

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Reagan, Ronald: Gubernatorial Papers,
1966-74: Press Unit

Folder Title: [Personnel] – California's 1971-1972
State Plan under the Intergovernmental
Personnel Act of 1970 (2 of 3)

Box: P38

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

PROGRAM OR PROJECT BUDGET

Program or Project Title: IPA GRANT ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET

I. FUNDING OF CURRENT-YEAR COSTS	1. ESTIMATED FEDERAL FUNDS UNUSED FROM PREVIOUS PERIOD	2. NEW FEDERAL FUNDS REQUESTED	3. NON- FEDERAL FUNDS APPLIED	4. TOTAL CURRENT- YEAR BUDGET
	\$ None	\$ 79,974	\$ 0	\$ 79,974

II. DETAIL BUDGET (Current-Year)

A. Direct Costs:

1. PERSONNEL:	FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME (INDICATE %)	DOLLAR AMOUNT OF COST
a. Position Title and Annual Salary of Project Director Executive Director \$16,000		
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: <u>3</u>		\$31,234
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: <u>1</u>		7,062
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost) 13%		4,978
Subtotal:		43,274
2. TRAVEL:		11,000
3. EQUIPMENT:		3,800
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES:		6,000
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS:		15,900
Total Direct Costs:		\$79,974
		-0-

B. Indirect Costs:

- (1) ☐ Rate not established under Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-87, but negotiated with the Commission at _____ % of ☐ Salaries and Wages, or ☐ Allowable Direct Costs
- (2) ☐ Rate negotiated under OMB Circular A-87 at _____ % of ☐ Salaries and Wages, or ☐ Allowable Direct Costs

Total Project Budget: \$79,974

III. SOURCE OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE (Current-Year)	
1. From Grantee Resources (Show source by budget category)	\$
2. From Other Sources	\$
Total:	\$ - 0-

IV. BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE PROGRAM OR PROJECT AFTER FIRST-YEAR				
	2ND YEAR	3RD YEAR	4TH YEAR	5TH YEAR
Total Program Budget After First-Year	\$100,000	\$105,000	\$110,000	\$115,000

V. FURTHER DISCUSSION <div style="margin-left: 20px;"> <u>Other Costs</u> <div style="margin-left: 20px;"> Space <div style="margin-left: 20px;">Office \$300 per month x 12 months</div> <div style="margin-left: 20px;">Meeting rooms 100 per day x 15 meetings</div> Consumable Supplies Telephone Reproduction Accounting Services Staff Training Part-time Help </div> </div>		\$ 3,600 1,500 2,300 1,600 3,500 1,800 600 <u>1,000</u> \$15,900
<div style="margin-left: 20px;"> <u>Travel</u> In-State Out-of-State 17 Council Members </div>		\$ 5,500 1,500 <u>4,000</u> \$11,000

JURISDICTIONS COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION

1. Legal Name of Each Jurisdiction and Projects applying to that Jurisdiction.

Advisory Coordinating Council on Public Personnel Management

2. The following documentation of agreement or authority for coverage of these jurisdictions is attached (please list):

☒ This application does not cover any jurisdictions other than the applicant.

1. Name of Applicant:

Los Angeles County
Department of Personnel

2. Title of Project:

Management Personnel System

3. Project Director:

Richard P. Raymond, Division Chief
222 North Grand Ave., Room 555
Los Angeles, CA 90015 — 625-3611, ext. 64301

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$ 85,151.00
Local Share:	\$ 28,383.00
Total Project Cost:	\$113,534.00

5. Need for Project:

Public agencies, as most employers, are facing a mounting scarcity of managerial talent, especially at the middle and upper levels. Frequently private organizations defer expansion or diversification because of this shortage; however, government does not share this advantage. As new services are demanded and departments grow to face the needs of a mounting population, new organizational units must be staffed and managers appointed to run them.

As the number of managers increases and their jobs grow more complex, it becomes more difficult to accept less than adequate performance. In examining some of the reasons for managerial failure, we are forced to dispel the Jacksonian-type myth that the job of the manager is so easy, such a natural outgrowth of technical expertise that it is a logical ascension for any capable technician. We are further forced to admit that raw, unguided experience is *not* the best teacher and, as in other professions, the best manager is not necessarily selftaught.

The time-in-grade concept, an outgrowth of most classification systems, presses any selection process to an unachievable limit. It restricts the recruitment base for the next level up, frequently narrowing it to a field of one. This does not allow the system even one mistake at any level, since that level makes up the promotional reserve for successive levels. Further, this process must somehow account for and measure qualities or requirements, not only of the present position but of higher levels to which the candidate may become the heir-in-fact.

In addition, other forces mitigate against continuing our past methods of dealing with this problem:

Mounting pressures for economy may soon deny top levels the opportunity to surround less capable managers with a myriad of staff upon whom can fall the duties managers are not capable of handling;

There is a mounting willingness, if not ability, to recognize and deal directly with less capable managers and a concomitant decline in the idea that a person after years of faithful service is entitled to a pasture position;

As information systems become more refined, delivering more accurate, diversified, and abundant information, and as the demands of community representatives become more sophisticated, it becomes virtually impossible to insulate or hide the less capable managers;

With the mounting militancy of special interest groups and the frequent abruptness of their actions, the decision-making process may have regressed from a pluralist process to an act performed by an individual under the least ideal conditions and the greatest of pressures.

The long standing practice of promoting from within has produced many problems, but one is particularly highlighted by public agencies' recent entry into formal negotiations with labor groups: principal concentration in all such negotiations has been upon benefits, advantages, and concessions for line employees, with little

attention devoted to concomitant incentives for the manager, who is now forced to choose sides between management and labor.

While on one hand we preach the uniqueness of his job, his special position as management advocate and the disadvantages of his fraternizing or becoming one of the employees, when it comes to compensation, selection, recruitment, evaluation and other such matters, his processing differs in no way from that of the average line employee.

In approaching a solution to this problem of developing managers, certain fundamentals seem to stand out, if not as axiomatic, at least as helpful assumptions to make in accelerating innovation:

ASSUMPTIONS

- I. The job of the manager differs exponentially from that of the worker. It is an entirely different job, calling for different knowledges, skills, and attitudes. For this reason not everyone, nor even the majority, of those who have demonstrated success as workers are capable of becoming managers.

II. Management Identity

With the passing of paternalism and the advent of labor relations, public management has lost its identity. No longer permitted to be tied to the workers' ranks from which they came, they are now faced by an organized and cohesive labor force with a newly-found sense of oneness. In many instances because of their designation as "management", they are forced to sever relations with employee groups or professional associations who have assumed a militant, union-like role. Under these conditions they grope for identity, for some unifying force. Unions represent the employees' interest, but who looks after management?

What is needed is a separate and different incentive plan, including intangible as well as material "rewards" to compensate for the unique demands of the managers job—some means of tying the management group together, giving them unity, common values, and identity. Theirs is a different job; theirs should be a separate fraternity.

- III. Present efforts in the recruitment, selection and development of managers are splintered and largely uncoordinated.
- IV. Some elements of the traditional merit system are outmoded and incompatible with effective management; e.g., making sure that no individual or group has promotional advantages over others; prohibiting supervisorial or managerial training being given *in advance* of appointment, etc.
- V. Present development methods fail to distinguish between (and tailor techniques for) kinds of management; the traditional line manager with direct authority over varying numbers of supervisorial strata beneath him and the high level staff man (Administrative Deputy, Executive Assistant) who may directly supervise only a secretary and whose line authority may be somewhat nebulous, in reality have few functions in common.

VI. Development, Not Training

The manager's job is essentially one of decision making. Decisions are a product of the interplay of facts and values, (*i.e.*, of technical expertise and a whole complex of objectives, priorities, compromises, and concessions). The average manager does not lack technical expertise, but needs considerable strengthening in the second—the valuational— area. This is not built by formal training but can be best developed experientially. What is needed is not more courses and more training, but concentration on creating the climate, opportunity, and mobility within which planned experiences and value creation can take place. It is apparent that this approach is some distance removed from the classroom and the site of the periodic seminar.

PROPOSAL

It seems clear that to mitigate, if not solve, these problems, some special type of subsystem—a *Management*

Personnel System—must be developed as a departure from our traditional way of handling managers, if we are to advance and improve upon our ability to forecast, recruit and train for these critical manpower needs.

6. Description of Project and Principal Concrete Results or Benefits Expected:

We propose to design a *Managerial Personnel System Model* which create a separate caste of management and separate treatment in the basic personnel functions.

We intend to assemble a skeleton staff to explore the possibilities, the requirements and limitations on the establishment and operation of such a system, rather than attempt to do it on a trial basis. Selected staff will be deployed to this special assignment for a period of one year to investigate recruitment, selection, classification, and the other major functions involved. They will establish the generic requirements and framework of such a system applicable to most public agencies. These objectives address themselves to one of the major problems facing all levels of government today. The resultant product would be of value to all branches of government. Such a study will amortize its cost many times over in the savings of research and trials by other agencies.

OBJECTIVES

The principal objectives of this project would be to:

1. Explore the feasibility of development and installation within the public service of a separate, but parallel, system exclusively for management levels.
2. Design a model for such a system which would: identify and create a pool of individuals with management skills and potential to fulfill future agency needs; increase a manager's proficiency in his present position and provide an organized means of preparing him for each step of advancement along a planned career ladder; and enable such personnel to be escorted through the numerous employment and personnel processes in a simplified and effective manner.
3. Compile and publish the results with sufficient completeness and depth to enable interested agencies to initiate such a system.

7. Project Evaluation:

While the validation of any model can only be made by an actual test run, some intermediate indicators can be identified. The goal of this particular project is not only the design of a model system, but also to assess its net pay-off. This will be essentially on a cost-benefits basis and will include, but not be limited to, the following:

SELECTION

The increased (or reduced unit cost of new selection methods.	VS	Estimated value of improved managerial performance.
---	----	---

CLASSIFICATION

Cost (or savings) of abstracting the classification of management positions from the central classification function.	VS	Benefits realized from specialization and the development of expertise, uniform and more valid criteria.
---	----	--

TRAINING-DEVELOPMENT

Compilation of costs currently incurred for all training courses.	VS	Estimated savings from ineffective classes eliminated.
---	----	--

Estimate of costs of installation of new methods (i.e., interdepartmental rotation, assignments as assistant to, etc.)	VS	Estimated value from reduced time to bring to productivity, improved performance, innovations from new perspectives, etc.
--	----	---

COMPENSATION & EMPLOYEE BENEFITS

Estimated annual costs of modified compensation and benefit system including evaluation criteria and instruments.

VS Estimated values of improved recruitment base, increased management mindedness, savings resulting from readier identification of performance problems, etc.

8. Timetable:

1. **Identification of Study Positions.** 1 Month
Criteria will be established and applied to identify and designate those positions which will compose the system.
2. **Position Elements will be Isolated** 1 Month
Using existing classification, selection, and training records, a factor analysis of all such positions will be conducted to isolate both the common and the unique job elements, particularly those contributing to success of the incumbent.
3. **Identification of Problems.** 2½ Months
A detailed analysis of the problems unique to these classes will be conducted, concentrating heavily on those in the areas of executive compensation, classification, recruitment, selection, employee relations, etc. Primary approach here will be clinical, concentrating on those incidents where the manager fails to perform effectively, where major problems, (particularly those that are recurrent) occurring in the process under study can be ascertained.
4. **Future Needs will be Determined.** 1 Month
Generic subsystems will be designed which will enable, with slight modification, virtually any agency to predict with some degree of accuracy its future managerial needs.
5. **Comparative Systems will be Analyzed.** 1 Month
In keeping with the intent of producing a tool of value to numerous agencies and levels of government, the existing systems of other major agencies will be studied. Both in the early diagnostic stages as well as later in the adaptive phases, existing systems of a representative sampling of major agencies will be examined in detail for compatibility with proposals and commonality of problems. We will contact the counties of Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego and Ventura, the City of Los Angeles, as well as various state and federal departments. These afford ample opportunity to test feasibility and applicability.
6. **Codify Present Personnel Methods** 1 Month
Recruitment, selection, training, evaluation, classification, and compensation of managers of such agencies will be studied in detail, with particular emphasis on the way and degree in which they differ from the handling of similar processes for non-managerial personnel. Equally detailed study will be made of negotiated contracts and the surrounding process in those agencies who have established formal labor relations to determine discrepancies and deficiencies between treatment of management and labor.
7. **Survey of Management Groups.** 1 Month
Detailed interviews will be conducted with officers and representatives of agencies' management councils or coalitions, securing a good vertical representation, to discover attitudes, perceptions, and needs from both senior and junior levels. Like study will be made of a smaller number of the governing legislative bodies where feasible.

8. Legislative Analysis.

1 Month

Comprehensive analyses will be made of agencies' charters or governing statutes and administrative law to determine both the legality and practicality of systems modification to permit abstraction of managerial elements from a variety of functions and their regrouping into a new organizational unit.

9. Formulation of Model.

2 Months

From data, conclusions, and elements adaptable to a variety of agencies or levels of government, model will be developed as a pattern for installation of such a system.

10. Publication of Results.

2 Weeks

A description of the project, its findings and results, including the recommended model, will be published and made available to interested agencies.

Program or Project Title: THE MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL SYSTEM

THE MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL SYSTEM

II. DETAIL BUDGET (Current-Year)		
A. Direct Costs:		
1. PERSONNEL:	FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME (INDICATE %)	DOLLAR AMOUNT OF COST
a. Position Title and Annual Salary of Project Director Division Chief, Richard P. Raymond - \$25,008/yr.	40%	\$ 10,000
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: <u>5</u> 2 Personnel Analysts III 1 Personnel Analyst III 1 Personnel Analyst II 1 Personnel Analyst I	100% 60% 100% 50%	32,232 10,788 15,252 5,796
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: <u>2</u> Intermediate Typist-Clerk	100%	13,440
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost) =	14.44%	12,636
	Subtotal:	100,144
2. TRAVEL:		1,700
3. EQUIPMENT:		2,280
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES:		-0-
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS: Printing		1,000
	Total Direct Costs:	\$105,124
		\$ 8,410
B. Indirect Costs:		
(1) <input type="checkbox"/> Rate not established under Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-87, but negotiated with the Commission at _____ % of <input type="checkbox"/> Salaries and Wages, or <input type="checkbox"/> Allowable Direct Costs		
(2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rate negotiated under OMB Circular A-87 at <u>8</u> % of <input type="checkbox"/> Salaries and Wages, or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Allowable Direct Costs		
	Total Project Budget:	\$113,534

III. SOURCE OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE (Current-Year)		
1. From Grantee Resources (Show source by budget category)		\$
A1. 25% of Personnel (Salaries and Employee Benefits)		23,378
B. 59.52% of 8% Allowable Direct Cost		5,005
2. From Other Sources		\$
Total:		\$ 28,383

IV. BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE PROGRAM OR PROJECT AFTER FIRST-YEAR				
	2ND YEAR	3RD YEAR	4TH YEAR	5TH YEAR
Total Program Budget After First-Year	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

V. FURTHER DISCUSSION	
<u>Travel - Mileage</u>	
1. Auto Mileage - 10,000 miles/year @ \$.12/mile for six (6) employee items	\$1,200
2. Miscellaneous Expenses and Travel Fund - As needed to attend pertinent conferences and survey other metro- politan agencies	500
Total	<u>\$1,700</u>
<u>Equipment Cost</u>	
2 Electric Typewriters, 20" carriage @ \$325 each	\$ 650
2 30 x 60 Steel/Walnut Top, Single Pedestal Secretary Desks @ \$250 each	500
2 Posture, Clerical Chairs @ \$50 each	100
2 Filing Cabinets, Four Drawer @ \$75 each	150
2 Transcribers w/stand @ \$280 each	560
4 Dictating Machines @ \$80 each	320
	<u>\$2,280</u>

JURISDICTIONS COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION

1. Legal Name of Each Jurisdiction and Projects applying to that Jurisdiction.

County of Los Angeles
Department of Personnel
222 North Grand Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90012

2. The following documentation of agreement or authority for coverage of these jurisdictions is attached (please list):

N/A

☒ This application does not cover any jurisdictions other than the applicant.

1. Name of Applicant:

California State Personnel Board

2. Title of Project:

Intergovernmental Center for the Improvement of Personnel Selection Programs

3. Project Director:

Richard L. Camilli
801 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814 — 415-445-5291

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$200,000
Local Share:	\$ 67,500
Total Project Cost:	\$267,500

5. Need for Project:

Increased Government Employment

State and local government employment will rise from 7.7 million in 1965 to a level of approximately 11.4 million by 1975 — an increase of 48 percent. Total recruiting needs are estimated at 2.5 million persons over the 10-year period. Nothing similar to this critical manpower situation has ever been faced before by State and local governments and the strain on selection systems will be enormous.

Stricter Laws Regarding Employee Selection Procedures

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has stated that "it has also been clear that in many instances persons are using tests as the basis for employment decisions without evidence that they are valid predictors of employee job performance".

In response to these and other findings the EEOC issued "Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures" to aid in determining whether selection programs conform with obligations of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and accepted professional standards.

Most government personnel administrators argue that the application of the EEOC guidelines to government employers would impose a burden on existing technical staff and program (money) resources. Albert Aronson, in reviewing the implications of the Duke Power Case and the EEOC guidelines for public employers (Public Employment Practices Bulletin No. 1, Public Personnel Association), concluded that, "greater resources need to be made available for job and validity studies and for more careful test planning and construction". Additionally, the Technical Advisory Committee on Testing to the California Fair Employment Practices Commission has stated that they "have a particular appreciation for the difficulties connected with test evaluation within the setting of a local government jurisdiction", and are interested in exploring "avenues by which assistance might be provided".

The "State of the Art" of Selection Systems in California

A recent survey of over 300 local California jurisdictions conducted by an arm of the California Fair Employment Practices Commission concluded: "that many local government jurisdictions would be hard pressed to meet the test evaluation guidelines being applied in connection with Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act (EEOC Guidelines)."

Short Supply of Available Expertise and Experience in Technical Personnel Selection Areas

As noted above, a survey of California jurisdictions revealed that in many jurisdictions responsibility for personnel selection was assigned to persons with no special education or experience in the field, and few jurisdictions have a viable personnel research function.

6. Description of Project and Principal Concrete Results or Benefits Expected:

The Center will provide sophisticated consultative, research and training services in the area of Public Personnel Selection, through a small staff of highly trained and experienced Consultants. Costs will be kept to a minimum through a pooling of resources and intensive intergovernmental cooperation.*

Specifically, the Center will have six major objectives.

Objective I: *To Act as An Agent of Responsible Change and Technical Resource so as to Encourage, Support and Provide for Intergovernmental Cooperation in Technical Personnel Areas.*

Objective II: *To Provide Sophisticated Consulting Services to Public Jurisdictions at Low Cost.*

Objective III: *To Provide Increased Technical Training for Persons Involved in Public Personnel Selection.*

Objective IV: *To Encourage, Provide for, and Support the Involvement of Colleges and Universities in Problems of Public Personnel Selection.*

Objective V: *To Increase and Support the Development and Use of Validated Tests for Personnel Selection.*

Objective VI: *To Encourage and Support the Conduct of Applied Research in the Field of Public Personnel Selection.*

EXPECTED ACTIVITIES

In order to meet its stated objective, the "Intergovernmental Center for the Improvement of Personnel Selection Programs" would expect to:

1. Offer and conduct training courses and seminars in "Technical Personnel Selection".
2. Offer and conduct training courses and seminars in "Selection Components of Affirmative Action Programs".
3. Develop a set of procedures (a methodology) so local jurisdictions can carry out, more effectively, their own validation studies.
4. Conduct validation studies for jobs in common use for many jurisdictions (clerical, fire, police).
5. Provide expert testimony in court, at legislative hearings, commissions, etc., on public personnel selection.
6. Provide effective and well-developed techniques that may be applied to the solution of technical personnel problems (job analysis, performance evaluation, etc.).
7. Provide, at minimal cost, data processing guidance and services in technical personnel areas (software and hardware).
8. Provide a bibliographic and off-print service in technical personnel areas (including practices of other jurisdictions).
9. Develop a program where university research (graduate student, faculty) can be conducted on real-life problems.
10. Conduct basic research on, and develop effective solutions for, difficult technical problems.
11. Provide a small number of rotational job sites for technicians to develop expertise in technical personnel selection areas.

**The following jurisdictions have indicated interest in participating in such intergovernmental efforts: City and County of San Francisco, City of San Jose, City of Pasadena, County of San Diego, State of Nevada.*

12. Work closely with Federal and State compliance agencies to improve the quality and fairness of personnel selection programs.
13. Speak publicly on the need for improvement, cooperation and mutual support of technical personnel activities; publish articles in journals, etc., on Center activities, research, problems, etc.

7. Project Evaluation:

Continuing evaluation of program effectiveness will be an integral part of Center operations. Responsibility for the evaluation function will be placed with an Intergovernmental Advisory Board.

In addition to comparing actual Center activities with program objectives and the list of expected activities, making priority adjustments as necessary, the Center will evaluate its effectiveness on a component basis, with service as its major goal.

Apart from formal efforts of program evaluation, the Center should eventually reach toward self-support. If Center activities are truly effective, it should be possible for them to be progressively self-supporting, perhaps in a three- or four-year period.

8. Timetable:

Estimated Project Beginning Date	1 Feb 1972
Selection of "Intergovernmental Advisory Board	10 Jan 1972
Selection of Center Director	15 Jan 1972
Center Begins Operation	1 Feb 1972
Interim Evaluation of Objective Achievement	15 June 1972
Submission of Proposal for Continued Funding	30 June 1972
Interim Evaluation of Objective Achievement	1 Dec 1972
Evaluation of Objective Achievement	1 April 1973

PROGRAM OR PROJECT BUDGET

INTERGOVERNMENTAL CENTER FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF PERSONNEL

Program or Project Title: SELECTION PROGRAMS

I. FUNDING OF CURRENT-YEAR COSTS	1. ESTIMATED FEDERAL FUNDS UNUSED FROM PREVIOUS PERIOD	2. NEW FEDERAL FUNDS REQUESTED	3. NON- FEDERAL FUNDS APPLIED	4. TOTAL CURRENT- YEAR BUDGET
	\$	\$ 200,000	\$ 67,500	\$ 267,500

II. DETAIL BUDGET (Current-Year)

A. Direct Costs:

1. PERSONNEL:	FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME (INDICATE %)	DOLLAR AMOUNT OF COST
a. Position Title and Annual Salary of Project Director Center Director (\$25,000)	100%	\$ 25,000
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: <u>8</u>	100%	148,000
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: <u>3</u>	100%	24,000
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost) 13%		25,610
Subtotal:		222,610
2. TRAVEL:		10,500
3. EQUIPMENT:		7,600
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES:		-0-
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS:		26,790
Total Direct Costs:		\$267,500
		-0-

B. Indirect Costs:

(1) ☐ Rate not established under Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-87, but negotiated with the Commission at _____ % of ☐ Salaries and Wages, or ☐ Allowable Direct Costs

(2) ☐ Rate negotiated under OMB Circular A-87 at _____ % of ☐ Salaries and Wages, or ☐ Allowable Direct Costs

Total Project Budget: \$267,500

III. SOURCE OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE (Current-Year)		
1. From Grantee Resources (Show source by budget category)		\$ 15,000
Personnel	\$8,000	
Miscellaneous	4,000	
Duplicating	3,000	
2. From Other Sources		\$ 52,500
Local Jurisdiction Match		
Personnel	\$16,000	
Fringe Benefits	25,610	
Travel	1,000	
Office Supplies	4,200	
Miscellaneous	5,690	
Total:		\$ 67,500

IV. BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE PROGRAM OR PROJECT AFTER FIRST-YEAR				
	2ND YEAR	3RD YEAR	4TH YEAR	5TH YEAR
Total Program Budget After First-Year	\$267,500	\$267,500		

V. FURTHER DISCUSSION		
<u>Travel</u>		
Travel and per diem (30% travel - responsible for covering entire State)		\$10,500
<u>Equipment</u>		
Training Supplies and Equipment - Video Tape Rental, \$325		
3 Electric Typewriters @ \$425		
Office Equipment (12 @ \$500, SPB Standard Rate)		\$ 7,600
<u>Other</u>		
Office Supplies (12 @ \$350, SPB Standard Rate)		\$ 4,200
Duplicating (Reports, Monthly Newsletter for over 200 jurisdictions, manuals, off-prints)		3,000
Office (50 sq. ft. @ 55¢ x 3 = \$990)		9,900
Space (150 sq. ft. @ 55¢ x 9 = \$8,910)		
Miscellaneous		<u>9,690</u>
Data Processing & Programming	\$2,310	\$26,790
Telephone Service (12 x \$30, SPB Standard Rate)	4,320	
Conference Fees	1,060	
Postage	800	
Accounting Services	1,200	

JURISDICTIONS COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION

1. Legal Name of Each Jurisdiction and Projects applying to that Jurisdiction.

2. The following documentation of agreement or authority for coverage of these jurisdictions is attached (please list):

☐ This application does not cover any jurisdictions other than the applicant.

1. Name of Applicant:

County of Santa Clara

2. Title of Project:

Evaluation of Local Agency Compensation Practices

3. Project Director:

Harold S. Rosen, Director of Personnel
Santa Clara County
70 West Hedding Street
San Jose, CA 95110 – 408-299-2341

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$19,884
Local Share:	\$ 7,603
Total Project Cost:	\$27,487

5. Need for Project:

The need for applied research in the area of compensation practices has been evident for some time. This is especially true at the local governmental level where the vast majority of agencies lack the resources to develop methods for evaluating the relative effectiveness of their policies and procedures and to develop or identify alternative practices or resources to meet their needs. Similarly, almost all such agencies have felt the effects of salary and benefit "whipsawing" but have not had the means to measure the extent of "whipsawing" against some common yardstick or to objectively assess the effect of various practices on "whipsawing". The urgency of this need has been accelerated by two factors – a "cost squeeze" and recent developments in employee relations. Local administrators are faced with increasingly sophisticated employee organizations which have challenged many traditional salary policies and practices. Bargaining units have been established or proposed which do not conform to previous salary groupings. Both factors result in a greater need for more specific data and for better methods and techniques of applying data.

6. Description of Project and Principal Concrete Results or Benefits Expected:

The principal results expected from this project are: (1) development of a transferable set of guidelines or methodology which will permit local agencies to identify their actual compensation needs and evaluate their compensation policies and practices in terms of meeting those needs; (2) determination of the effects of various compensation practices on salary and benefit "whipsawing" over an extended period of time; and (3) the development and identification of additional sources of compensation information, including new approaches to compensation survey design and basic salary and benefit structures.

The activities of the project are as follows:

- 1) Prior to the proposed starting date of the project, grantee agency staff will develop an open-ended questionnaire which will be used to assist in the identification of compensation practices, problems and policies in the 14 member agencies.
- 2) Following the appointment of project staff, a survey will be made to identify the broadest possible range of compensation policies and practices in member agencies. The survey will consist of extensive interviews with personnel administrators in each agency; source documents will be collected.
- 3) Information derived from the survey will be classified, and criteria, resources and procedures will be developed to permit its assessment. An analysis of policies and procedures and an assessment of their effects will be made. The specific statistical and other methods which will be employed at this stage will be geared to the information collected.
- 4) Alternative practices and compensation data will be identified and developed to meet the needs of the various agencies. Methods used to develop the necessary information will include: reviews of pertinent literature;

surveys of practices in other local governmental agencies and of private industry; purchasing of specialized private industry salary and benefit surveys.

- 5) Preliminary guidelines will be prepared and evaluated by project and grantee agency staff and by personnel administrators and chief executives of member agency.
- 6) The preliminary guidelines will be refined following evaluation. The refinement will include such activities as clarification of needs of member agencies and the reappraisal of assessment techniques.
- 7) The revised preliminary guidelines will be published and disseminated to member agencies, the League of California Cities, the County Personnel Administrators' Association of California, and IPA officials at the State and Federal levels. Comments will be solicited from recipients to permit further evaluation of the guidelines.
- 8) A variety of data will be collected to meet the needs of the various member agencies which were identified in the evaluation process, and to permit further clarification and refinement of the guidelines.
- 9) Following the establishment of salaries for FY 1973/74, a second survey of member agencies will be made to determine: the extent to which guidelines and additional compensation data were used in meeting previously identified problems and new problems encountered in the salary setting process; what changes in compensation practices and policies occurred.
- 10) A revision of the preliminary guidelines will be made in light of the experience gained in the salary setting process. In addition, the extent to which salary "whipsawing" and other problems were reduced will be assessed.
- 11) A final version of the guidelines will be published and disseminated as described in 7) above.

For a period of five years following completion of the project, it is the intention of the Managers' Advisory Group to prepare annual reports which: describe the evolution of compensation policies and practices among the member agencies; measure the extent of salary "whipsawing" over a period of time; and assess the effects of various compensation practices and policies on salary "whipsawing".

7. Project Evaluation:

The project evaluation design will focus on: (1) the efficacy of the guidelines; and (2) their impact.

An evaluation of the guidelines will be made at the end of both the first and second year of the proposed two year project. Two approaches will be utilized at each time. The first will consist of a technical review by project and grantee agency staff who will attempt to assess the extent to which: (1) compensation policies, practices and problems were properly identified and classified; (2) it was possible to measure or objectively assess the effects of practices on "whipsawing" and other compensation problems; and (3) statistical and other assessment techniques were appropriate.

The second approach will utilize personnel administrators and chief executives from each member agency. This group will first review the technical evaluation. It will then evaluate the guidelines in light of the stated project objectives with emphasis on the extent to which: (1) needs of the various agencies were identified and met; (2) alternative practices or data identified or developed were viable; (3) solutions developed to various problems were appropriate; and (4) the guidelines permitted an accurate assessment of their practices. In addition, comments and criticism will be requested from all recipients of the preliminary guidelines.

The first assessment of project impact will be made at the end of the second year of the proposed project. A survey will be made of administrators in member agencies to identify specific changes in practices which occurred as a result of the project, and to determine what use was made of new compensation information developed by the project.

A second assessment will be made by grantee agency staff over the five years following the project. This evaluation will attempt to: (1) determine the extent of "whipsawing" over an extended period of time; and (2) determine the effect of changing practices on "whipsawing" and other compensation practices. The methods utilized to make this assessment will be similar to those developed during the project.

8. Timetable:

Three factors dictated the project's timetable. The first was that guidelines or methodology was needed which would permit an evaluation of the broadest range of compensation practices and problems encountered by local agencies. The first 12 months of the proposed 24 month project, and a majority of the total staff time, is devoted to developing such guidelines. The second was that the usefulness of the guidelines might be severely hampered if they were treated as static or theoretical. The second 12 months of the project are directed towards "testing" and refining the guidelines through the application of experience gained in the salary setting process and of additional compensation information. The third was that compensation practices and problems are not normally susceptible to rapid change. Consequently, the grantee agency intends to make a five year post-project follow-up assessment of "whipsawing" and the effects of evolving compensation practices on "whipsawing" and other compensation problems.

An Estimate Timetable of Activities is shown below.

1. Development of questionnaire prior to project	Jan./Feb. 1972
2. Survey of compensation practices	Mar. 1972
3. Evaluation of information from survey	Apr./Nov. 1972
4. Development of alternative information and data	Jul./Sept. 1972
5. Preparation and evaluation of preliminary guidelines	Nov./Dec. 1972
6. Refinement of guidelines	Jan./Feb. 1973
7. Publication and dissemination of guidelines	Mar. 1973
8. Collection of data to meet agencies' needs	Mar./Jul. 1973
9. Survey of practices following salary setting	Aug. 1973
10. Revision of guidelines	May/Dec. 1973
11. Second evaluation of guidelines	Dec. 1973
12. Publication and dissemination of guidelines	
13. Five year follow-up assessment	

PROGRAM OR PROJECT BUDGET

Program or Project Title: EVALUATION OF LOCAL AGENCY COMPENSATION PRACTICES

I. FUNDING OF CURRENT-YEAR COSTS	1. ESTIMATED FEDERAL FUNDS UNUSED FROM PREVIOUS PERIOD	2. NEW FEDERAL FUNDS REQUESTED	3. NON- FEDERAL FUNDS APPLIED	4. TOTAL CURRENT- YEAR BUDGET
	\$ -0-	\$19,884	\$7,603	\$27,487

II. DETAIL BUDGET (Current-Year)

A. Direct Costs:

1. PERSONNEL:	FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME (INDICATE %)	DOLLAR AMOUNT OF COST
a. Position Title and Annual Salary of Project Director		
Director of Personnel	1 @ 1%	\$ 277
\$27,705 FY 71/72		
\$29,099 FY 72/73 estimate		
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: <u>2</u>		
	1 @ 15%	2,736
	1 @ 100%	12,336
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: <u>1</u>		
	1 @ 50%	3,276
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost) 15.34%		2,858
Subtotal:		21,483
2. TRAVEL:		288
3. EQUIPMENT:		1,290
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES:		1,300
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS:		1,090
Total Direct Costs:		\$25,451
		\$ 2,036

B. Indirect Costs:

(1) ☐ Rate not established under Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-87, but negotiated with the Commission at _____ % of ☐ Salaries and Wages, or ☐ Allowable Direct Costs

(2) ☒ Rate negotiated under OMB Circular A-87 at 8 % of ☐ Salaries and Wages, or ☒ Allowable Direct Costs

Total Project Budget: \$27,487

III. SOURCE OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE (Current-Year)	
1. From Grantee Resources (Show source by budget category)	\$
a. Personnel	3,013
b. Fringe Benefits	426
c. Travel	288
d. Other Direct Costs	540
e. Indirect Costs	2,036
2. From Other Sources	
<u>Consulting Services</u>	
Personal services of 13 city personnel administrators	
10 hours each @ \$10 an hour; 13 x 10 x \$10	1,300
Total:	\$7,603

IV. BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE PROGRAM OR PROJECT AFTER FIRST-YEAR				
	2ND YEAR	3RD YEAR	4TH YEAR	5TH YEAR
Total Program Budget After First-Year	\$14,431	- 0 -		

V. FURTHER DISCUSSION Explanation of items above in III (1)	
a. Supervising Personnel Analyst (technical project supervision)	
12 months x \$1,520 x 15%	\$2,736
Director of Personnel (Project Director)	
12 months x \$2,309 x 1%	277
	3,013
	\$3,013
b. 15.58% x \$2,736 = \$426	\$ 426
(15.58% = 6.571% retirement; 5.2% OASDHI; 2.8% medical and life; 1.01% Workmen's Compensation)	
c. 40 miles per week for trips to member agencies	
40 x 52 weeks x 10¢ per mile	208
800 miles for surveys of private industry,	
trips to other public agencies: 800 x 10¢	80
	288
	\$ 288
d. Postage, est. at \$6 per month x 12 months	72
Telephone, est. at \$10 per month x 12 months	120
Reproduction (Xerox) 200 copies per month x 12	168
Supplies, est. at \$15 per month x 12 months	180
	540
	\$ 540

JURISDICTIONS COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION

1. Legal Name of Each Jurisdiction and Projects applying to that Jurisdiction.

Evaluation of Local Agency Compensation Practices

City of Gilroy
City of Morgan Hill
City of Campbell
City of San Jose
City of Cupertino
City of Santa Clara
City of Sunnyvale
City of Milpitas
City of Mountain View
City of Palo Alto
City of Los Altos
City of Los Altos Hills
City of Saratoga
County of Santa Clara
Town of Los Gatos

2. The following documentation of agreement or authority for coverage of these jurisdictions is attached (please list):

☐ This application does not cover any jurisdictions other than the applicant.

1. Name of Applicant:

League of California Cities

2. Title of Project:

Salary and Supplemental Wage Benefit Information Service

3. Project Director:

Clark Goecker, Assistant to the Director
League of California Cities
Hotel Claremont
Berkeley, CA 94705 — 415-843-3083

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$21,820.00
Local Share:	\$14,630.00
Total Project Cost:	\$36,450.00

5. Need for Project:

In the face of new developments in public personnel administration, particularly the advent of new concepts in employer-employee relations and the fiscal crisis facing many local governments, it is important that cities have an information system which provides them with accurate, meaningful, and current salary and supplemental wage/benefit data on a continuous basis.

Intergovernmental cooperation is essential if city councils and administrators are to strengthen their capacity to plan, organize, coordinate and administer equitable and acceptable employee compensation programs. Emphasis must be placed on equity among employees and on the greatest benefit to the employee and taxpayer alike for the tax dollars spent in relation to what is taking place in the labor market, as well as in other public jurisdictions. The interests of local governments and of their employees can only suffer from continued "salary-whipsawing" between jurisdictions, salary inequities within cities, and salary and benefit decisions based on erroneous or haphazard information.

Without such adequate and reliable data, city managers and/or personnel directors are not in any position either to meet the needs of the employee or protect the budget and tax base. When "whipsawing" is an effective tool of the employee unions, it is used. The city manager and/or personnel director, without sufficient information regarding the current total cost of compensation for his employees and those of other jurisdictions, cannot meet the needs of employees and still provide sound fiscal control.

The immediate objective is to determine how to construct an innovative data collection and distributive system which can provide California municipalities with necessary, accurate, useful and current information upon which to base decisions on salary and supplemental benefit policies.

6. Description of Project and Principal Concrete Results or Benefits Expected:

To achieve the objectives outlined above, the League of California Cities will undertake employment, direction, supervision and provision of supportive services of a chief consultant who will supervise the research and demonstration project, maximizing the following objectives:

- A. Determining the information needed to assist city officials in developing reasonable, equitable and workable compensation plans including, but not limited to, the following:
 1. Selecting benchmark positions and job descriptions, reconciling the differences in duties and responsibilities of positions from city to city.
 2. Collecting salary information.
 3. Collecting and collating all supplemental benefits and computing their dollar cost.

- B. Designing a format for collection and dissemination of salary and supplemental benefit information. Developing an information service designed to keep salary and benefit information up to date, with data collected on a sub-regional, regional or statewide basis, as needed.
- C. Constructing, as a demonstration project, a salary and supplemental wage benefit information service for a two-year period.
- D. Determining the municipal interest in and feasibility of computerizing such information relating to salaries and supplemental benefits with consideration given to the desirability and applicability of computerized information service, as distinguished from actual development of such a system.

The information service will be geared to the needs of cities as determined by the consultant during his work program. The consultant will be guided by recommendations of the Committee on Municipal Government and Administration, a standing policy committee primarily concerned with labor relations, personnel administration, retirement, workmen's compensation, in-service training and interdepartmental relations. The Committee is composed of mayors and councilmen, city managers, personnel directors, city attorneys and other department-head officials.

The League intends to employ the services of Mr. Ralph Andersen, a private consultant. He is a former member of the League staff eminently qualified for this project. Completely familiar with the principles of personnel administration, he brings to the project a thorough knowledge of developments in the field of labor relations, needs of local governments in this area and financial implications of employee compensation programs. Mr. Andersen enjoys a close working relationship with city officials throughout the State and is assured of their full cooperation.

The League does not intend to develop an in-depth work program for the consultant. Fulfillment of the project objectives depends upon analysis of the data as it is collected and the recommendations of the Committee on Municipal Government and Administration.

We anticipate that consultants with specialized knowledge will also be employed and subcontractors will be used, such as the State Cooperative Personnel Services, institutes of industrial relations, academicians and others who offer particular expertise in fulfilling the objective of the program.

It is the intent of the League that, following the two-year research and demonstration project, the salary and supplemental wage benefit information service will be so structured that the League will be able to provide it on a continuing basis.

7. Project Evaluation:

Continuous evaluation will be provided. The League Committee on Municipal Government and Administration will review the activities of the consultant(s), and provide guidance to the Project Director. Evaluation will be in the form of written reports from participating cities and of discussions and interviews with city officials and League staff members.

Following the project, a thorough review will be made. The League Committee on Municipal Government and Administration will consider recommending revision of the system and long-term support by the League to the Board of Directors.

8. Timetable:

January, 1972 - March, 1972

Prepare and distribute questionnaires to city managers, city clerks in nonmanager cities, and personnel directors to determine salary and supplemental wage benefit information needs and their recommendations for collecting and distributing data.

April, 1972 - May, 1972

Evaluate questionnaires; meet with county and area-wide manager groups on alternative approaches to meeting the needs for city officials for salary and benefit information.

June, 1972 - August, 1972

Design information services system.

September, 1972 - July, 1973

Undertake demonstration project, including on-going evaluation.

August, 1973 - September, 1973

Evaluation of demonstration project, including revision of information services.

October, 1973 - December, 1973

Implement revised salary and supplemental wage benefit information services for cities.

PROGRAM OR PROJECT BUDGET

Program or Project Title: SALARY AND SUPPLEMENTAL WAGE BENEFIT INFORMATION SERVICE

I. FUNDING OF CURRENT-YEAR COSTS	1. ESTIMATED FEDERAL FUNDS UNUSED FROM PREVIOUS PERIOD	2. NEW FEDERAL FUNDS REQUESTED	3. NON- FEDERAL FUNDS APPLIED	4. TOTAL CURRENT- YEAR BUDGET
	\$	\$ 21,820	\$ 14,630	\$ 36,450

II. DETAIL BUDGET (Current-Year)			
A. Direct Costs:			
1. PERSONNEL:		FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME (INDICATE %)	DOLLAR AMOUNT OF COST
a. Position Title and Annual Salary of Project Director			
Executive Director \$41,000		1%	\$ 410
Assistant Director \$28,500		4.1%	1,160
Assistant Legal Counsel \$24,000		1%	240
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: <u>4</u>			
1 Project Coordinator		8%	1,156
2 Staff Assistants		4%	464
1 Project Director \$190/week (50 weeks)		40%	9,500
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: <u>2</u>			
1 Clerk Typist 3/5 time per week @ \$3.50 hour			4,200
1 Clerical Assistance @ \$100 per month			1,200
Committee on Municipal Government and Administration			5,150
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost)			
Subtotal:			23,480
2. TRAVEL:			4,990
3. EQUIPMENT:			360
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES: \$100 x 40 days			4,000
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS:			3,620
Total Direct Costs:			\$36,450
			-0-
B. Indirect Costs:			
(1) <input type="checkbox"/> Rate not established under Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-87, but negotiated with the Commission at _____ % of <input type="checkbox"/> Salaries and Wages, or <input type="checkbox"/> Allowable Direct Costs			
(2) <input type="checkbox"/> Rate negotiated under OMB Circular A-87 at _____ % of <input type="checkbox"/> Salaries and Wages, or <input type="checkbox"/> Allowable Direct Costs			
Total Project Budget:			\$36,450

III. SOURCE OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE (Current-Year)		
1. From Grantee Resources (Show source by budget category)		\$
Personnel		9,780
Travel		4,350
Other Costs		
Conference rooms		500
2. From Other Sources		
<div style="text-align: right;">Total:</div>		\$ 14,630

IV. BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE PROGRAM OR PROJECT AFTER FIRST-YEAR				
	2ND YEAR	3RD YEAR	4TH YEAR	5TH YEAR
Total Program Budget After First-Year	\$15,000	- 0 -		

V. FURTHER DISCUSSION		
<u>Travel</u>		
Automobile @ 11¢/mile	\$440	
Air fare	200	
Expenses for 25 committee members for 6 meetings @ \$25/max/mtg	4,350	\$4,990
<u>Other Expenses</u>		
Conference rooms	\$ 500	
Office Expense (postage @ \$1.50/day; telephone @ \$1.25/day; desk top supplies and consumables @ \$1.50/day) (\$75/mo.)	900	
Project materials	500	
Printing and binding (questionnaires and surveys, etc.)	1,200	
Reproduction @ \$10/wk.	520	
	<u>\$3,620</u>	\$3,620
<u>Equipment</u>		
Desk, typewriter, etc. (rental)		\$ 360

JURISDICTIONS COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION

1. Legal Name of Each Jurisdiction and Projects applying to that Jurisdiction.

406 Incorporated Cities in California

2. The following documentation of agreement or authority for coverage of these jurisdictions is attached (please list):

☐ This application does not cover any jurisdictions other than the applicant.

1. Name of Applicant:

City of Los Angeles

2. Title of Project:

Culture-Fair Testing and Validation Study

3. Project Director:

John E. Wilson, Chief
Employment Opportunities Division
Los Angeles City Personnel Department
Room G-23, City Hall South
111 East First Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012 – 213-485-3906

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$ 75,582
Local Share:	\$ 53,226
Total Project Cost:	\$128,808

5. Need for Project:

The City of Los Angeles is the second largest local government employer in the State of California with over 45,000 employees. More than 3,500 appointments from open competitive eligible lists are made each year.

As a large employer, our hiring policies have a measurable impact on the local and national employment scene in terms of governmental effectiveness and fairness.

The need for valid employment tests has long been recognized as fundamental to successful hiring on the basis of merit. A test which does not adequately measure the relative capacity of an individual to perform the job cannot be consistent with merit system principles.

As an equal opportunity employer, the City is highly interested in hiring qualified persons from all ethnic and racial groups. While the City's Affirmative Action Program has had considerable success in hiring qualified minority group members, more progress in this area is still desirable.

Research by the City of Los Angeles confirms the need for development of culturally-fair employment selection devices. One of the obstacles to hire minorities has been identified as the written test. Our studies indicate that the average pass rate of minority candidates in many written tests is significantly lower than the pass rate of other candidates. There is no evidence that the differences in pass rates among the various ethnic and racial groups is based on differences in ability to perform on the job.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that public agencies which do not develop culturally fair and validated employment selection tests will soon be forced to do so by the judicial or legislative branches of the state or federal government.

In August of 1970, the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission (E.E.O.C.) issued its Guidelines on Employee Selection. These Guidelines provide an interpretation of non-discriminatory requirements of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. They require stringent, empirical proof of the validity of all employment selection devices on which there are disproportionate pass rates among ethnic groups. In the 1971 decision of Griggs versus Duke Power Company, the United States Supreme Court gave force to the E.E.O.C. Guidelines by stating that they "... comport with congressional intent." Although the 1964 Civil Rights Act exempts public agencies from its provisions, a California court case in 1970 (Penn versus Stumpf) found that where the relief sought in injunctive and not monetary, public agencies are not immune.

As the courts become increasingly aware of and sophisticated in the functions of employment testing, it is likely that court injunctions and prolonged court cases may soon drastically impede the operation of local government merit systems.

The City of Los Angeles Personnel Department recognizes the importance of test research in order to maintain a quality work force through a merit system to give responsive service to the public. However, the intense competition for City funds has repeatedly resulted in deletion of budget requests to fund the required test research.

6. Description of Project and Principal Concrete Results or Benefits Expected:

The purpose of this project is to develop culturally-fair, validated, alternate forms of several general ability tests. Separate tests will be developed, which will be appropriate for job classifications requiring high school graduation or less, or requiring 1, 2, or 3 years of college, or requiring a college bachelor's degree. More alternate forms of each test will be developed, if feasible.

All tests will be validated for several job classifications for which they are appropriate. All tests will be developed in such a way that equally qualified members of each major ethnic group will do equally well on the tests.

The use of these tests in hiring persons for jobs with the City of Los Angeles will result in more equally balanced proportions of employees from each ethnic group. The results, conclusions, and techniques developed by this research will be made available to other interested governmental agencies, so that they may profit from this grant.

The project consists of the development of at least six culturally-fair, validated employment tests. Each test will be developed in two phases.

Phase I is composed of Steps 1-6 below. During this phase, techniques developed by the staff of this agency will be employed in order to identify individual test questions which are culturally fair.

Phase II is composed of steps 7-13 below. It consists of the standard, recognized procedure for validating and cross-validating employment tests.

Phase I

- (1) Job analysis – task list; analysis of necessary abilities to perform tasks
- (2) Test construction – outline of test section to test necessary abilities; construction of test questions; compilation of test
- (3) Preliminary test administration for cultural fairness analysis
- (4) Statistical analysis for cultural fairness – ethnic group matching; separate scoring for ethnic group
- (5) Cultural-fairness analysis – comparison of question difficulty for ethnic groups; selection of culturally fair questions
- (6) Test refinement – selection of culturally fair questions for test

Phase II

- (7) Job performance criteria development – determination of quantifiable measures of job performance
- (8) Job performance criteria data collection
- (9) Test administration for validation
- (10) Statistical analysis for validation – scoring; correlations of test scores with job performance measures
- (11) Test refinement – selection of valid questions
- (12) Refined test administration for cross validation
- (13) Cross validation evaluation – comparison of means and standard deviations of ethnic groups; correlation of test scores with job performance

7. Project Evaluation:

Success of the project will be quantitatively measured by the following criteria: Each of the tests developed will:

1. Yield mean test scores for equally qualified groups of 50 members of Negroes, Mexican-Americans, and Anglos which are not significantly different from each other at the 5% level of significance.
2. Have a positive predictive validity co-efficient which is significantly different from zero at the 5% level of significance for a group of 100 candidates for one or more job classifications.

8. Timetable:

Organization and Orientation — 1st to 2nd week

Test I — 2nd to 32nd week

Test II — 2nd to 32nd week

Test III — 8th to 38th week

Test IV — 14th to 42nd week

Test V — 18th to 46th week

Test VI — 20th to 48th week

Program Evaluation and Summary — 48th to 52nd week

PROGRAM OR PROJECT BUDGET

Program or Project Title: CULTURE-FAIR TESTING AND VALIDATION STUDY

I. FUNDING OF CURRENT-YEAR COSTS	1. ESTIMATED FEDERAL FUNDS UNUSED FROM PREVIOUS PERIOD	2. NEW FEDERAL FUNDS REQUESTED	3. NON- FEDERAL FUNDS APPLIED	4. TOTAL CURRENT- YEAR BUDGET
	\$ -0-	\$ 75,582	\$ 53,226	\$ 128,808

II. DETAIL BUDGET (Current-Year)

A. Direct Costs:

1. PERSONNEL:	FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME (INDICATE %)	DOLLAR AMOUNT OF COST
a. Position Title and Annual Salary of Project Director		
1 - Chief Personnel Analyst - 5th step @ \$24,993	1 @ 20%	\$ 4,999
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: <u>4</u>		
1 - Senior Personnel Analyst II - @ \$20,666	1 @ 25%	5,016
1 - Senior Personnel Analyst I - 15,242	1 @ 100%	15,242
2 - Personnel Analyst - @ \$12,925 25,850	2 @ 100%	25,850
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: <u>4</u>		
1 - Senior Clerk Typist 7,914	1 @ 100%	7,914
1 - Clerk Typist 6,723	1 @ 100%	6,723
1 - Senior Proctor @ \$3.79/hr for 80 hr 303	1 @ 4%	303
1 - Proctor @ \$3.05/hr for 80 hr 244	1 @ 4%	244
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost) 15%		9,944
	Subtotal:	76,235
2. TRAVEL:		480
3. EQUIPMENT:		3,413
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES:		8,000
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS:		5,231
	Total Direct Costs:	\$93,359
		7,469

B. Indirect Costs:

- (1) ☒ Rate not established under Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-87, but negotiated with the Commission at 8 % of ☐ Salaries and Wages, or ☒ Allowable Direct Costs
- (2) ☐ Rate negotiated under OMB Circular A-87 at _____ % of ☐ Salaries and Wages, or ☐ Allowable Direct Costs
- (3) ☒ Indirect cost above allowable 8%.
Total indirect cost of 46.5% of Personnel less allowable indirect cost of 8% 27,980
- Total Project Budget: \$128,808

III. SOURCE OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE (Current-Year)	
1. From Grantee Resources (Show source by budget category)	\$
<u>Personnel</u>	11,517
Chief Personnel Analyst	\$4,999
Senior Personnel Analyst II	5,016
15% fringe benefits	1,502
	<u>\$11,517</u>
<u>Travel</u>	480
<u>Other Direct Cost</u>	5,231
<u>Allowable Indirect Costs</u>	7,469
<u>Indirect Costs Above Allowed 8%</u>	27,980
<u>Equipment</u>	
3 Executive desks @ \$140	
3 Executive chairs @ 43	549
Total:	\$ 53,226

IV. BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE PROGRAM OR PROJECT AFTER FIRST-YEAR				
	2ND YEAR	3RD YEAR	4TH YEAR	5TH YEAR
Total Program Budget After First-Year	\$135,248	\$142,011	\$149,111	\$156,567

V. FURTHER DISCUSSION	
<u>Travel</u> - 80 miles/wk for 50 weeks @ 12¢ mile	\$ 480
<u>Equipment</u>	
3 Executive desks @ \$140	= 420
3 Executive chairs @ 43	= 129
2 Typist desks @ 148	= 296
2 Typist chairs @ 42	= 84
2 Electric typewriters @ 492	= 984
1 Printing calculator @ 1,500	= <u>1,500</u>
	\$3,413
<u>Consultant</u> - Professional, psychometric, technical consultant for program development, staff orientation, continued technical assistance	8,000
<u>Other Direct Costs</u>	
a. Telephones - 4 phones, 3 lines, 6 button	= 656
b. Office Supplies - \$4.25 per month per desk	= 255
c. Technical Reference Materials	= 215
(1) Technical books - \$100	
(2) Subscriptions - 115	
d. Printing and duplication - 20 tests x \$74 test	= 1,500
e. Office space, utilities, and maintenance	= <u>2,605</u>
(521 ft ² @ \$5.00)	5,231

JURISDICTIONS COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION

1. Legal Name of Each Jurisdiction and Projects applying to that Jurisdiction.

City of Los Angeles

2. The following documentation of agreement or authority for coverage of these jurisdictions is attached (please list):

☒ This application does not cover any jurisdictions other than the applicant.

1. Name of Applicant:

City of Inglewood

2. Title of Project:

Full Resource Development Program

3. Project Director:

Gary C. Foss
City of Inglewood
105 East Queen Street
Inglewood, CA 90301 — 213-674-7111, ext. 271

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$20,000
Local Share:	\$14,409
Total Project Cost:	\$34,409

5. Need for Project:

The City of Inglewood has recognized the need for formulating an action program which has concrete innovative procedures for the recruitment, selection, testing, and training of persons who have had, or are having, problems seeking or maintaining employment. These persons include, but are not limited to, minorities, the physically handicapped, and women. Through insights and skills gained from implementing the above program the City will also be able to develop the selection, testing, and career training procedures of present employees.

The development and implementation of this program will represent a radical departure in the employment and training of the disadvantaged. The results of this breakthrough will provide a much-needed source of information and guidance to government agencies across the nation who are making a legitimate effort to reach out to the disadvantaged in their jurisdictions and within their own organization.

6. Description of Project and Principal Concrete Results or Benefits Expected:

The project will consist of three major segments: (1) Recruitment: Newspaper advertisement (both community and City), radio announcements (including those which appeal to specialized audiences) and social service agencies will be used extensively in the City's effort to reach persons with employment difficulties. (2) Selection and testing: -a- An attempt will be made to insure the validity and culture-fairness of our written tests. We realize this is a long-term and difficult project. -b- The personal interview will often be utilized for selecting the disadvantaged. New methods of determining such qualities as potential, motivation, and ability to adjust to work environment will be developed. -c- Performance tests will be utilized to determine physical agility, basic motor skills, and job related work skills. (3) Training will consist of four phases: -a- Orientation and career opportunities counseling. -b- On-the-job training. (Persons will have a combination of intensive training sessions and training at the job site.) -c- Off-the-job training. (Opportunities will be provided for the trainee to continue school and also take advantage of special training courses when offered.) -d- Periodic counseling sessions to review the progress of trainees, their needs for improvement, and their suitability for the job. (4) Benefits expected: -a- The program will allow persons to acquire skills and employment who would otherwise have a limited opportunity for employment and career development. -b- Skills learned in conducting this program will aid in the development of present employees. -c- The program will serve as a model for other governments which will aid them in the recruitment, selection, training, career development, and evaluation of the disadvantaged.

7. Project Evaluation:

The full-time staff assistant, involved trainers, and supervisors will be responsible for conducting the evaluation process. The following points will be included: (1) Performance evaluations will be devised and utilized by the counselor, supervisors, and foremen to determine such items as ability to perform assigned tasks, adjustment to work environment, and potential promotability. (2) A comparative analysis will be made of the performance of employees who entered jobs by the current standards and selection process as contrasted to those who entered

through the new process and have now moved into regular positions. (3) An evaluation will be made of the usefulness of this model for other government agencies. (4) Questionnaires will be devised to obtain information about the attitudes concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the program as seen by persons employed under this program and their immediate supervisors. (5) A determination will be made of the number of persons who successfully move to permanent positions beyond the trainee level.

8. Timetable:

(1) Begin the project as soon as the funds are available. First four months will be spent establishing job classifications, recruitment, selection, and testing procedures. (2) Development of training procedures will require a minimum of two months. (3) Continuous recruitment, selection, and training will consume the next 2-½ years. (4) The project will be evaluated every six months. In addition, a final report will be published at the end of the grant period.

PROGRAM OR PROJECT BUDGET

Program or Project Title: FULL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

I. FUNDING OF CURRENT-YEAR COSTS	1. ESTIMATED FEDERAL FUNDS UNUSED FROM PREVIOUS PERIOD	2. NEW FEDERAL FUNDS REQUESTED	3. NON- FEDERAL FUNDS APPLIED	4. TOTAL CURRENT- YEAR BUDGET
	\$ -0-	\$20,000	\$14,409	\$34,409

II. DETAIL BUDGET (Current-Year)			
A. Direct Costs:			
1. PERSONNEL:		FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME (INDICATE %)	DOLLAR AMOUNT OF COST
a. Position Title and Annual Salary of Project Director			
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: <u>1</u> Administrative Assistant		100%	\$11,746
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: <u>1</u> Clerk Stenographer		100%	6,795
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost) This is figured at 35% of total yearly salaries and includes retirement, medical insurance, vacation, sick leave.			6,489
		Subtotal:	25,030
2. TRAVEL:			1,000
3. EQUIPMENT:			1,830
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES:			-0-
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS: Supplies, operating expenses, and training			4,000
		Total Direct Costs:	\$31,860
			2,549
B. Indirect Costs:			
(1) <input type="checkbox"/> Rate not established under Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-87, but negotiated with the Commission at _____ % of <input type="checkbox"/> Salaries and Wages, or <input type="checkbox"/> Allowable Direct Costs			
(2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rate negotiated under OMB Circular A-87 at <u>8</u> % of <input type="checkbox"/> Salaries and Wages, or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Allowable Direct Costs			
		Total Project Budget:	\$34,409

III. SOURCE OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE (Current-Year)**1. From Grantee Resources (Show source by budget category)**

\$

Personnel

6,795

Fringe Benefits

2,378

Other direct cost

4,000

Indirect cost

1,236

2. From Other Sources**Total:**

\$14,409

**IV. BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE PROGRAM
OR PROJECT AFTER FIRST-YEAR**

	2ND YEAR	3RD YEAR	4TH YEAR	5TH YEAR
Total Program Budget After First-Year	\$30,000	\$32,000		

V. FURTHER DISCUSSION**Equipment Costs:**

1 Secretarial Desk and Chair

\$ 490

1 Electric Typewriter

600

2 Side Chairs with Arms

250

1 Vertical File with 5 Drawers

350

2 Telephones

140

TOTAL:

\$1,830

Other Direct Costs:

Office Supplies

800

Car Allowance

1,200

Advertising and Publications

500

Training

1,500

TOTAL:

\$4,000

JURISDICTIONS COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION

1. Legal Name of Each Jurisdiction and Projects applying to that Jurisdiction.

City of Inglewood, located in Los Angeles County.

2. The following documentation of agreement or authority for coverage of these jurisdictions is attached (please list):

☒ This application does not cover any jurisdictions other than the applicant.

1. Name of Applicant:

City of Fresno

2. Title of Project:

Personnel Management Systems

3. Project Director:

Patrick Mahler, Director
Personnel and Labor Relations
City of Fresno
2326 Fresno Street
Fresno, CA 93721 — 209-266-8031, ext. 571

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$20,000
Local Share:	\$10,445
Total Project Cost:	\$30,445

5. Need for Project:

The City of Fresno is experiencing tremendous pressures on its personnel management system; these pressures emanate from minority groups, labor unions, political groups and citizen groups. Compounding the problem is the inability of the personnel management system to deal with and respond to problems inherent in minority recruiting, developing job related performance tests, assuring equitable opportunity for career advancement, job design and content, and eliminating artificial and unrealistic job requirements. If Fresno is to successfully solve these complex problems, it must have the best possible employees. These employees must include representation from the minority groups. All employees must feel they are adequately compensated and have the opportunity to advance within the system. Additionally, Fresno is under pressure from the federal government to hire more minorities or face losing vital federal assistance unless it fulfills its Affirmative Action Plan. This plan indicates existing numbers of ethnic minorities at all salary levels and then states when and how the City will increase these numbers to correspond to City ethnic composition.

6. Description of Project and Principal Concrete Results or Benefits Expected:

The existing Civil Service System and the procedures employed in the Personnel Department are neither adequately fulfilling the personnel needs of the City nor of the employees themselves. Specific problem areas include, but are not limited to:

- a) Recruitment—How, When and Where. Methods of recruiting qualified members of the minority community must be developed.
- b) Testing and Examination. Job analysis must be conducted and relevant performance tests developed to be used in lieu of an over-reliance on written examinations. Reliability and validity of all examinations written or performance evaluated must be established.
- c) Job Design. Entry level skill requirements must be reviewed. Artificial job requirements must be isolated and eliminated. Job content should be reviewed in order that proper and adequate levels of skills, career lattices and advancement based on job performance can be provided.
- d) Performance Appraisal. Quantitative criteria free from prejudice and subjectivity must be developed to provide advancement on the basis of merit and ability to perform rather than because of cultural, personal or political factors.
- e) Training Needs. Training needs must be determined and training programs developed that provide progression from relatively unskilled entry level positions to skilled positions within the job lattice.

The recent court decision of Griggs vs. Duke Power Company gave legal confirmation to the fact that merit personnel systems, with artificial requirement and culturally biased examinations, are equal opportunity employers in slogan only. Yet the tradition-bound practices and antiquated rules and procedures that fail to provide total community involvement in the system can only be changed through the political process of council action. In order to justify the needed changes those responsible for initiating such changes must be given factual

information and empirical data that can logically and rationally support the modifications and innovations required before it will be possible for citizens of all backgrounds to compete equally for Civil Service jobs. This information and necessary changes can only be determined and developed through an independent study conducted by an organization or individual free from the pressures of the organization and special interest. This project will specifically produce the following:

- a) Recruiting, selecting and advancing employees on the basis of their relative ability, knowledge and skills, including open consideration of qualified applicants for initial appointment.
- b) Providing equitable and adequate compensation.
- c) Training employees as needed to assure high quality performance.
- d) Retaining employees on the basis of the adequacy of their performance, correcting inadequate performance and separating employees whose inadequate performance cannot be corrected.
- e) Assuring fair treatment of applicants and employees in all aspects of personnel administration without regard to political affiliation, race, color, national origin, sex or religious creed and with proper regard for their privacy and constitutional rights as citizens.
- f) Assuring that employees are protected against coercion for partisan political purposes and are prohibited from using their official authority for the purpose of interfering with or affecting the result of an election or a nomination for office.

7. Project Evaluation:

The project will be evaluated on the following basis:

- a) The increase in minority applicants for positions at all levels but especially in public safety and administration positions.
- b) The development of performance tests for all entry level positions in which manual or technical skills make up the majority of the job requirements.
- c) The development of a performance appraisal system which reflects the ability of the incumbent to perform the job in terms of quantitative performance standards.
- d) Successful identification and elimination of artificial job requirements.
- e) Implementation of career development training programs that permit upward mobility.
- f) Adoption by the City Council of at least 75% of the recommended changes of the rules and policies resulting from the study.

8. Timetable:

The approach which will be utilized attempts to coordinate with other federally funded programs. The study of the existing system would be conducted by consulting personnel or an organization hired with the initial grant funding. The recommendations will then be implemented or the necessary action to adopt recommended changes in rules, procedures, policies and codes will be implemented by the Personnel Analyst hired under the auspices of Planned Variations.

Project Timetable:

March 1, 1972 — Beginning date
June 30, 1972 — Ending date

Major Milestones:

September 1, 1972 — Complete study
October 1, 1972 — Submit recommended code changes to council
November 1, 1972 — Council acts on recommended changes

NOTE: Where it is feasible to implement recommended changes without code change, administration approval will be obtained and immediate implementation will be made.

PROGRAM OR PROJECT BUDGET

Program or Project Title: PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

I. FUNDING OF CURRENT-YEAR COSTS	1. ESTIMATED FEDERAL FUNDS UNUSED FROM PREVIOUS PERIOD	2. NEW FEDERAL FUNDS REQUESTED	3. NON- FEDERAL FUNDS APPLIED	4. TOTAL CURRENT- YEAR BUDGET
	\$	\$20,000	\$10,445	\$ 30,445

II. DETAIL BUDGET (Current-Year)

A. Direct Costs:

1. PERSONNEL:	FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME (INDICATE %)	DOLLAR AMOUNT OF COST
a. Position Title and Annual Salary of Project Director		
Patrick Mahler Director of Personnel and Labor Relations	10%	\$ 1,421
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: <u>5</u>		
2 Junior Administrative Assistants	50%	5,068
1 Personnel Analyst	25%	2,114
1 Training and Safety Officer	10%	882
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: <u>1</u>		
1 Typist-Clerk	25%	756
Fringe Benefits (if direct cost) 20%		204
	Subtotal:	10,445
2. TRAVEL:		
3. EQUIPMENT:		
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES:		20,000
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS:		
	Total Direct Costs:	\$30,445
		- 0 -

B. Indirect Costs:

- (1) ☐ Rate not established under Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-87, but negotiated with the Commission at _____ % of ☐ Salaries and Wages, or ☐ Allowable Direct Costs

- (2) ☐ Rate negotiated under OMB Circular A-87 at _____ % of ☐ Salaries and Wages, or ☐ Allowable Direct Costs

Total Project Budget: \$30,445

III. SOURCE OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE (Current-Year)		
1. From Grantee Resources (Show source by budget category)		\$ 10,445
Personnel		
2. From Other Sources		\$
Total:		\$ 10,445

IV. BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE PROGRAM OR PROJECT AFTER FIRST-YEAR				
	2ND YEAR	3RD YEAR	4TH YEAR	5TH YEAR
Total Program Budget After First-Year	- 0 -			

V. FURTHER DISCUSSION	
Contractual and Consulting Services	
The City of Fresno is anticipating using the National Civil Service League and/or the San Francisco Regional Office of the U.S. Civil Service Commission to assist them in this project.	

JURISDICTIONS COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION

1. Legal Name of Each Jurisdiction and Projects applying to that Jurisdiction.

City of Fresno

2. The following documentation of agreement or authority for coverage of these jurisdictions is attached (please list):

☒ This application does not cover any jurisdictions other than the applicant.

1. Name of Applicant:

County of Santa Clara

2. Title of Project:

Development of a Management Appraisal Program

3. Project Director:

Harold S. Rosen
Director of Personnel
Santa Clara County
70 West Hedding Street
San Jose, CA 95110 — 408-299-2341

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$16,384
Local Share:	\$ 8,871
Total Project Cost:	\$25,255

5. Need for Project:

Most public agencies do not have a meaningful system of evaluation of executive or management personnel. Performance appraisal in local agencies has been for "lower level" employees. The results of this have been a continuing decline in the effect of most agency-wide appraisal programs. To correct the problem of mediocrity in such programs, we feel, it is first necessary to develop a system which rates the "raters".

Those public agencies having a system of rating managers usually do so on a "trait" basis which is normally not effective in motivating personnel or in correcting inadequate performance. The need for the project is urgent in terms of the necessity to improve the quality of managerial personnel and to provide a meaningful record of managerial behavior and a means of quantifying systematically the evaluations made of it. A by-product of such a system would be to assess the effectiveness of the appraisal program.

6. Description of Project and Principal Concrete Results or Benefits Expected:

We expect to develop a transferable management appraisal system by which a chief executive of an agency will be able to evaluate management personnel on the basis of their achievement of pre-determined objectives and goals. The system will be designed to require managers to set goals and objectives for approval by their superior and to train chief executives in the methods of goal setting and techniques of appraisal.

The chief executives of the County and of the thirteen incorporated cities within the County are expected to participate in the project. These agencies appear to have sufficient commonality and variety to serve as an adequate sample for the development of a transferable management appraisal program. The agencies range in size from 7500 to 8 employees, and from 28 to 3 departments.

The following is a general outline of the approach envisioned for the project. We expect that the research will dictate the specific steps which will be utilized in conducting the project.

The first phase of the project will be devoted to research. This will include identification and evaluation of existing management appraisal programs used in public agencies and private industry. It will also entail the investigation of various criteria necessary to determine the extent to which goals and objectives are achieved, including specific criteria related to the functions of the department or operation being managed. We anticipate that many local private firms will cooperate in providing information and assistance during this phase. The majority of firms in the County are participants in the Bay Area Salary Survey and contacts are established. The Bay Area Salary Survey Committee (BASSC) is comprised of all major public agencies, both cities and counties, in the San Francisco Bay Area and the State of California. Assistance from educational institutions, such as the University of Santa Clara, will also be solicited.

Following an analysis of all information derived from the first phase, a management appraisal system will be

developed. An integral part of this will be the review of the system by all participating chief executives. For purposes of the final project report, the system will be utilized by participating executives for at least six months. Reactions by both managers and executives will be solicited throughout the trial period. Analysis and refinement of the system will continue throughout the trial period, especially in the area of developing criteria for the assessment of goal or objective achievement.

The final phase of the project will be devoted to the preparation and dissemination of the final report, and to the development of a follow up study to evaluate the effectiveness of the system over a two year period in all participating agencies.

7. Project Evaluation:

The major portion of evaluation will be done on a follow-up basis after the program has been operative. The development of a study to assess the effectiveness is an integral part of the program. Specifically, the program will be evaluated by the grantee after two years of operation by questionnaire and personal contact with chief executives of agencies participating.

8. Timetable:

A tentative timetable of project activities is shown below:

Research on existing programs	Pre-project through 1st. month
Development of criteria	2nd month through 4th month
Development of appraisal system	2nd month through 5th month
Utilization and refinement of system	5th month through 10th month
Preparation and dissemination of final report	11th month through 12th month
Development of follow-up study	12th month
Conduct two year follow-up evaluation	Post project

PROGRAM OR PROJECT BUDGET

Program or Project Title: DEVELOPMENT OF A MANAGEMENT APPRAISAL PROGRAM

I. FUNDING OF CURRENT-YEAR COSTS	1. ESTIMATED FEDERAL FUNDS UNUSED FROM PREVIOUS PERIOD	2. NEW FEDERAL FUNDS REQUESTED	3. NON- FEDERAL FUNDS APPLIED	4. TOTAL CURRENT- YEAR BUDGET
	\$ -0-	\$16,384	\$8,871	\$25,255

II. DETAIL BUDGET (Current-Year)

A. Direct Costs:

1. PERSONNEL:	FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME (INDICATE %)	DOLLAR AMOUNT OF COST
a. Position Title and Annual Salary of Project Director Director of Personnel \$27,705 FY 71/72 \$29,099 FY 72/73 estimate	1 @ 1%	\$ 268
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: <u>2</u>	1 @ 15%	3,179
	1 @ 100%	13,656
	1 @ 25%	1,563
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: <u>1</u>		
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost) 15.58% of salaries for (b) and (c) above		2,866
Subtotal:		21,532
2. TRAVEL:		520
3. EQUIPMENT:		325
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES:		-0-
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS:		1,008
Total Direct Costs:		\$23,385
		1,870
B. Indirect Costs:		
(1) <input type="checkbox"/> Rate not established under Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-87, but negotiated with the Commission at _____ % of <input type="checkbox"/> Salaries and Wages, or <input type="checkbox"/> Allowable Direct Costs		
(2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rate negotiated under OMB Circular A-87 at <u>8</u> % of <input type="checkbox"/> Salaries and Wages, or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Allowable Direct Costs		
Total Project Budget:		\$25,255

III. SOURCE OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE (Current-Year)	
1. From Grantee Resources (Show source by budget category)	\$
a. Personnel	5,010
b. Fringe Benefits	738
c. Travel	520
d. Equipment	325
e. Other Direct Costs	408
2. From Other Sources	\$
f. Indirect Costs	1,870
Total:	\$ 8,871

IV. BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE PROGRAM OR PROJECT AFTER FIRST-YEAR				
	2ND YEAR	3RD YEAR	4TH YEAR	5TH YEAR
Total Program Budget After First-Year	- 0 -			

V. FURTHER DISCUSSION		Explanation of items in III (1) above	
a.	Asst. Director of Personnel (technical proj. supvn)	(6 mos. x \$1723 x 15%) + (6 mos. x \$1810 x 15%) = \$3,179	
	Director of Personnel (project Director)	(6 mos. x \$2039 x 1%) + (6 mos. x \$2425 x 1%) = 268	
	Inter. Typist Clerk	(6 mos. x \$496 x 25%) + (6 mos. x \$546 x 25%) = <u>1,563</u>	
		\$5,010	\$5,010
b.	15.58% x (3,179.70 + 1563.00) =	(15.58% = 6.571% retirement; 5.2% OASDHI; 2.8% medical and life; 1.01% workmen's compensation)	\$ 739
c.	Estimated at 100 miles per week: 100 x 52 x 10¢ per mile =		\$ 520
d.	1 desk @ \$140; 1 chair @ \$100; 1 table @ \$85 =		\$ 325
e.	Supplies, est. at \$10 per mo. x 12 mos.	\$120	
	Telephone, est. at \$10 per mo. x 12 mos.	120	
	Reproduction (Xerox), estimated		
	at 200 copies per mo. @ 7¢ each x 12 mos.	<u>168</u>	
		\$408	\$ 408

JURISDICTIONS COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION

1. Legal Name of Each Jurisdiction and Projects applying to that Jurisdiction.

County of Santa Clara

2. The following documentation of agreement or authority for coverage of these jurisdictions is attached (please list):

☒ This application does not cover any jurisdictions other than the applicant.

1. Name of Applicant:

County of Santa Cruz

2. Title of Project:

Study of Employment Requirements in the Classified Service in Santa Cruz County

3. Project Director:

Charles Shean
Personnel Director
County of Santa Cruz
701 Ocean Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95060 – 408-425-2316

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$19,642
Local Share:	\$ 6,566
Total Project Cost:	\$26,208

5. Need for Project:

Santa Cruz County has an annual unemployment rate approaching 12%. The need to employ local residents in permanent meaningful positions is evident.

Governmental employment is the largest single type of employment in the County. Many of our local citizens are kept from governmental employment because of unnecessarily strict employment requirements. In this program we will review the job requirements in the eighteen participating agencies to assure that the standards established are appropriate to the work that is required.

This will be the first multi-agency county effort in working cooperatively towards establishing standard public personnel management systems and procedures. We anticipate that this program will make employment available to individuals who otherwise would have been excluded because of unnecessarily high employment standards.

6. Description of Project and Principal Concrete Results or Benefits Expected:

The program consists of reviewing and revising employment and promotion requirements of the eighteen participating agencies. The participating agencies employ approximately 3,000 individuals in some 700 job categories.

The program will be executed by full time staff working out of the County personnel department. The County will coordinate and supervise all program activities. The full time staff will consist of a Senior Personnel Analyst and a Typist Clerk II, funded under this grant. Supporting services will be provided by two Personnel Analysts, one Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinator, one Field Employment Coordinator, and secretarial staff.

The governmental agencies which will be participating in this program are the County of Santa Cruz, Cabrillo College, Santa Cruz Housing Authority, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, City of Watsonville, Pajaro Valley Unified School District, Pajaro Valley Cemetery District, Aptos Fire District, Soquel Elementary School, Mountain School District, City of Capitola, Live Oak School District, City of Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz City Schools, San Lorenzo Valley Unified School District, Santa Cruz Port District, Scotts Valley School District, and Scotts Valley Fire District. Consultant services will be requested from the U.S. Civil Service Commission where technical services are needed during the course of the program year. Such services will include working with local Civil Service Commissioners regarding recent Court decisions and new management approaches in the field of public personnel management.

It is expected that this program will eliminate artificial barriers to employment within the classified services of the participating agencies. This in turn will assure a chance of employment to individuals who otherwise might be excluded from obtaining meaningful employment.

This program will also establish the precedent for local agencies to work together in establishing fair and standard personnel practices and procedures.

7. Project Evaluation:

Program evaluation can be accomplished by a periodic review of records which will indicate individuals applying for work and those hired. This information in turn should be compared to the information available prior to the start of the project. A comparison of this information should show that individuals who may have been eliminated from employment before the inception of this program are now being hired or are being considered for employment.

A continual review of the policies and guidelines used in establishing this program will be made to assure that the participating agencies are using sound and current public personnel management techniques in maintaining and creating their job standards.

PROGRAM OR PROJECT BUDGET

STUDY OF THE EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS IN THE CLASSIFIED SERVICE

Program or Project Title: IN SANTA CRUZ COUNTY

I. FUNDING OF CURRENT-YEAR COSTS	1. ESTIMATED FEDERAL FUNDS UNUSED FROM PREVIOUS PERIOD	2. NEW FEDERAL FUNDS REQUESTED	3. NON- FEDERAL FUNDS APPLIED	4. TOTAL CURRENT- YEAR BUDGET
	\$ -0-	\$19,642	\$6,566	\$26,208

II. DETAIL BUDGET (Current-Year)

A. Direct Costs:

1. PERSONNEL:	FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME (INDICATE %)	DOLLAR AMOUNT OF COST
a. Position Title and Annual Salary of Project Director Senior Personnel Analyst	100%	\$13,068
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: <u>3</u> 2 Personnel Analysts	15%	3,325
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: <u>1</u> Typist Clerk II	50%	2,784
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost) 10% of a. and c.		1,585
	Subtotal:	20,762
2. TRAVEL: 10¢ x 200 mi per week x 30 weeks		600
3. EQUIPMENT:		2,205
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES:		-0-
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS:		700
	Total Direct Costs:	\$24,267
		1,941

B. Indirect Costs:

- (1) ☐ Rate not established under Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-87, but negotiated with the Commission at _____ % of ☐ Salaries and Wages, or ☐ Allowable Direct Costs
- (2) ☒ Rate negotiated under OMB Circular A-87 at 8 % of ☐ Salaries and Wages, or ☒ Allowable Direct Costs

Total Project Budget: \$26,208

III. SOURCE OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE (Current-Year)**1. From Grantee Resources (Show source by budget category)**

Personnel \$3,325
Travel 600
Other direct cost 700
Indirect cost 1,941
\$6,566

\$ 6,566

2. From Other Sources**Total:**

\$ 6,566

**IV. BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE PROGRAM
OR PROJECT AFTER FIRST-YEAR****2ND YEAR****3RD YEAR****4TH YEAR****5TH YEAR**

Total Program Budget
After First-Year

- 0 -

V. FURTHER DISCUSSIONEquipment

Desk, Analyst \$ 225
Desk, Typist 350
Table, Analyst 150
Chair, Typist 120
Chair, Analyst 160
Typewriter, Typist 500
Calculator, Analyst 700
\$2,205

\$2,205

Other direct cost

Printing \$400
Office Supplies 300
\$700

\$ 700

JURISDICTIONS COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION

1. Legal Name of Each Jurisdiction and Projects applying to that Jurisdiction.

Santa Cruz County is applying for this grant on behalf of 18 local public agencies who are in need of this assistance. The agencies involved are:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| 1. County of Santa Cruz | 2. Cabrillo College |
| 3. Housing Authority | 4. Assoc. of Monterey Bay Governments
(Joint Power Agency) |
| 5. City of Watsonville | 6. Pajaro Valley School District |
| 7. Pajaro Valley Cemetery | 8. Aptos Fire District |
| 9. Soquel Elementary School | 10. Mountain School District |
| 11. City of Capitola | 12. Live Oak School District |
| 13. City of Santa Cruz | 14. Santa Cruz City School |
| 15. San Lorenzo School | 16. Santa Cruz Port District |
| 17. Scotts Valley School District | 18. Scotts Valley Fire District |

2. The following documentation of agreement or authority for coverage of these jurisdictions is attached (please list):

☐ This application does not cover any jurisdictions other than the applicant.

1. Name of Applicant:

League of California Cities

2. Title of Project:

Local Government Administrative Aides Program

3. Project Director:

Clark Goecker, Assistant to the Director
League of California Cities
Hotel Claremont
Berkeley, CA 94705 — 415-843-3083

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$20,335
Local Share:	\$18,320
Total Project Cost:	\$38,655

5. Need for Project:

This is a demonstration project bringing the resources of participating cities and institutions of higher education together to accomplish the following objectives:

1. - to more effectively utilize administrative and professional manpower resources through the employment of entry level Administrative Aides thus taking advantage of the vast reservoir of untried but enthusiastic talent graduating from colleges and universities.
2. - to recruit young people including women, members of minorities and others whose capabilities are not being fully utilized to solve the problems facing local government.
3. - to enable academic institutions and cities to cooperatively address themselves to local problems. The Aide can serve as a valuable communications link between the academic institutions and the city, providing feedback which helps bridge the gap between theory and practice.
4. - to provide a training experience in which the Aide can test academic principles in real life situations and thus develop talent to fill leadership needs in local government.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics (Tomorrow's Manpower Needs, Washington D.C. 1969), estimates that employment requirements in local government will increase by one-third in the next six years—nearly twice as fast as the increase projected for total employment in the U.S. The rapidity of employment growth in local government will be particularly acute in the areas of professional and administrative manpower, which is also in strong demand in other sectors of the community.

The Summary Report of the California Governmental, Administrative, Professional and Technical Manpower Needs Study, reported that "there is serious doubt . . . that cities can attract the type of manpower required to cope with the complex socio-economic forces affecting California." Further, the Summary Report states that "according to the Department of Labor projections of public and private expenditures and employment, a further sharp expansion in demand for state and local government services and hence any manpower requirements, is virtually certain over the next 5 years. The DOL in their publication of June 1971 on manpower, states that state and local government may generate one-third of the 15 million new jobs likely to open up in this country. California may assume that at least 10% of them will be in this State."

The shortage of people being prepared for administrative, professional and technical careers in local government will continue. Thus the use of Administrative Aides may well be the solution to the everpresent situation facing city managers: the never ending supplies of issues, projects, and policies to be researched and not enough time or staff to maintain the work. Some examples of the jobs Administrative Aides could perform are as follows:

Develop management improvement programs; make administrative production analyses; collect, analyze and interpret data and prepare reports for the city manager's use before the city council

and other agencies; participate in bid preparation; develop training and safety programs; construct examinations; gather salary survey data and prepare analysis and evaluation and qualification of pay schedules; prepare personnel rules and regulations; prepare employee handbook; and develop work improvement programs.

Using the Aide for these types of tasks will allow other staff members, i.e., Administrative Assistant, Assistant to the City Manager and the City Manager, to devote themselves to other activities thus maximizing the manpower resources of the agency.

Government, and particularly local government, has an uphill job in recruiting qualified people. The Research Institute of America, recently interviewed 5,000 students at 12 colleges in the U.S. Only eight of these students indicated that they thought government provided them with the most promising opportunities in terms of their personal fulfillment. In another survey, the Gallup Organization interviewed 1,100 students at 57 colleges. 15% of these students stated they would prefer working in government. Of the latter group only 37 (or 3.6% of the total sample) thought that government work would be "satisfying and meaningful." In another study involving 1,000 students, at 18 colleges, it was found that these students rank the prestige of government careers well behind those in many other career categories. Business and Economic students ranked Government 18th of 19 categories; Liberal Arts Students ranked it 16th; and Science and Technology Students ranked it 11th.

The major assumption upon which this proposal is based is that cities and academic institutions through cooperative endeavors can develop personnel competent to manage public policy. The need to attract young people and to train them in local government has long been a concern of municipal government. If cities are to successfully compete with private industry in attracting qualified college students to their employ and if the level of municipal services is to continue to improve, positive recruitment programs developed jointly by cities and academic institutions must be encouraged.

With many cities facing a fiscal crisis of such magnitude that they have laid-off employees, the argument for Administrative Aides may be considered inappropriate at this time. On the contrary, it is more important now than ever before for cities to take advantage of the opportunity to more effectively utilize limited manpower resources. What is necessary is the development of a model for the utilization of manpower resources graduating from institutions of higher education. We hope that cities participating in this program, after weighing the benefits of employment of an Administrative Aide, will continue the program and seek funding locally to employ Administrative Aides.

6. Description of Project and Principal Concrete Results or Benefits Expected:

The League will coordinate development of meaningful Administrative Aide positions in cities in the Los Angeles and San Francisco metropolitan areas with the cooperation of institutions of higher learning in these areas. The objective of this demonstration project is to create a model that can be used by other cities and academic institutions to create Administrative Aide positions.

The League will place fifteen (15) Administrative Aides with approximately half of Aides working on a full-time basis from June 15, 1972, through September 15, 1972, and the remainder on a part-time basis from November 1, 1972, through April 30, 1973. In establishing priorities for matching jobs and students, consideration will be given to the high demand from both cities and students in the Los Angeles area with the balance of Aides being placed in the San Francisco area.

The purpose of the program is to interest young people in and prepare them for careers in local government. The recruitment and educational functions are accomplished by:

1. Orienting and exposing the Administrative Aide to city services and providing him with a basic knowledge of and familiarity with the organization and administration of municipal government.
2. Providing practical experience in issuing assignments to both staff and line functions, usually at a high enough level to allow the Aide to observe and, where appropriate, to take part in the decision and policy making process.

To implement a meaningful program for both the city and the Administrative Aide, the League staff will work closely with the parties involved to ensure that they fulfill their responsibilities. These responsibilities were first

identified in the report "*Internships in California Cities*", published by the League of California Cities. The following responsibilities, as proposed in that report, will serve as a basis upon which the League will select both the Administrative Aides and the cities to participate in this demonstration project.

1. *Selection of Administrative Aide*

Positive recruitment is essential to a productive program both for the Aide and the city. Candidates should have upper division or graduate standing with demonstrated academic ability. They should be able to analyze and organize information, and present concise oral and written reports. Moreover, they should have a strong interest in a career in local government.

The precise selection process will be developed jointly by the participating city managers, academic institutions and the League staff. However, the basic responsibility for selection of candidates for the positions will rest with the academic institutions, with the final selection being made by the city manager in each participating city. Keeping in mind the intention of the pilot project, alternative selection processes may be utilized to determine their respective advantages and disadvantages in terms of the selection of individuals for the position of Administrative Aide.

2. *Provide Challenging Job Assignments*

A program deficiency most frequently mentioned by entry level administrative types is that tasks assigned them are of clerical nature and required little imagination or analytical thought. It is virtually impossible to eliminate every task of a clerical nature from the Administrative Aide's responsibilities. However, these duties should be kept to a minimum and wherever possible be assigned to the position level most economically able to handle it. Giving the Administrative Aide simple clerical assignments defeats the program and drives away the kind of talent it seeks to develop.

Since the Administrative Aide, in most cases, is experiencing his first professional assignment, it is important that his tasks be serious, significant and interesting.

Criteria for developing job assignments are:

- a. The job is one that needs to be done. It is not a "make work" project.
- b. It involves administrative work that will benefit the agency.
- c. The job provides a real challenge.
- d. Job performance can be measured and results known.
- e. There is risk in the job, but reasonable opportunity for success.
- f. The job is not boring; the Aide is kept occupied and under completion deadlines.
- g. The job requires administrative decision-making.
- h. The job requires getting things done with and through others.
- i. There is good communication between agency supervisor and Aide.

3. *The Administrative Aide Should be Properly Oriented*

Time should be taken for proper orientation to acquaint the new employee with the goals, objectives and assignments he will be given. Common courtesy dictates that he should be introduced to the rest of the staff just as soon as practicable after employment. A tour of the facilities and brief explanation of department functions should not be overlooked.

4. *Administrative Aides should be used as Staff Members*

The intent of this program is for the Administrative Aide not to be simply an observer but rather a full staff member. Adequate salary, secretarial support, reimbursement for expenses directly related to his job, meaty work assignments, and where possible, an opportunity to advance in the organization, are some of the earmarks of being a member of the staff. He should be made an integral part of the organization—not an appendage to be endured for a time.

5. *Attendance at Meetings should be Encouraged*

The Administrative Aide should be asked to attend council, commission and staff meetings as an essential element of his training. This is where he will get to see local government in action. Time should be taken to review agenda items prior to and after the meetings to increase the Aide's awareness and sensitivity to decision-making processes of local legislative bodies.

6. *Keep the Program Adaptable*

The best programs are built around the individual participants, as much as possible. Each Administrative Aide brings to his job some special ability, background and interests; a good program will utilize these capabilities to best advantage. To optimize his value to the city, therefore, assignments should relate to his capacities and abilities, as well as to the needs of the city.

7. *The Administrative Aide Should have Adequate Supervision*

If the assumption is correct that top management people in cities have a responsibility to help train and develop new talent, then the city manager must be involved and show interest in the Administrative Aide. The Aide can be effectively supervised by Assistant City Managers, Administrative Assistants or others, but the ultimate responsibility rests with the manager, and he should make certain that needed supervision is given.

8. *Administrative Aides should have Accessibility to Top Management*

A deficiency frequently mentioned by entry level staff people is that they did not get to associate with the manager or other top-level staff members. In a recent article, psychologist Harry Levinson said: "A major factor in a manager's development is the opportunity for him to identify with those who have more experience, skill and power than he has." He pointed out further that no matter how good a training program is, it cannot replace personal relationships with the organization's leaders. Time for personal contact on a one-to-one basis with the manager to help ensure guidance and two-way communication and that essential ingredient - an opportunity to identify with the responsibilities of the manager - should be provided. Administrative Aides need to be able to get the "feel" of management.

9. *Final Review of Administrative Aide Performance is Essential*

At the conclusion of the Aide's employment the manager should sit down with him in an uninterrupted discussion of his experience with the city. The Aide needs specific feedback as to his value to the city, his own strengths and weaknesses, and most of all, his potential for a career in local government. In turn, he can give the manager frank suggestions for improvement of the program, its strengths and weaknesses and any other observations which he, from his vantage point, may have to offer about the organization, the personnel, the community. The potential for mutual benefit in such an "exit interview" is often neglected, but it should be incorporated as an integral part of the program.

Following approval of this application, the League will meet with selected city managers to determine their willingness and ability to take part in the demonstration project. Similarly, the League will meet with representatives of academic institutions in both metropolitan areas to solicit their support and participation in the program. Further, the League will request the city managers who have agreed to participate in the program to meet as a group prior to employing the Administrative Aide to review with the League staff the city manager's responsibilities in this program. Finally, the League will conduct an educational seminar for the Administrative Aides during their employment. The seminar will not only provide an opportunity for Administrative Aides to exchange experiences and interact with staff members and professionals in the field of public administration, but

the Aides will have the opportunity of discussing with League members career opportunities available to them. As indicated above, it is the expressed hope that those cities participating in this program, after weighing the benefits of employing an Administrative Aide, will continue the program and seek funding locally.

7. Project Evaluation:

The program will be evaluated by analyzing written reports from participating Aides, cities and academic institutions. Analysis of reports will pay particular attention to the evaluation each participant made of the others in terms of fulfilling their responsibilities. Further, the analysis will also determine advantages/disadvantages of the full-time Administrative Aides as opposed to the part-time Aides. The Aides collectively, at the seminar, will evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the program. Assuming the pilot project proves successful, the League of California Cities will submit a second year application which will extend the demonstration project statewide and, hopefully, double the number of Administrative Aides employed by cities.

The reports and staff analysis will be reviewed with the Committee on Municipal Government and Administration and the City Managers' Department Executive Committee to revise the program as needed to ensure effective utilization of manpower resources.

8. Timetable:

<i>February, 1972 – March, 1972</i>	Interview city managers to determine their desire and ability to take part in the demonstration project. Further, solicit the support and cooperation of neighboring academic institutions.
<i>March 31, 1972</i>	Announce the cities selected to participate in the demonstration project in both the Los Angeles and San Francisco areas.
<i>April, 1972</i>	With the assistance of representatives from academic institutions, interview the prospective Administrative Aides and forward to participating managers the names of individuals to be considered.
<i>April 25, 1972</i>	Participating city managers announce the names of Administrative Aides employed.
<i>June 15, 1972 – September 15, 1972</i>	Administrative Aides work on a full-time basis in eight cities.
<i>August, 1972 – September, 1972</i>	Interview city managers to determine their desire and ability to take part in the demonstration project. Further, solicit the support and cooperation of neighboring academic institutions.
<i>September 29, 1972</i>	Announce the cities selected to participate in the demonstration project in both the Los Angeles and San Francisco areas.
<i>October, 1972</i>	With the assistance of representatives from academic institutions, interview the prospective Administrative Aides and forward to participating managers the names of individuals to be considered.
<i>October 16, 1972</i>	Participating city managers announce the names of Administrative Aides employed.
<i>November 1, 1972 – April 30, 1973</i>	Administrative Aides to work on a part-time basis in seven cities.

PROGRAM OR PROJECT BUDGET

Program or Project Title: LOCAL GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATIVE PROGRAM

I. FUNDING OF CURRENT-YEAR COSTS	1. ESTIMATED FEDERAL FUNDS UNUSED FROM PREVIOUS PERIOD	2. NEW FEDERAL FUNDS REQUESTED	3. NON- FEDERAL FUNDS APPLIED	4. TOTAL CURRENT- YEAR BUDGET
	\$	\$20,335	\$18,320	\$38,655

II. DETAIL BUDGET (Current-Year)

A. Direct Costs:

1. PERSONNEL:	FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME (INDICATE %)	DOLLAR AMOUNT OF COST
a. Position Title and Annual Salary of Project Director		
Assistant Director (Don Benninghoven) \$28,500	1%	\$ 285
Project Director (Clark Goecker) \$13,200	8%	1,056
Asst. to Director (Randy Harrison) \$13,200	6%	760
Staff Assistant (Ken Frank) \$11,200	5%	560
Staff Assistant (Dave Nicoll) \$10,200	7%	714
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: _____		
Administrative Aides (15)		25,200
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: _____		
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost) None		
Subtotal:		28,575
2. TRAVEL:		1,480
3. EQUIPMENT:		- 0 -
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES:		1,125
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS:		7,475
Total Direct Costs:		\$38,655

B. Indirect Costs:

- (1) ☐ Rate not established under Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-87, but negotiated with the Commission at _____ % of ☐ Salaries and Wages, or ☐ Allowable Direct Costs
- (2) ☐ Rate negotiated under OMB Circular A-87 at _____ % of ☐ Salaries and Wages, or ☐ Allowable Direct Costs

Total Project Budget: \$38,655

III. SOURCE OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE (Current-Year)	
1. From Grantee Resources (Show source by budget category)	\$
Personnel	3,375
2. From Other Sources	\$
Other Costs	7,100
City cash contribution - 15 Administrative Aides (\$75 per month - 6 months each)	6,720
Contractual and Consulting Services:	
Meeting of 15 City Managers Supervising Aides (\$75 ea x 1 day)	1,125
Total:	\$ 18,320

IV. BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE PROGRAM OR PROJECT AFTER FIRST-YEAR				
	2ND YEAR	3RD YEAR	4TH YEAR	5TH YEAR
Total Program Budget After First-Year	\$40,000	- 0 -		

V. FURTHER DISCUSSION	
Travel:	
Staff Travel - 3,000 miles @ 11¢ per mile =	\$ 330
15 Administrative Aides travel to 2-day seminar plus per diem =	1,150 \$1,480
Other Costs:	
Educational material - @\$25 per Aide	\$ 375
Conference Rooms - 2 @ \$85 each =	\$ 170
Office equipment rental, secretarial support, supplies, telephone, postage (15 Interns @ \$77 a month x 6 months each)	6,930 \$7,100

JURISDICTIONS COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION

1. Legal Name of Each Jurisdiction and Projects applying to that Jurisdiction.

15 California Cities

2. The following documentation of agreement or authority for coverage of these jurisdictions is attached (please list):

☐ This application does not cover any jurisdictions other than the applicant.

1. Name of Applicant:

California Youth Authority

2. Title of Project:

Education Program in Systems Analysis for Frederick F. Mills

3. Project Director:

Harold R. Eyer, Training Officer
Rehabilitation Services South
California Youth Authority
Post Office Box 800
Ontario, CA 91761 — 714-627-3566

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$ 1,000
Local Share: (Salary and Books)	\$ 9,816
Total Project Cost:	\$10,816

5. Need for Project:

The Youth Authority recognizes a need to develop managers who are capable of using systems analysis in planning programs to meet the needs of the department's changing clientele. These managers also must be able to recognize and adjust to the many internal forces acting on correctional organizations.

The department also needs to improve the capability of minority staff to move into administrative positions.

Graduate level administrative education and practical experience is a means of enabling minority staff who have demonstrated interest, and who have managerial potential, to develop skills in systems analysis.

6. Description of Project and Principal Concrete Results or Benefits Expected:

The Public Policy Research Organization, Graduate School of Administration, University of California at Irvine, has offered the Youth Authority the opportunity to have one staff member participate in their Educational Program in Systems Analysis. This program provides six months graduate level work at the University of California, Irvine, in public administration and three months practical experience at the Rand Corporation. At Rand, the employee is allowed to develop his own work-related project in cooperation with consultants from that agency. The program is designed to develop the capabilities of participants and to enable them to make an impact on public policy through use of analysis. The University is requiring a \$1000 tuition fee to cover special program costs.

Two years ago the Youth Authority was fortunate in obtaining a scholarship for one staff member to attend this program. After completing the training, this person was assigned as Special Assistant to the Chief, Rehabilitation Services, Southern California, and has made excellent use of the skills he acquired. His duties include analyzing present programs used in rehabilitating delinquent youth and planning of new treatment programs.

Mr. Mills, who has been selected to attend the UCI-Rand program, is a parole agent (minority) who has a high potential for administrative responsibilities. This program offers him an opportunity to develop his administrative capabilities, and to bring the department the benefits of a systems approach to Corrections. On completion of the course he will be assigned duties which will be commensurate with his education and experience. The department needs additional minority staff in administrative positions since 50% of our clients represent minority groups. This program will improve Mr. Mills' capability to assume administrative duties. His salary will be continued during his educational experience.

7. Project Evaluation:

Mr. H. R. Eyer, Training Officer, Rehabilitation Services South, will monitor Mr. Mills' progress and periodically will consult with Mr. Mills and UCI-Rand staff as to his progress. Mr. L. P. Brusca, Special Assistant to the Chief, Rehabilitation Services South, will assist in the periodic evaluations. Mr. Brusca is a graduate of the program.

A major focus of the evaluation will be to find ways for Mr. Mills to use the added education, experience, and broader approach in dealing with major systems problems in Corrections.

8. Timetable:

The employee, Frederick Mills, will be in this program for a period of nine months. During this time he has a contract with the Youth Authority to continue to work for the department for a period of at least twice the length of stay in the educational program. During the nine month education period Mr. Mills will spend six months in a fellowship program at the graduate level in public administration and three months in a carefully planned experience program in the Rand Corporation.

PROGRAM OR PROJECT BUDGET

Program or Project Title: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM IN SYSTEMS ANALYSIS FOR FREDERICK MILLS

I. FUNDING OF CURRENT-YEAR COSTS	1. ESTIMATED FEDERAL FUNDS UNUSED FROM PREVIOUS PERIOD	2. NEW FEDERAL FUNDS REQUESTED	3. NON- FEDERAL FUNDS APPLIED	4. TOTAL CURRENT- YEAR BUDGET
	\$	\$ 1,000	\$ 9,816	\$ 10,816

II. DETAIL BUDGET (Current-Year)

A. Direct Costs:

1. PERSONNEL:	FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME (INDICATE %)	DOLLAR AMOUNT OF COST
a. Position Title and Annual Salary of Project Director Lyle Egan, Chief Rehabilitation Services - South \$27,180 per annum	Less than 1%	-0-
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: <u>1</u> Parole Agent I, Frederick Mills assigned full-time for 9 months Salary: \$1,074 per month	100%	\$9,666
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: _____		
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost)		
Subtotal:		9,666
2. TRAVEL:		
3. EQUIPMENT: (Books and Supplies)		150
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES:		
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS: (Tuition - UC, Irvine)		1,000
Total Direct Costs:		\$10,816

B. Indirect Costs:

- (1) ☐ Rate not established under Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A-87, but negotiated with the Commission at _____ % of ☐ Salaries and Wages, or ☐ Allowable Direct Costs
- (2) ☐ Rate negotiated under OMB Circular A-87 at _____ % of ☐ Salaries and Wages, or ☐ Allowable Direct Costs

Total Project Budget: \$10,816

III. SOURCE OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE (Current-Year)	
1. From Grantee Resources (Show source by budget category)	\$ 9,666
Salaries and wages - \$9,666	
Training Funds - \$ 150 (books and supplies)	150
2. From Other Sources	\$
Total:	\$ 10,816

IV. BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE PROGRAM OR PROJECT AFTER FIRST-YEAR				
	2ND YEAR	3RD YEAR	4TH YEAR	5TH YEAR
Total Program Budget After First-Year	- 0 -			

V. FURTHER DISCUSSION

JURISDICTIONS COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION

1. Legal Name of Each Jurisdiction and Projects applying to that Jurisdiction.

State of California
California Youth Authority

2. The following documentation of agreement or authority for coverage of these jurisdictions is attached (please list):

☒ This application does not cover any jurisdictions other than the applicant.