment Assistance |
| UI | Unemployment Insurance |

Federal Employment and Training Programs Proposed Funding Levels by Agency (Fiscal Year 1994)^a

Dollars in millions

| Agency and programs | Fiscal year 1994 |
|--|------------------------|
| All programs (154) | Total: \$24,831 |
| Action - (3) programs | Total: 10 |
| Literacy Corps | 1 |
| Foster Grandparent Program | 6 |
| Senior Companion Program | 2 |
| Department of Agriculture - (1) program | Total: 16 |
| Food Stamp Employment & Training | 16 |
| Appalachian Regional Commission - (1) program | Total: 1 |
| Appalachian Vocational and Other Education Facilities and Operations | 1 |
| Department of Commerce - (9) programs | Total: 22 |
| Minority Business Development Centers | 2 |
| American Indian Program | 1 |
| Economic Development-Grants for Public Works and Development | 13 |
| Economic Development-Public Works Impact Program | 2 |
| Economic Development-Support for Planning Organizations | 2 |
| Economic Development-Technical Assistance | 1 |
| Economic Development-State and Local Economic Development Planning | 1 |
| Special Economic Development and Adjustment Assistance Program-Sudden and Severe Economic Dislocation and Long-Term Economic Deterioration | 1 |
| Community Economic Adjustment | 1 |
| Department of Defense - (2) programs | Total: 7 |
| Military Base Reuse Studies and Community Planning Assistance | 1 |
| Transition Assistance Program | 6 |
| Department of Education - (60) programs | Total: 13,03 |
| Even Start-State Educational Agencies | 8 |
| Even Start-Migrant Education | 1 |
| Women's Educational Equity | 1 |
| Indian Education-Adult Education | 1 |
| Migrant Education-High School Equivalency Program | 1 |
| Migrant Education-College Assistance Migrant Program | 1 |
| School Dropout Demonstration Assistance | 3 |
| Adult Education-State Administered Basic Grant Program | 26 |
| Adult Education for the Homeless | 1 |
| National Adult Education Discretionary Program | 1 |
| Vocational Education-Demonstration Projects for the Integration of Vocational and Academic Learning | 1 |
| Vocational Education-Educational Programs for Federal Correctional Institutions | 1 |
| Vocational Education-Comprehensive Career Guidance and Counseling | 1 |

(continues)

**Appendix I
Federal Employment and Training Programs
Proposed Funding Levels by Agency (Fiscal
Year 1994)***

Dollars in millions

| Agency and programs | Fiscal year 1994^b |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Vocational Education-Blue Ribbon Vocational Educational Programs | f |
| Vocational Education-Model Programs for Regional Training for Skilled Trades | f |
| Vocational Education-Business/Education/Labor Partnerships | f |
| Vocational Education-Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions | 2.9 |
| Vocational Education-Tribal Economic Development | f |
| Vocational Education-Basic State Programs | 717.5 ^c |
| Vocational Education-State Programs and Activities | 81.3 |
| Vocational Education-Single Parents, Displaced Homemakers, and Single Pregnant Women | 69.4 |
| Vocational Education for Sex Equity | 31.1 |
| Vocational Education-Programs for Criminal Offenders | 9.6 |
| Vocational Education-Cooperative Demonstration | f |
| Vocational Education-Indian and Hawaiian Natives | 15.1 |
| Vocational Education-Opportunities for Indians and Alaskan Natives | f |
| Vocational Education-Community Based Organizations | 11.8 ^c |
| Vocational Education-Bilingual Vocational Training | 0.0 |
| Vocational Education-Demonstration Centers for the Training of Dislocated Workers | ^{c,f} |
| Vocational Education-Consumer and Homemaking Education | 0.0 |
| Vocational Education-TechPrep Education | 104.1 |
| National Workplace Literacy Program | 22.0 |
| English Literacy Program | 0.0 |
| Literacy for Incarcerated Adults | 5.1 |
| National Center for Deaf-Blind Youth and Adults | 6.7 |
| State Literacy Resource Centers | 7.9 |
| Student Literacy Corps | 6.1 ^c |
| Federal Pell Grant Program ^g | 2,846.9 |
| Guaranteed Student Loans ^g | 5,889.0 |
| Federal Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants ^g | 125.0 |
| Upward Bound | 160.5 ^c |
| Talent Search | 67.0 ^c |
| Federal Work Study Program ^g | 89.6 |
| Federal Perkins Loan Program-Federal Capital Contributions ^g | 13.0 |
| Grants to States for State Student Incentives | 0.0 |
| Educational Opportunity Centers | 23.3 ^c |
| Higher Education-Veterans Education Outreach Program | 3.1 |
| Student Support Services | 110.3 |
| Postsecondary Education Programs for Persons with Disabilities | 8.8 |
| Rehabilitation Services Basic Support-Grants to States | 1,933.4 |
| Rehabilitation Services Basic Support-Grants for Indians | 6.4 |

(continued)

**Appendix I
Federal Employment and Training Programs
Proposed Funding Levels by Agency (Fiscal
Year 1994)***

Dollars in millions

| Agency and programs | Fiscal year 1994^b |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Rehabilitation Services Service Projects-Handicapped Migratory and Seasonal Farm Workers | 1.2 |
| Rehabilitation Services Service Projects-Special Projects and Demonstrations for Providing Vocational Rehabilitation Services to Individuals With Severe Disabilities | 19.9 |
| Rehabilitation Services Service Projects-Supported Employment Projects With Industry Programs | 10.6 |
| Supported Employment Services for Individuals with Severe Handicaps | 21.6 |
| Comprehensive Services for Independent Living | 33.1 |
| Library Literacy | 15.8 |
| School to Work ^h | 0.0 |
| Public Library Services | 135.0 ^c |
| Department of Health and Human Services - (14) programs | Total: 2,203.5 |
| Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Program | 825.0 ^c |
| Community Services Block Grant | 352.7 |
| Community Services Block Grant- Discretionary Award | 39.7 |
| Community Services Block Grant Discretionary Awards-Demonstration Partnership | 4.4 |
| Refugee and Entrant Assistance-Discretionary Grants | 12.6 |
| Refugee and Entrant Assistance-State Administered Programs | 84.4 |
| Refugee and Entrant Assistance-Voluntary Agency Programs | 39.9 |
| Community Demonstration Grant Projects for Alcohol and Drug Abuse Treatment of Homeless Individuals | † |
| Family Support Centers Demonstration Program | 6.9 |
| State Legalization Impact Assistance Grants | 809.9 |
| Transitional Living for Runaway and Homeless Youth | 11.8 ^c |
| Independent Living | 16.2 ^c |
| Scholarships for Health Professions Students From Disadvantaged Backgrounds | † |
| Health Careers Opportunity Program | † |
| Department of Housing and Urban Development - (4) programs | Total: 303.4 |
| Emergency Shelter Grants Program | 51.4 |
| Supportive Housing Demonstration Program | 164.0 |
| Youthbuild ^h | 88.0 ^c |
| Family Self-Sufficiency Program | c,j |
| Department of the Interior - (2) programs | Total: 20.9 |
| Indian Employment Assistance | 16.9 |
| Indian Grants-Economic Development | 4.0 |
| Department of Labor - (36) programs | Total: 7,141.5 |
| JTPA IIA Training Services for the Disadvantaged-Adult | 793.1 ^c |
| JTPA IIA State Education Programs | 82.4 ^c |
| JTPA IIA Incentive Grants | 51.5 ^c |
| JTPA IIA Training Programs for Older Individuals | 51.5 ^c |

(continued)

**Appendix I
Federal Employment and Training Programs
Proposed Funding Levels by Agency (Fiscal
Year 1994)***

Dollars in millions

| Agency and programs | Fiscal year 1994^b |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| JTPA IIC Disadvantaged Youth | 563.1 ^c |
| JTPA IIC Disadvantaged Youth-Incentive Grants | 34.3 ^c |
| JTPA IIC Disadvantaged Youth-State Education Programs | 54.9 ^c |
| JTPA IIB Training Services for the Disadvantaged-Summer Youth Employment and Training Program (Regular) | 1,688.8 ^c |
| JTPA IIB Summer Youth Employment and Training Program (Native American) | ^{b,k} |
| JTPA EDWAA-Dislocated Workers (Local SDA Allotment) ^k | 229.5 ^c |
| JTPA EDWAA-Dislocated Workers (Governor's 50% Discretionary) ^k | 229.5 ^c |
| JTPA EDWAA-Dislocated Workers (Secretary 20% Discretionary) ^k | 114.7 ^c |
| JTPA Defense Conversion Adjustment Program | ^{c,m} |
| JTPA Defense Diversification | ^{c,n} |
| JTPA Clean Air Employment Transition Assistance | ^{c,o} |
| JTPA-Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers | 78.3 |
| JTPA-Employment and Training Research and Development Projects | 11.2 |
| JTPA Employment Services and Job Training-Pilot and Demonstration Programs | 35.1 |
| JTPA-Native American Employment and Training Programs | 61.9 |
| JTPA Job Corps | 1,153.7 ^c |
| Federal Bonding Program | 0.2 |
| Senior Community Service Employment Program | 421.1 ^c |
| Apprenticeship Training | 17.2 |
| Trade Adjustment Assistance-Workers | 215.0 ^c |
| Targeted Jobs Tax Credit | 19.2 |
| Employment Service-Wagner Peyser State Grants (7a) | 734.8 |
| Employment Service-Wagner Peyser Governor's Discretionary Funds (7b) | 81.6 |
| Labor Certification for Alien Workers | 58.6 |
| Interstate Job Bank | 1.9 |
| Youth Fair Chance ⁱ | 25.0 ^c |
| One-Stop Career Centers ⁱ | 150.0 |
| Veterans Employment Program | 9.0 |
| Disabled Veterans Outreach Program | 84.0 |
| Local Veterans Employment Representative Program | 77.9 |
| Homeless Veterans Reintegration Project | ^f |
| Job Training for the Homeless Demonstration Project | 12.5 |
| Office of Personnel Management - (1) program | Total: ^q |
| Federal Employment for Disadvantaged Youth-Summer | ^{c,q} |
| Small Business Administration - (8) programs | Total: 157.4 |
| Management and Technical Assistance for Socially and Economically Disadvantaged Businesses | 8.1 |
| Small Business Development Center | 67.0 |

(continued)

**Appendix I
Federal Employment and Training Programs
Proposed Funding Levels by Agency (Fiscal
Year 1994)***

Dollars in millions

| Agency and programs | Fiscal year 1994^b |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Women's Business Ownership Assistance | 1.5 |
| Veteran Entrepreneurial Training and Counseling | 0.4 |
| Service Corps of Retired Executives Association | 3.1 |
| Business Development Assistance to Small Business | 20.9 |
| Procurement Assistance to Small Business | 33.7 |
| Minority Business Development | 22.7 |
| Department of Transportation - (1) program | Total: 1.5 |
| Human Resource Programs | 1.5 |
| Department of Veterans Affairs - (12) programs | Total: 1,410.0 |
| All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance | 895.1 |
| Selected Reserve Educational Assistance Program | t |
| Survivors and Dependents Educational Assistance | 109.1 |
| Vocational Rehabilitation for Disabled Veterans | 245.1 |
| Post-Vietnam Era Veterans Educational Assistance | 42.4 |
| Hostage Relief Act Program | s |
| Vocational Training for Certain Veterans Receiving VA Pension | f |
| Vocational and Educational Counseling for Servicemembers and Veterans | t |
| Service Members Occupational Conversion and Training | 64.5 |
| Health Care for Homeless Veterans | 28.3 |
| Domiciliary Care for Homeless Veterans | 23.4 |
| Housing and Urban Development/Veterans Affairs-Supported Housing | 2.1 |

^aPrograms identified are federally funded and designed to (1) assist the unemployed, (2) create employment, and (3) enhance employability. The programs provide assistance to adults and out-of-school youth not enrolled in advanced-degree programs.

^bThe proposed fiscal year 1994 funding amounts shown in appendix I are based primarily on the President's proposed budget dated April 8, 1993. In some instances, the amount shown may have been adjusted to reflect only that portion of the program that provided assistance to adults and out-of-school youth; however, in other instances the amount shown is for the entire program even though only a portion of the program funding may go to providing employment training assistance as defined in this report.

^cProgram included in analysis.

^dEconomic Development-Public Works Impact: program funds included in Grants for Public Works and Development Facilities.

^eCommunity Economic Adjustment: funds allocated in 1993 are used to support programs in out years until funding is depleted.

^fData not available at this time.

^gEducation loan program: amounts shown are estimates of loans for associate and nondegree programs, when possible to differentiate.

**Appendix I
Federal Employment and Training Programs
Proposed Funding Levels by Agency (Fiscal
Year 1994)^a**

^bSchool to Work: program proposed for fiscal year 1994. Funded at \$270.0 million split evenly between the Departments of Education and Labor. Department of Education funding is from Carl Perkins Act: \$15 million from National Programs-Research and Development and \$120 million from Cooperative Demonstrations Program. Department of Labor funding is from the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA).

^cYouthbuild: program proposed for fiscal year 1994.

^dFamily Self-Sufficiency Program: job training, education, and support services are paid for by other programs such as Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) and JTPA. Federal funds may be used to cover local administrative costs. For fiscal year 1993, appropriations for operating subsidies permit the payment of \$25.9 million to cover the administrative costs of operating the Family Self-Sufficiency program.

^eThe actual funding for the JTPA Title III EDWAA program was increased significantly from the budget request dated April 8, 1993. The proposed funding for substate areas of \$229.5 million was increased to \$537 million. The proposed funding for the EDWAA Governor's Discretionary funds were also \$229.5 million, but was increased to \$357 million. Similarly, the Secretary's Discretionary funds were increased from \$114.7 million to \$223 million.

^fJTPA IIB Summer Youth Employment and Training Program (Native American): funding included in JTPA IIB (Regular) program total.

^gJTPA Defense Conversion Adjustment Program: funds allocated in 1991 used to support programs in out years until funding is depleted.

^hJTPA Defense Diversification: funds allocated in 1993 used to support programs in out years until funding is depleted.

ⁱJTPA Clean Air Employment Transition Assistance: no funds were appropriated for the Clean Air Act in fiscal year 1994.

^jNew program in 1994.

^kFederal Employment for Disadvantaged Youth-Summer: program coordinated by Office of Personnel Management (OPM), but carried out by numerous federal agencies. Obligations devoted to administration not separately identifiable.

^lSelected Reserve Educational Assistance Program: funding included in All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance total.

^mHostage Relief Act Program: replaced by the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Anti-Terrorist Act of 1986. No program funding used in any year, but available.

ⁿVocational and Educational Counseling for Servicemembers and Veterans: program funds included in other veterans programs, such as the All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance Program.

Four Target Groups Included in Analysis

| Target group | Program | Fiscal year 1994 proposed funding (in millions) |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| Economically Disadvantaged | JTPA IIA Training Services for the Disadvantaged-Adult | \$ 793.1 |
| | JTPA IIA State Education Programs | 82.4 |
| | JTPA IIA Incentive Grants | 51.5 |
| | Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training | 825.0 |
| | Food Stamp Employment and Training | 162.7 |
| | Family Self-Sufficiency Program | ^a |
| | Vocational Education-Basic State Programs | 717.5 |
| | Educational Opportunity Centers | 23.3 |
| | Student Literacy Corps | 6.1 |
| | Subtotal | 2,661.6 |
| Older Workers | Senior Community Service Employment Program | 421.1 |
| | JTPA IIA Training Program for Older Individuals | 51.5 |
| | Foster Grandparent Program | 66.4 |
| | Senior Companion Program | 29.2 |
| | Subtotal | 568.2 |
| Youth | JTPA IIC Disadvantaged Youth | 563.1 |
| | JTPA IIC Disadvantaged Youth - Incentive Grants | 34.3 |
| | JTPA IIC Disadvantaged Youth - State Education Programs | 54.9 |
| | JTPA IIB Training Services for the Disadvantaged-Summer Youth Employment and Training Program (Regular) | 1,688.8 |
| | JTPA IIB Summer Youth Employment and Training Program (Native American) | ^b |
| | JTPA Job Corps | 1,153.7 |
| | Youth Fair Chance | 25.0 |
| | Transitional Living for Runaway and Homeless Youth | 11.8 |
| | Independent Living | 16.2 |
| | School Dropout Demonstration Assistance | 37.7 |
| | Vocational Education-Community Based Organizations | 11.8 |
| | Upward Bound | 160.5 |
| | Talent Search | 67.0 |
| | School to Work | 135.0 |
| | Federal Employment for Disadvantaged Youth-Summer | ^c |
| | Youthbuild | 88.0 |
| | Subtotal | 4,047.8 |
| Dislocated Workers | JTPA EDWAA-Dislocated Workers (Local SDA Allotment) | 229.5 |
| | JTPA EDWAA-Dislocated Workers (Governor's 50% Discretionary) | 229.5 |
| | JTPA EDWAA-Dislocated Workers (Secretary's 20% Discretionary) | 114.7 |

(continued)

**Appendix II
Four Target Groups Included in Analysis**

| Target group | Program | Fiscal year 1994 proposed funding (in millions) |
|---|--|---|
| | JTPA Defense Conversion Adjustment Program | ^d |
| | JTPA Clean Air Employment Transition Assistance | ^e |
| | JTPA Defense Diversification | ^f |
| | Trade Adjustment Assistance-Workers | 215.0 |
| | Vocational Education-Demonstration Centers for the Retraining of Dislocated Workers | ^g |
| | Transition Assistance Program | 66.8 |
| | Subtotal | 855.5 |
| Total for Target Groups Analyzed | | \$8,133.1 |

^aFamily Self-Sufficiency Program: job training, education, and support services are paid for by other programs such as JOBS and JTPA. Federal funds may be used to cover local administrative costs. For fiscal year 1993, appropriations for operating subsidies permit the payment of \$25.9 million to cover the administrative costs of operating the Family Self-Sufficiency program.

JTPA IIB Summer Youth Employment and Training Program (Native American): funding included in JTPA IIB (Regular) program total.

^cFederal Employment for Disadvantaged Youth-Summer: program coordinated by OPM, but carried out by numerous federal agencies. Obligations devoted to administration not separately identifiable.

^dJTPA Defense Conversion Adjustment Program: funds allocated in 1991 used to support programs in out years until funding is depleted.

^eJTPA Clean Air Employment Transition Assistance: funds allocated in 1993 used to support programs in out years until funding is depleted.

^fJTPA Defense Diversification: funds allocated in 1993 used to support programs in out years until funding is depleted.

^gData not available at this time.

Eligibility Standards for the Economically Disadvantaged

In reviewing the factors generally used to determine eligibility, we found that the nine programs that specifically target the economically disadvantaged used six different measures of income level, five definitions of family or household, and five definitions of income. The large array of eligibility criteria makes implementation difficult for state administrators as well as for those seeking assistance.

As shown in table III.1, the standards used to measure low income included the official poverty income guidelines, some multiple of those guidelines (such as 130 or 150 percent), and area median family income. Two programs illustrate the differences that can result from using a variety of measures. A member of a family of four with an income of up to \$20,040 would be considered "disadvantaged" and eligible for services from the Educational Opportunity Centers. This program uses the income measure of 150 percent of the Bureau of Census poverty level. However, for this same family member to be eligible for the Food Stamp Employment and Training Program, income could not exceed \$17,420 because this program uses the measure of 130 percent of the official poverty guidelines. Some programs use two measures. For example, JTPA programs use the higher of the official poverty measure or 70 percent of the regionally adjusted Lower Living Standard Income Level (LLSL). In the above example, this would have been the LLSL, which was higher in the metropolitan Northeast, \$16,360, compared with \$13,400 for the official poverty measure.

**Appendix III
Eligibility Standards for the Economically
Disadvantaged**

Table III.1: Different Standards for Measuring Income Used by Programs Targeting Economically Disadvantaged

| Program | Income does not exceed... | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|------|
| | HHS Official Poverty Guidelines | | Lower Living Standard Income Level | Area Median Family Income | Bureau of Census Poverty Threshold | |
| | 100% | 130% | 70% | | 100% | 150% |
| JTPA IIA Disadvantaged Adults | X ^a | | X | | | |
| JTPA IIA State Education Programs | X | | X | | | |
| JTPA IIA Incentive Grants | X | | X | | | |
| Job Opportunities and Basic Skills ^b | | | | | | |
| Food Stamp Employment and Training | X ^c | X | | | | |
| Family Self-Sufficiency Program | | | | X ^d | | |
| Educational Opportunity Centers | | | | | | X |
| Vocational Education-Basic State Programs | X ^e | | | | X | |
| Student Literacy Corps ^f | | | | | | |

^aJTPA programs base eligibility on whichever is higher, the official poverty guidelines or 70 percent of the regionally adjusted Lower Living Standard Income Level.

^bEligibility varies by state because of differences in state criteria for AFDC eligibility.

^cUses three measures: (1) household income after exclusions and deductions as defined by the Gross Income Standard for households that include an elderly or disabled member or (2) household income after exclusions but before deductions for households that do not include an elderly or disabled member or (3) gross income not to exceed 130 percent of the official poverty guidelines for households that do not include an elderly or disabled member.

^dUses two measures: "Low-income" does not exceed 80 percent of area's median income while "very low income" does not exceed 50 percent of the area's median income.

^eThis program allows educational institutions to use several low-income measures as well as "other indices of economic status" with the approval of the Department of Education.

^fWhile program is targeted to the economically disadvantaged, the program requirements do not include a specific definition of income or related financial eligibility information.

Program eligibility and coverage also depends on whose income is counted in the eligibility calculation. We found five different criteria for family or household. As shown in table III.2, for example, JTPA considers the income of the family—all persons related by blood, marriage, or court decree—in determining eligibility. In contrast, the Food Stamp Program considers the income of the household, all those who purchase and cook food together.

**Appendix III
Eligibility Standards for the Economically
Disadvantaged**

Table III.2: Different Standards for Defining a Family or Household Used by Programs Targeting Economically Disadvantaged

| Program | Family or household assistance unit includes... | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| | Persons related by blood, marriage, or court decree | Unrelated dependents of head of household | Other unrelated persons if needed by child | Those who purchase & cook food together | Unrelated if elderly also present |
| JTPA IIA Training Services for the Disadvantaged-Adult | X | | | | |
| JTPA IIA State Education Programs | X | | | | |
| JTPA IIA Incentive Grants | X | | | | |
| Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training | | | X | | |
| Food Stamp Employment and Training | | | | X | |
| Family Self-Sufficiency Program | | | | | X |
| Educational Opportunity Centers | | X | | | |
| Vocational Education-Basic State Programs ^a | | | | | |
| Student Literacy Corps ^b | | | | | |

^aComplex family or household assistance unit definitions, which can vary by state.

^bFamily or household not defined.

Programs also differ in their definition of what constitutes income. We identified five definitions of income, each with its own set of deductions and exclusions (see table III.3). For example, the JTPA programs include all earned income, but exclude unemployment insurance. The Food Stamp Employment and Training program includes unemployment insurance, but excludes 20 percent of all earned income. It is evident in some instances that exclusions are driven by the program's purpose, such as encouraging the participant to seek employment. While excluding some portion of earned income may provide an incentive to work, state and local administrators indicated that these differences not only confuse administrators and clients, but they can result in situations where economically disadvantaged workers may not receive needed services because the different eligibility criteria exclude them from the program that provides the services they need.

**Appendix III
Eligibility Standards for the Economically
Disadvantaged**

Table III.3: Income Definitions for Programs Targeting the Economically Disadvantaged

| Program | Differences in Income criteria | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|---|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| | Income excludes UI | Uses IRS taxable income including capital gains | Includes all earned income | Excludes 20% of earned income | Excludes \$30 + one-third of earned income first 4 months |
| JTPA IIA Training Services for the Disadvantaged-Adult | X | | X | | |
| JTPA IIA State Education Programs | X | | X | | |
| JTPA IIA Incentive Grants | X | | X | | |
| Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training | | | | | X |
| Food Stamp Employment and Training | | | | X | |
| Family Self-Sufficiency Program | | | X | | |
| Educational Opportunity Centers | | X | X | | |
| Vocational Education-Basic State Programs ^a | | | | | |
| Student Literacy Corps ^b | | | | | |

^aExcluded from analysis due to wide latitude that states can exercise in determining income.

^bProgram requirements do not include a technical definition of income.

Differences in income definitions are further magnified by income exclusions that can vary from state to state. These rules produce a range of state income eligibility limits. For example, in the Foster Grandparent Program and Senior Companion Program, income levels cannot exceed 125 percent of the poverty guidelines or 100 percent of the poverty guidelines plus any Supplemental Security Income (SSI) provided by the state. As a result, a senior in one state receiving an SSI state supplement may be eligible for the program with income that exceeds 125 percent of the poverty level, while a senior in another state that does not provide SSI would be excluded if income exceeds 125 percent of the poverty level.

Some programs allow automatic eligibility to participants enrolled in another program. This tends to soften the effect of some of the above differences. However, minor differences exist within cross-eligibility definitions that can also create coordination barriers. For example, a person receiving food stamps is automatically eligible for the JTPA program. However, some people may choose not to participate in the Food Stamp program. It has been reported that only 59 percent of persons eligible for food stamps actually received them in 1989.¹ A report by the

¹Time for a Change, Welfare Simplification and Coordination Advisory Committee Report (June 1993).

**Appendix III
Eligibility Standards for the Economically
Disadvantaged**

National Commission for Employment Policy² concluded that since many Hispanic families are clustered around JTPA's income cut-off point and choose not to participate in the Food Stamp program, many economically disadvantaged Hispanics are ineligible for needed JTPA training services. To resolve this problem, this report recommended that "receipt of Food Stamps," as an eligibility requirement, should be removed from the law and replaced with "eligible for Food Stamps."

²Training Hispanics: Implications for the JTPA System, National Commission for Employment Policy Report (Jan. 1990).

Age Requirements in Older Worker Programs

The four programs that target older workers vary in their minimum age requirements. As shown in table IV.1, two programs had a minimum age requirement of 55, although one program gave priority to those aged 60. The other two programs had a minimum age requirement of 60. These relatively minor age differences may result in some older workers under 60 years of age being excluded from needed program services.

Table IV.1: Older Worker Programs Differ in Age Requirements

| Program name | Minimum age required for admission | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|
| | Age 55 | Age 60 |
| JTPA Older Worker | X | |
| Senior Community Service Employment | X ^a | |
| Foster Grandparent | | X |
| Senior Companion | | X |

^aPriority is given to applicants 60 years of age.

Although the revised JTPA program amendments and the Older Americans Act, which authorizes the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP), call for increased coordination, these programs are prime examples of the difficulties that can arise when programs provide complementary services, but their eligibility requirements are not compatible. The SCSEP may be used to help older people, such as displaced homemakers,¹ gain work experience while JTPA finances skills training. Both the JTPA and the SCSEP define an "older worker" as one 55 years of age or older. However, SCSEP may exclude some older workers because it gives service priority to those applicants 60 years of age and older.

Even those seniors who meet the age criteria may sometimes be excluded because of additional differences in requirements related to economic status. Under JTPA, clients' incomes must be no more than 100 percent of the poverty guidelines or 70 percent of the lower living standard income level, but SCSEP allows participants to have incomes that are up to 125 percent of the poverty guidelines. Although JTPA does allow administrators to waive the income guidelines for 10 percent of participants, these workers must also face serious barriers to employment. According to a local program administrator, where these programs are located within the same building, clients are frequently referred from SCSEP to JTPA, but do not qualify under the latter program's more stringent

¹An individual who was a full-time homemaker for a substantial number of years and derived the substantial share of his or her support from a spouse and no longer receives such support.

**Appendix IV
Age Requirements in Older Worker
Programs**


income criteria. In these instances, not only is it difficult for case managers to track client eligibility, but clients themselves feel confused and discriminated against.

In addition, program eligibility may vary from state to state. SCSEP includes Social Security as part of countable income, but for the JTPA Older Worker Program, each state has the choice of including or excluding Social Security income.

Lower and Upper Age Limits for Youth Programs

Programs targeting youth vary in eligibility requirements because of differences in their lower and upper age limits. As shown in figure V.1, lower age limits ranged from 11 to 16 years of age, while upper age limits ranged from 19 to 27.

Figure V.1: Lower and Upper Age Limits Differ Among Youth Programs



These differences in age criteria may result in youth being denied access to some programs. For example, as shown in table V.1, the JTPA Disadvantaged Summer Youth Program and the Federal Employment for Disadvantaged Youth both create summer employment for disadvantaged youth. Although both allow youth up to 21 years of age to participate, the programs had different requirements regarding lower age limits. Under the Federal Employment for Disadvantaged Youth, administered by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), youth under the age of 16 are excluded from the program. However, the JTPA summer program, administered by the Department of Labor, permits youth to enroll in the program at 14 years of age.

**Appendix V
Lower and Upper Age Limits for Youth
Programs**

Table V.1: Lower and Upper Age Limits for Youth Programs

| Program | Lower and upper age limits | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 11-27 | 13-19 | 14-21 | 16-20 | 16-21 | 16-24 |
| JTPA IIC Disadvantaged Youth | | | | | X | |
| JTPA IIC Disadvantaged Youth-Incentive Grants | | | | | X | |
| JTPA IIC Disadvantaged Youth-State Education Programs | | | | | X | |
| JTPA IIB Summer Youth Employment and Training Program (Regular) | | | X | | | |
| JTPA IIB Summer Youth Employment and Training Program (Native American) | | | X | | | |
| JTPA Job Corps | | | | | X | |
| Youth Fair Chance | | | X | | | |
| Transitional Living for Runaway and Homeless Youth | | | | | X | |
| Independent Living | | | | X | | |
| School Dropout Demonstration Assistance ^a | | | | | | |
| Vocational Education-Community Based Organizations | | | | | X | |
| Upward Bound | | X | | | | |
| Talent Search | X | | | | | |
| School to Work ^b | | | | | | |
| Federal Employment for Disadvantaged Youth-Summer | | | | | X | |
| Youthbuild | | | | | | X |

^aProgram requirements include a minimum age of 16, but no upper age limit.

^bProgram is proposed in fiscal year 1994 budget.

Definitions of Job Loss Among Dislocated Worker Programs

Nine separate dislocated worker¹ programs have been established to ensure that workers adversely affected by special circumstances, such as increased imports or defense downsizing, have access to reemployment assistance. Although all programs commonly target those workers who are dislocated, as shown in table VI.1, programs vary in their definitions of what constitutes "job loss." These differences may result in workers being denied access to program services.

Table VI.1: Definitions of Job Loss Among Dislocated Worker Programs

| Program | Notice of layoff accepted | Date of hire/layoff restricted | Reduced hours and wages accepted | Voluntary separation accepted |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| JTPA-EDWAA-Dislocated Workers (Local SDA Allotment) | X | | | |
| JTPA-EDWAA-Dislocated Workers (Governor's 50% Discretionary) | X | | | |
| JTPA-EDWAA-Dislocated Workers (Secretary's 20% Discretionary) | X | | | |
| JTPA Defense Conversion Adjustment Program | X | | | |
| JTPA Clean Air Employment Transition Assistance | X | | | |
| JTPA Defense Diversification | X | X | | X |
| Trade Adjustment Assistance-Workers | | X | X | |
| Vocational Education-Demonstration Centers for the Retraining of Dislocated Workers ^a | | | | |
| Transition Assistance Program | X | X | | |

^aThis program does not have a specific definition for dislocated workers.

Although most dislocated worker programs accepted a layoff or termination notice as proof of job loss and eligibility for services, three programs restricted access depending on hire and separation dates. The complexity of such requirements is evidenced by one program that targets four subgroups of workers adversely affected by military base closings. The JTPA Defense Diversification Program excludes members of the Armed Forces if they were hired or were not on active duty on or before September 30, 1990; other targeted groups are excluded if they received layoff notices or were terminated before October 1, 1992, or after September 30, 1997. Members of the Armed Forces and Defense employees are excluded for eligibility until they are within 180 days of the separation; civilian employees working at military installations are

¹Workers with an established work history who have lost their jobs as a result of structural changes in the economy and who are not likely to find new jobs in their former industries or occupations.

**Appendix VI
Definitions of Job Loss Among Dislocated
Worker Programs**

excluded from eligibility until they are within 24 months of separation. A second and similar program, the Transition Assistance Program, also restricts access unless the member of the Armed Forces is within 180 days of separation. Until these arbitrary time periods have expired, some workers may be denied access to services needed to provide the necessary training and skills in order to make the transition to new industries and occupations.

A third program, Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA), focuses on trade-impacted workers and has complex job loss requirements related to the date of separation as well as the level of employment activity during that time. For example, the worker's first qualifying separation must occur after the "impact date" (the date on which layoffs began or threatened to begin), within 2 years of the worker's being certified as adversely affected by imports, and before the termination date of the certification. Further, the worker must have (1) been employed at least 26 of the 52 weeks preceding the last layoff in this trade-affected employment and (2) received wages of \$30 or more per week. In our prior report that compared TAA with the Economic Dislocation and Worker Adjustment Assistance (EDWAA) program, state officials said that such complex regulations contribute to the lack of coordination between the two programs. An important indicator of this lack of coordination is that only 10 percent of all TAA participants received EDWAA services during fiscal year 1990.²

²Dislocated Workers: Comparison of Assistance Programs (GAO/HRD-92-153BR, Sept. 1992).

Program Annual Operating Cycles

Coordination of services is also hampered by differences in program operating cycles within each of the four target groups. According to one administrator, these barriers result in "program coordination becoming...an art," particularly in view of additional state and local operating time frames superimposed on the differing program operating cycles. For these reasons, state officials contacted were in agreement that a standard operating year would greatly facilitate program coordination.

As shown in table VII.1, the 38 programs we reviewed operated on four different annual cycles. Some programs completed their planning process and began operation on January 1, while others did not complete planning and begin operation until October 1. Most programs (20) operated on the basis of a program year (July 1-June 30); 12 programs operated on the federal fiscal year (October 1-September 30); 4 programs operated on an academic year (September 1-August 31); and 2 programs operated on a calendar year (January 1-December 31). These operating cycles varied within each target group regardless of administering agency. For example, two programs previously discussed that target dislocated workers are both administered by the Department of Labor (see appendix VI). However, the TAA program operates on a fiscal-year basis while the EDWAA program operates on a program-year basis.

Administrators attempting to coordinate programs through joint planning have difficulty when operating cycles do not match. One administrator told us that his state operates on a September-to-August time frame, while the JOBS program operates on the federal fiscal year (October 1 to September 30) and JTPA operates on a program year (July 1 to June 30). Although administrators strive to coordinate the programs through joint planning, it is difficult, without parallel operating cycles, to match up available funding with estimates of clients that may need assistance. To accomplish joint planning, the state must resort to several circuitous strategies. Among other things, some agencies involved "lowball," that is, only commit resources they know will be available, and contribute additional resources, as available, at a later time. Other agencies make commitments contingent on expected funding so they are not held to prior commitments when their funding "falls through."

Another state administrator commented that although coordination is hampered by many service delivery barriers, such as conflicting eligibility requirements, other barriers, such as differing operating cycles, pertain to the process or "mechanics" of administering programs. Accordingly, in his view, establishing a standard operating year would be "the key to start the

**Appendix VII
Program Annual Operating Cycles**

car"— the impetus needed to begin collaborative planning leading to successful coordination.

Table VII.1: Programs Within Four Target Groups Differ in Definition of Annual Operating Cycle

| Target group/program | Annual operating cycles | | | |
|---|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | Jan. 1-Dec. 31 | July 1-June 30 | Sept. 1-Aug. 31 | Oct. 1-Sept. 30 |
| Older Workers | | | | |
| Senior Community Service Employment Program | | X | | |
| JTPA IIA Training Programs for Older Individuals | | X | | |
| Foster Grandparent Program | | | | X |
| Senior Companion Program | | | | X |
| Dislocated Workers | | | | |
| JTPA EDWAA-Dislocated Workers (Local SDA Allotment) | | X | | |
| JTPA EDWAA-Dislocated Workers (Governor's 50% Discretionary) | | X | | |
| JTPA EDWAA-Dislocated Workers (Secretary's 20% Discretionary) | | X | | |
| JTPA Defense Conversion Adjustment | | X | | |
| JTPA Clean Air Employment Transition Assistance | | X | | |
| JTPA Defense Diversification | | X | | |
| Trade Adjustment Assistance-Workers | | | | X |
| Vocational Education-Demonstration Centers for the Retraining of Dislocated Workers | | X | | |
| Transition Assistance Program | | | | X |
| Economically Disadvantaged | | | | |
| JTPA IIA Training Services for the Disadvantaged-Adult | | X | | |
| JTPA IIA State Education Programs | | X | | |
| JTPA IIA Incentive Grants | | X | | |
| Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training | | | | X |
| Food Stamp Employment and Training | | | | X |
| Family Self-Sufficiency Program | | | | X |
| Vocational Education-Basic State Programs | | X | | |
| Educational Opportunity Centers | | | X | |
| Student Literacy Corps | | | X | |
| Youth | | | | |
| JTPA IIC Disadvantaged Youth | | X | | |
| JTPA IIC Disadvantaged Youth-Incentive Grants | | X | | |
| JTPA IIC Disadvantaged Youth-State Education Programs | | X | | |
| JTPA IIB Training Services for the Disadvantaged-Summer Youth Employment and Training Program (Regular) | X | | | |

(continued)

**Appendix VII
Program Annual Operating Cycles**

| Target group/program | Annual operating cycles | | | |
|---|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | Jan. 1-Dec. 31 | July 1-June 30 | Sept. 1-Aug. 31 | Oct. 1-Sept. 30 |
| JTPA IIB Summer Youth Employment and Training Program (Native American) | X | | | |
| JTPA Job Corps | | X | | |
| Youth Fair Chance | | X | | |
| Transitional Living for Runaway and Homeless Youth | | | | X |
| Independent Living | | | | X |
| School Dropout Demonstration Assistance | | | | X |
| Vocational Education-Community Based Organizations | | X | | |
| Upward Bound | | | X | |
| Talent Search | | | X | |
| School to Work | | X | | |
| Federal Employment for Disadvantaged Youth-Summer | | | | X |
| Youthbuild | | | | X |

Major Contributors to This Report

Health, Education,
and Human Services
Division,
Washington, D.C.

Clarence Crawford, Associate Director

Detroit Regional
Office

Robert T. Rogers, Assistant Director, Education and Employment,
(313) 256-8011
Edna Saltzman, Evaluator-in-Charge
Jonathon Banas, Intern
Barbara Moroski-Browne, Senior Evaluator
David Porter, Evaluator
Lynda Racey, Evaluator

Ordering Information

The first copy of each GAO report and testimony is free. Additional copies are \$2 each. Orders should be sent to the following address, accompanied by a check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents, when necessary. VISA and MasterCard credit cards are accepted, also. Orders for 100 or more copies to be mailed to a single address are discounted 25 percent.

Orders by mail:

**U.S. General Accounting Office
P.O. Box 6015
Gaithersburg, MD 20884-6015**

or visit:

**Room 1100
700 4th St. NW (corner of 4th and G Sts. NW)
U.S. General Accounting Office
Washington, DC**

**Orders may also be placed by calling (202) 512-6000
or by using fax number (301) 258-4066, or TDD (301) 413-0006.**

Each day, GAO issues a list of newly available reports and testimony. To receive facsimile copies of the daily list or any list from the past 30 days, please call (202) 512-6000 using a touchtone phone. A recorded menu will provide information on how to obtain these lists.

For information on how to access GAO reports on the INTERNET, send an e-mail message with "info" in the body to:

info@www.gao.gov

**United States
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548-0001**

**Bulk Rate
Postage & Fees Paid
GAO
Permit No. G100**

**Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300**

Address Correction Requested
