

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 (3 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/>

1. Name of Applicant:

Advisory Coordinating Council on Public Personnel Management

2. Title of Project:

Development of the Public Service Internship Program

3. Project Director:

Michael W. Poggenburg
Executive Director
801 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814 — 916-445-3637

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$14,527
Local Share:	\$ -0-
Total Project Cost:	\$14,527

5. Need for Project:

In 1970, the legislature established the Public Service Internship Program and assigned administration to the State Scholarship and Loan Commission. Funds for the implementation of the program were not included in enabling legislation due to budget limitations, and the Department of Finance was unable to support the Commission's request that funds be included in the State budget for 1971-72.

The Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 specifies that the quality of public service at all levels of government can be improved by the development of systems of personnel administration consistent with merit principles:

“recruiting, selecting, and advancing employees on the basis of their relative ability, knowledge, and skills, including open consideration of qualified applicants for initial appointment.”

This would enable State and local government to evaluate first hand the quality of personnel available to them; also, it provides the student with practical and educational experience, enriching both his academic background and appreciation for the complexities inherent in intergovernmental relations. The internship experience aids the student in developing useful skills and insights which could benefit him in a subsequent career in public service. The internship program enriches the education of the intern and permits him to participate in the actual process of government.

The Fellowship/Internship Subcommittee of the Advisory Coordinating Council on Public Personnel Management proposes that the Council implement certain phases of this legislation to:

- a) Acquaint students with the opportunities for challenging careers in public service and to stimulate the interest of students in particular functions and agencies;
- b) Enable public jurisdictions to attract students of high ability and achievement potential to government and thereby improve the overall quality of the public service;
- c) Induce students to seek careers in fields of public employment where critical shortages exist and where future personnel needs will be great;
- d) Develop closer relationships between educational institutions and government agencies of the State by fostering better understanding of each jurisdiction's problems and needs;
- e) Extend and improve existing legislative and administrative internship programs throughout the State; programs which have already made a major contribution to the quality of State and local government; and
- f) Cooperate with agencies of the federal government and quasi-governmental and private organizations in building more effective State and local internship and training programs.

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

A public service internship is a student assignment with a governmental jurisdiction or public agency intended to provide the student with a learning experience offering exposure to and understanding of the environment and tasks of government and of particular agencies and functions. In contrast to a specific job or work task, the internship affords creative opportunities for the intern to participate in various phases of a planned training program developed and implemented cooperatively by governmental agencies and institutions of higher learning.

The program under the Advisory Coordinating Council, as defined in the Public Service Internship Bill, would:

- a) Establish the policies and standards for administration of an internship program;
- b) Develop a systematic and continuous inventory and evaluation of all internship programs of the kind described and related preservice training opportunities within the State. The inventory shall be published and made available to educational institutions, public agencies and others who would directly benefit; and
- c) Support academic institutions working with governmental agencies to develop interinstitutional and regional cooperative programs.

7. Project Evaluation:

The evaluation of the project will be in three phases:

- a) Phase one of the program would be evaluated by determining the extent to which State and local government would utilize the policies and standards developed under the Council's internship program.
- b) The success of phase two would be judged by the effectiveness (extent of use) of the proposed publication describing available internship programs.
- c) Evaluation of phase three would be conducted two years after the planning project has been completed to determine the increase in the number of governmental agencies, educational institutions and interns participating.

8. Timetable:

March 1, 1972 to September 1, 1972 — Six-month project.

PROGRAM OR PROJECT BUDGET

Program or Project Title: DEVELOPMENT OF THE PUBLIC INTERNSHIP 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
	\$	\$14,527	\$ -0-	\$14,527

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 (6-month program) Advisory Coordinating Council on Public Personnel Management		10.5%	\$ 843
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: _____ Assistant Government Program Analyst - \$10,860 (6-month program)		100%	5,430
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: <u>1</u> Temporary help		100%	2,742 500
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost) 13%			1,237
Subtotal:			10,752
2. TRAVEL:			500
3. EQUIPMENT:			
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES:			
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS:			3,275
Total Direct Costs:			
			-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:			\$14,527

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**V. FURTHER DISCUSSION**Other Costs:Office space
(300 sq. ft. x 50¢ x 6 months) \$ 900

Telephone 175

Reproduction 500

Postage 250

Equipment 1,200

Consumable supplies 250
\$3,275

\$3,275

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:

California State Personnel Board

2. Title of Project:

The Establishment of Permanent Intergovernmental Training Centers

3. Project Director:

R. Permin Everett, Chief
Local Governmental Services Division
The Management Development Institute
State Personnel Board
801 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814 -- 916-445-5291

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$ 78,299
Local Share:	\$ 32,159
Total Project Cost:	\$110,458

5. Need for Project:

The continuity of good management in California Government is urgently needed to meet the increasing public demand. The development of key professional, administrative and technical employees and officials is receiving deserving attention.

Providing developmental opportunities for all governmental managers at a reasonable cost to the taxpayers is not an easy task. Many jurisdictions are without training officers or adequate staff to regularly provide these opportunities to their managers.* Other opportunities in the community are often limited, not specially tailored for governmental needs, expensive and not of a desirable quality.

For a local agency to establish a training center to provide these opportunities is an expensive arrangement. However, the Community Center servicing several jurisdictions within a locale, could provide these opportunities at low cost and support itself. Thus, what one jurisdiction could not accomplish by itself would be made possible by joining with others.

Since most problems facing society today cannot be solved by one jurisdiction alone, another benefit occurs. Through the center, managers from various agencies have the opportunity to meet and work with their peers from other jurisdictions. Governmental managers, performing similar functions and concerned with the solution of the same problems in the community, will exchange ideas and develop cooperative attitudes—all made possible because of the non-threatening atmosphere that develops within properly constructed conferences and courses. It is possible that the benefits from intergovernmental cooperation that results from these Community Training Center activities will be even greater than those resulting from the new management knowledge attained.

At a recent school of management conducted for managers from the state, cities and counties, several of the participants mentioned that this school was the first opportunity they had to meet and share ideas with managers from other jurisdictions. They seemed surprised that their problems and approaches to resolving their problems were not very different. Out of one such intergovernmental activity was generated a series of group meetings and action plans to increase tourism business within the state. The nature of this activity included not only governmental jurisdictions but also the private sector and the Chambers of Commerce. Thus, through the intergovernmental contacts generated at the conference, California embarked upon a plan to increase its tax revenues and jobs from its tourism business.

*The League of California Cities cites the following statistics in their report entitled, Municipal Post-Entry Training Needs and Resources in California. A) 50% of the cities with population over 25,000 have no formal written policy for post-entry training. B) 10% of these cities have a full-time training officer. C) 25% of the cities regularly conduct formal employee training on city time. D) 33% regularly send the employees somewhere for training.

Similar data was revealed recently by Hayward State College who performed an independent survey. They reported that 3 out of 16 cities surveyed had training officers and that 50% of the cities did training of some kind.

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

A. *Project Objectives*

To establish Community Training Centers meeting the following criteria:

1. Local and independent entities reporting to a board of directors under joint powers agreement
2. Responds to community's developmental needs
3. Offers programs on a reimbursable basis
4. Serves all government agencies in their area
5. Receives top management support from the beginning
6. Provides high quality training opportunities
7. Develops new courses, exploring innovative and creative methods and techniques

To provide developmental opportunities for trainees in a variety of subjects. Although by necessity each Center must respond to the needs of the community it serves, titles of some of the programs might be:

Middle Management School; Creative Problem Solving; Decision Making; Intergovernmental Relationships; Group Leadership; Communications; Specialized Technical Programs, e.g.: Health Inspection Techniques, Building Inspection Skills, Environmental Quality Management, and Supervising the Underprivileged.

B. *Description of Project*

Accomplishment of the project will result in the permanent establishment of a training capability in three California communities.* The Training Center will be a consortium of the government agencies within each community, be bound together by a "Joint Powers Agreement", and be responsible only to the agencies party to the agreement. The Joint Powers Agreement enable the participants to act independently of their agencies and unrestricted by many of the rules and regulations except those established by the board. There are some important reasons why such a community training center can contribute effectively and economically to the achievement of IPA goals:

1. The instructional staff of the center is composed primarily of top managers of the agencies involved who contribute their knowledge, experience and time to the training of others, and who, in the process of preparing for their instructional assignments, gain new insights which improve their own policies and practices.
2. The use of practicing managers as teachers of other governmental managers produces instruction of high credibility.
3. State, city, county, and federal managers who work together as students and instructors in the training programs of the community training center become acquainted with each other personally and officially and each learns the problems and concerns of the others, resulting in an enormous improvement in intergovernmental communication.
4. Training courses provided by the center are specific to the needs and interests of the agencies of the community rather than being conceived and prescribed by outside institutions.
5. After three years of partial support the community training center will be self-sustaining. All expenses of operation are reimbursed through tuitions and fees paid by the agencies which make use of its services. There are no budgeted funds or other appropriations for its support.

*Fresno, Alameda, and San Diego areas.

6. So long as most of the instructors contribute their time, tuition charges for most of the training programs of the center will be low.
7. The community training center focuses the resources of higher education, government and other non-profit community organizations on the problems of the community and solicits the contribution of expertise from all citizens.

Addendum

To Establish an Administrative Coordinator for the Centers

Although the salaries of employees who work for the respective centers will be funded initially by the act and later by tuitions, there is no provision for administratively linking these centers together. The State has a genuine interest in seeing these centers develop, but it does not have the funds to underwrite the cost of coordinating them. Yet for the best chance of success and to save "re-inventing the wheel" each time a new center is opened, certain administrative functions do need to be performed.

The coordinator would play a dual role with the centers. First, he would provide the impetus for getting the center established. The state feels comfortable in assuming this leadership role and feels it has much to gain by establishing these centers. Secondly, with the continuity of one person working with all the centers he can be a very helpful resource both from a training and operational standpoint. The completed application describes these functions more specifically.

7. Project Evaluation:

- A. If the faculty consists of over 50% top governmental managers, we will feel there is satisfactory involvement.
- B. If the participant mix is approximately 20% state, 40% county and 40% city employees or officials we will be satisfied that the activity is intergovernmental. (This mix will vary somewhat with the area.)
- C. At the completion of each program a written and/or oral evaluation will be solicited from each participant. This evaluation will provide information about the quality of the program, effectiveness of the consultants and to what extent the program has met the needs of the people who have attended. Future programs will be modified according to these evaluations.
- D. If the programs are being supported by the jurisdictions the center serves and the center will be solvent at the end of 3 years and 40%-50% self-supporting the first year, we will regard the operation as satisfactorily meeting the needs of the client.
- E. If costs continue to be lower to participants than private or other competition, the costs will be considered low.
- F. If the dates for installing the centers are met, this objective will have been met.

8. Timetable:

The project year should run from March 1, 1971, to October 1, 1972, for each of the three centers.

Program or Project Title: INTERGOVERNMENTAL TRAINING CENTERS

Program or Project Title: INTERGOVERNMENTAL TRAINING CENTERS

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, Regional Training Centers	71%	\$10,000
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: <u>4</u>	@ 50%	29,800
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: <u>7</u>	@ 38% average	17,723
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost)		7,348
Subtotal:		64,871
2. TRAVEL:		8,627
3. EQUIPMENT:		8,940
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES:		14,406
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS:		13,614
Total Direct Costs:		\$110,458
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:		\$110,458

III. SOURCE OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE (Current-Year)

1. From Grantee Resources (Show source by budget category)

Project Director	\$ 2,500
Administrative Staff - 3	7,450
Secretarial Assistance - 6	3,781
Benefits	1,803
Travel	2,681
Equipment and Supplies	3,188
Rent	4,441
Consultants	6,227
Equipment Maintenance	88

Total: \$ 32,159

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	\$274,000	\$389,000	\$295,000	

V. FURTHER DISCUSSION

Other Direct Costs

Rent	\$13,264
Equipment Maintenance	350

JURISDICTIONS COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION

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

State of California

County of Alameda

County of Fresno

County of San Diego

City of Fresno

Cities and counties surrounding the three training centers supported by this project.

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:

Pasadena Area Junior College District

2. Title of Project:

Intergovernmental Training Program Assisting Effectiveness of City Management

3. Project Director:

Dr. Louis C. Riess
Pasadena City College
1570 East Colorado Boulevard
Pasadena, CA 91106 — 213-795-6961

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$42,700
Local Share:	\$15,640
Total Project Cost:	\$58,340

5. Need for Project:

An extensive needs analysis involving the city management personnel involved herein resulted in a determination that a number of significant problem areas contributed to the lack of greater effectiveness in municipal government. A survey of perceived needs of city management and administrative personnel identified the following areas as problems and suitable to the program's attention.

1. *Relevant Determination and Implementation of Public Policy, Planning and Decision-Making in Municipal Government.*

Municipal government is hampered in its effectiveness by the lack of both understanding and communication between managerial-administrative personnel and elected officials. In part, the policy-planning-decision process is limited by too frequent a response to community pressure rather than planning for orderly growth and development in accordance with plans previously established.

2. *Public Organization that is Effectively Responsive to Dynamic and Changing Internal and External Environments.*

Municipal government is not operationally flexible in terms of its organizational design or human resource adaptability to respond to or capitalize upon changes from the environment.

3. *Development of a Modern and Comprehensive Public Personnel System that Fully Embraces the Goal of Service to Management and Protection of Employee Rights on the Basis of Merit.*

(1) Inadequate knowledge about salary setting policies and compensation systems in general.

(2) Failure to fully utilize fair standards of job performance and equal opportunity for appointment, retention, separation, and promotion of personnel.

(3) Insufficient understanding of the strengths and limitations of the means available for solving labor relations problems.

(4) A lack of understanding of the benefits and limitations in personnel training and development.

4. *Attraction and Utilization of Persons with Minimal Qualifications but with Potential for Development.*

An inadequate understanding of cultural and human differences as well as organizational inflexibility has made this an acute problem. Specific problems relate to attracting minorities, disabled or handicapped people and returning veterans.

5. *Intergovernmental Communication and Cooperation at the Municipal Government Level.*

This problem is caused by the lack of communication between elected and appointed officials of different municipalities which arises from lack of meaningful contact or lack of awareness of the commonality of certain problems and their resolutions.

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

1. To improve policy making, strategy implementation, planning, and decision-making in urban government through developing an appreciation for differing functions, roles, and values in the policy-strategy-planning-decision activity.
2. To help participants understand the external and internal environments in which their governments operate while simultaneously developing capability to respond to those environments.
3. To foster the development of a comprehensive modern public personnel system that serves the objectives of the chief executive and the best interests of present and potential employees.
 - (a) To promote the establishment of merit principles.
 - (b) To facilitate understanding and knowledge of methods for the solution of labor negotiations.
 - (c) To promote an appreciation and working knowledge of data and information system collection, analysis and use in the personnel function.
 - (d) To foster an understanding of the use and value of personnel development and training.
4. To promote the attraction and utilization of persons with minimal qualifications but a potential for development through employment and training. To develop flexible public personnel systems capable of meaningful response to special and emergency legislation.
 - (a) To foster flexibility in municipal organization that allows urban government to respond to its changing environment.
 - (b) To promote an understanding of cultural and human differences.
5. To foster intergovernmental cooperation, communication and activity that leads to the greatest public welfare for dollars expended, that results in a sharing of information and that facilitates decision-making and the prevention of problems.

PROGRAM STRUCTURE

The basic program format is ten (10) one-half day courses to be conducted at Pasadena City College. These four-hour courses will be subdivided as follows:

1. *General Session (1st hour)*

Each session will be opened by a speaker who is a recognized authority on the session topic. This 30 to 40 minute presentation will be followed with a question and answer period.

2. *Interactive Group Workshop Sessions (3 hours)*

The workshops will involve small groups in simulation exercises, case studies, discussions and role playing situations. The problems used in these sessions will be based on the actual problems identified by the participating cities in field studies which will be completed prior to development of the workshop materials.

FOLLOW-UP WORKSHOPS

The participating cities will receive instructional materials and staff support. These will enable the cities to conduct follow-up inservice training programs.

PROJECT SPREAD EFFECT

The materials developed and used during the seminar courses are acknowledged to be in the public domain and will be made available upon request to all other interested educational institutions and city governments in California.

1. Video tapes of the ten one-hour general course programs will be housed at Pasadena City College and distributed to users for a nominal postage and handling fee.
2. Workshop materials will be furnished on a cost of production basis through The Eckman Center.
3. A final report summarizing the program outcome together with recommendations as to the subsequent exploitation of the developed program materials will be made available to the League of California Cities for statewide distribution.

7. Project Evaluation:

Each main program session has a built-in pretest component which serves to establish a baseline of participant attitude, topic content awareness, and prior accomplishments relative to individual session areas. The pretest results, taken together with the data set from the follow-up survey will form the basis of program evaluation. This evaluation will determine how well the program has succeeded in fostering positive attitudes toward increased knowledge of effective city management. The evaluation also assesses the extent in which the participant implements the concepts which he learned in the program.

8. Timetable:

I. Program Development

March 1 — April 15, 1972

- A. Needs analysis and participant problem determination
- B. Designate participants
- C. Research and case problem development
- D. Secure resource personnel
- E. Develop resource material
- F. Develop and test instructional materials
- G. Produce instructional materials
- H. Develop pre-test and evaluation instruments
- I. Arrange facilitator program schedule
- J. Orient Facilitators and resource personnel
- K. Secure University Credit

II. Program Conduct

April 15 — July 15, 1972

- L. Conduct sessions
- M. Modify session materials
- N. Conduct process evaluation
- O. Direct participant and staff logistics
- P. Present certificates of completion

III. Follow-up Program (Optional)

August, 1972

- Q. Conduct participant survey
- R. Design follow-up sessions
- S. Develop and produce follow-up materials
- T. Conduct follow-up sessions
- U. Conduct follow-up process evaluation
- V. Provide on-site training materials and assistance

IV. Program Evaluation
August or October, 1972

- W. Administer instruments
- X. Analyze data
- Y. Develop and submit final report

PROGRAM OR PROJECT BUDGET

INTERGOVERNMENTAL TRAINING PROGRAM

Program or Project Title: ASSISTING EFFECTIVENESS OF CITY MANAGEMENT

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
	\$	\$42,700	\$15,640	\$58,340

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 Dr. Louis C. Riess Assistant to the President \$24,000	7.5%	\$1,800
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: <u>2</u> Director of Television Chief of Television	5%	800
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: <u>3</u> 11 Student Assistants	26% Hourly	1,730 440
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost) 11%		547
Subtotal:		5,317
2. TRAVEL:		125
3. EQUIPMENT:		4,500
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES:		42,700
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS:		2,920
Total Direct Costs:		\$55,562
		2,778
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 <u>5</u> % of <input type="checkbox"/> Salaries and Wages, or <input checked="" 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:		\$58,340

III. SOURCE OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE (Current-Year)

1. From Grantee Resources (Show source by budget category)

Personnel	\$ 5,317
Travel	125
Equipment	4,500
Other Direct Costs	2,920
Indirect Costs	2,778

(Of the \$15,640 match, \$7,200 is cash which will be expended on the above listed line items.)

Total: \$ 15,640

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.

1. Pasadena Area Community College District
2. City of Alhambra
3. City of El Monte
4. City of Pasadena
5. City of Rosemead
6. City of San Gabriel
7. City of Sierra Madre
8. City of South Pasadena
9. City of Temple City

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:

Institute of Industrial Relations
University of California, Los Angeles

2. Title of Project:

Public Sector Management Training Project

3. Project Director:

Philip Tamoush, Coordinator
Public Sector Management Programs
Institute of Industrial Relations
UCLA
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024 – 213-825-7609

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$70,510
Local Share:	\$23,543
Total Project Cost:	\$94,053

5. Need for Project:

The Institute is applying for this grant to meet two critical needs in public sector labor-management relations.

- a) the need for elected officials, public management, and their staffs to upgrade their skills in coping with and understanding the currently critical issues in public employee relations; and to increase their effectiveness in dealing with organized employee groups through the latest methods of administering personnel and merit systems and principles, and
- b) the need to meet the rapidly increasing demand for skilled labor relations professionals in the public sector and requests for the Institute to expand its community services role in labor-management relations training for public officials; and to facilitate intergovernmental cooperation among local agencies in California through participation in such training programs.

The courses offered by the Institute in this field are designed to provide specialized training to reduce tensions, resolve conflict, and facilitate the task of public administrators faced with the need for a new approach to public personnel administration. Resistance to change is common whenever new developments take place in any field. Changes in employee relation methods and techniques are no exceptions to this rule; particularly when such changes involve sharing a part of the decision-making process with employees and their organizations.

The accumulation of knowledge in both private and public sector labor relations is vast and comprehensive. Public sector training in this field must consider significant differences between public and private employment. Constraints operating in the public sector make the complete transfer of private industry practices and institutions inappropriate or undesirable in public employment. It is proposed, therefore, that a planned and integrated sequence of courses, designed for public sector labor relations but drawing from the experience of the private sector, be developed leading from broad general concepts and knowledge of the field to specific skill training.

Because of the experience and qualifications of its staff, the Institute could effectively expand its public sector labor relations courses. But public agencies cannot, under current budget restrictions, finance 100% of this training for all administrative and elected personnel who desire or need such training. To provide the highest quality courses, the Institute must charge tuition or fees to finance an expanded staff to handle the increased workload. Funding resources, such as provided by the Intergovernmental Personnel Act, are ideally suited since, not only can a high level of training be offered, but agencies which might not otherwise qualify for funds can participate in truly "intergovernmental" courses at reduced costs.

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

Descriptive Title or Project:

Training Courses for Local Government Agency Elected and Appointed Management Officials in Employer-Employee Relations

Type of Training: (approximately 12 training courses)

- 1) Broad general training conferences to meet the needs of public officials to become familiar with concepts and problems in labor relations, public sector labor law, personnel policy decision-making, negotiation and administration of agreements, impact of employee organizations on cities and counties, employer-employee rights and obligations, and strengthening merit systems through formal employee relations programs.
- 2) Specialized workshops to deal with particular problems such as unit determination, representation elections, recognition procedures, grievance and arbitration proceedings, strategies and techniques of negotiation, and preparing revised personnel policies and procedures.

Principal Concrete Results or Benefits Expected:

The objectives of typical training courses offered by the Institute and financed under this application may be outlined as follows:

- 1) To increase understanding of the broad field of public sector labor-management relations; to provide a basic knowledge of the development and direction of labor-management relations in government employment.
- 2) To analyze the major components of California legislation; to consider the impact of the legislation on all the affected parties; to discuss and evaluate some of the limitations and constraints on managerial authority in the law.
- 3) To provide specific data on the principles and procedures of representative unit determination and unit determination criteria; recognition; emerging patterns in local governments; conduct of elections; and decertification.
- 4) To communicate information on attitudes and approaches of the parties in the negotiation of labor-management agreements; content of the memorandum of understanding; scope of negotiations; strategy and tactics; to apply knowledge to actual case problems in a workshop setting; to participate in a simulation of pre-negotiation and negotiation sessions.
- 5) To relate basic principles of labor-management relations to the day-to-day administration of the memorandum of understanding and the grievance process.
- 6) To analyze methods of impasse resolution and other types of disputes; criteria in the resolution of interest disputes; attitudes of parties toward alternative methods.

More specifically, it is anticipated that trainees will be able to utilize the knowledge and skills gained through application on the job of training content, especially in the areas of group employee relations, personnel policy decision-making, day-to-day supervisory-subordinate relationships, grievance administration, and collective negotiations. In addition, the Institute encourages governmental agencies to conduct their own training programs, using knowledge and skills gained from Institute programs and training materials. The Institute staff engages in frequent consultation with agencies as part of its broad community service.

7. Project Evaluation:

Evaluation instruments in all public sector management programs of the Institute include:

- a) *Trainee Evaluation* - detailed paper-and-pencil evaluation of content, faculty, materials, etc., in the context of the stated behavioral objectives of each program.
- b) *Institute Staff Evaluation* - Periodic meetings are held with Institute faculty and staff to critique each course before and after it is conducted. The faculty and staff include many nationally acknowledged experts in private and public sector labor relations.
- c) *Evaluation by a representative committee* of cities, counties, the League of California Cities, and the County Supervisors Association of California.
- d) Post-training visits to faculty and trainees at their work locations to determine applicability of training to actual job situations.

8. Timetable:

Specific courses to be conducted approximately one each month during calendar year 1972, beginning the month following approval of the grant application.

PROGRAM OR PROJECT BUDGET

Program or Project Title: PUBLIC SECTOR MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROJECT

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-	\$ 70,510	\$ 23,543	\$94,053

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		
*Philip Tamoush-Coordinator Public Sector Management Programs	50%	\$10,050
*Training Specialist	100%	17,500
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: _____		
*Benjamin Aaron, Director, Institute of Industrial Relations	2.5%	1,000
*Paul Prasow, Associate Director, Institute of Industrial Relations	6%	1,500
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: _____		
**Secretary	100%	7,500
**Pat Akins, Administrative Assistant	21%	2,000
**Hazelle Van Gorder, Administrative Services Officer	18%	2,000
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost)*15% x \$30,050 = \$4,508; **12% x \$11,500 = \$1,380		5,888
*Academic		
**Nonacademic		
Subtotal:		47,438
2. TRAVEL:		3,750
3. EQUIPMENT: Typewriter		400
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES:		18,000
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS: (See breakdown on page PART 3-A, V.)		17,498
Total Direct Costs:		\$87,086
		6,967

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 \$87,086
- (2) ☐ Rate negotiated under OMB Circular A-87 at _____ % of ☐ Salaries and Wages, or ☐ Allowable Direct Costs

Total Project Budget: \$94,053

III. SOURCE OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE (Current-Year)

1. From Grantee Resources (Show source by budget category)

\$ 12,043

Personnel:

Benjamin Aaron \$ 1,000

Paul Prasow 1,500

Philip Tamoush 2,550

Pat Akins 2,000

Hazelle Van Gorder 2,000

Consulting Services (Speakers) 863

Fringe Benefits:

\$5,050 x 15% = \$758

\$4,000 x 12% = 480

1,238

Subtotal Direct Cost \$11,151

Indirect Cost - 8% of Direct Cost 892

Total \$12,043

2. From Other Sources

Fee income from participants

\$ 11,500

Total: \$ 23,543

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	\$94,053	\$94,053	\$94,053	\$94,053

V. FURTHER DISCUSSION

Other Direct Costs A. 5.:

Teaching and Library Material for reference \$ 1,000

Books, Pamphlets, and Miscellaneous Material for participants 7,600

Telephone 720

Mimeograph and Xerox supplies 558

Equipment Rental-Video Tape 1,600

Class Room Rental Fee 360

Mailing 360

Program Support 5,000

Brochures 300

\$17,498

JURISDICTIONS COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION

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

The Regents of the University of California. The Institute of Industrial Relations at the University of California, Los Angeles, will provide services in the form of training courses to combined groups of city and county personnel in the State of California with emphasis on smaller public agencies which do not otherwise qualify for IPA grants.

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:

Contra Costa County Mayors' Conference

2. Title of Project:

Intergovernmental Cooperative Training Program for the Cities and the County of Contra Costa

3. Project Director:

Kenneth H. Smith
City Hall
Richmond, CA 94804 — 415-232-1212, ext. 301

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$20,000
Local Share:	\$ 8,108
Total Project Cost:	\$28,108

5. Need for Project:

The need for training has been recognized as a critical one, and the county and cities of Contra Costa County have joined together to achieve better ways of meeting this need. Until now, the problems of keeping pace with the growth of the area has prevented the funding of any but the barest of training projects. What has been accomplished has been in the areas of Public Safety and Health and Welfare. The programs there have shown what training can accomplish and have made it possible for some funds to be budgeted for more generalized training.

To date, all available funds have been allocated to provide the services and facilities required by the rapid growth of the area and its transition from a rural to an urban environment. Additionally, at least two cities are experiencing most of the same problems which have beset any urban core area. Therefore, little time or money has been available to devote to the training of original employees, to say nothing of those hired in response to the growth experienced by the whole county.

In the Spring of 1971, the City Managers of the County appointed a committee to work on a coordinated project to start upgrading and expanding training activities. This committee is presently working with the San Francisco Regional Training Center of the Federal Civil Service Commission, and will be utilizing some of its services to instigate basic training courses. This effort is limited, in that funds are still not available in significant amounts.

Intergovernmental Personal Act funds will allow us to expand and accelerate our training efforts. They will allow us to better prepare our personnel to meet their obligations in: serving the public, integrating underprivileged persons into our labor force; improving the cost/effectiveness of the services provided and proposed; labor relations; training; interpersonal relationships; and overall organizational development.

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

The project proposed in our application is twofold, and was not presented with a priority recommendation on either part.

One part was a request to fund an in depth survey of each participating agency which will identify all areas in which training is needed and to establish an integrated priority ranking of such training. The survey group would then formulate a plan to efficiently provide resources and services through which continuing and coordinated training activities can be established, put into effect and then updated as necessary. In this regard, it is not intended to create a regional training center, but to identify available training resources, establish procedures for their utilization and to set up the methods needed to provide for programs not available.

The other part of the application involves the request for funds to supplement our agencies' budgets for training. This will allow us to accelerate and expand the steps we are taking to meet our training needs and obligations.

The proposed training is a result of a questionnaire prepared and tabulated by the Federal Regional Training Center. In late Spring 1971, the Center, using a limited number of courses, surveyed our agencies' needs and our interest in having our employees receive such training. As the result, we are coordinating with the Center in putting on training courses in public relations and supervision. The funds requested will allow us to make a meaningful start in training in two areas of need while our total needs are being identified and given priorities.

It is not anticipated that this project will have a specific target deadline. It is seen as the beginning of a continuing program which will provide the training and resources to continually upgrade and revise our services, and to make all of our employees responsive to the needs of our citizens and communities.

7. Project Evaluation:

The true accomplishments of a project such as the one we have proposed are difficult, if not impossible, to measure. The result desired is a continuing improvement in government with emphasis placed on public service. Time and citizen reaction and response will be the true test.

It will, however, be possible to evaluate specific items contained in the overall project, and to accomplish this, the following procedures will be established.

We will establish a steering committee with a representative from each agency involved. Their responsibility will be to receive instructions and guidance from the elected officials and chief administrators in overseeing the project. They will review, evaluate and guide the survey of training needs, recommendations of priorities and means of accomplishing specific training projects.

The committee will establish reporting procedures which will allow each agency to provide feedback on results from training courses, participant evaluation of the benefits derived from courses and critiques from trainers and training agencies.

The committee will make frequent progress reports to the elected officials and chief administrators on the progress of the project and training activities, of new and/or better methods of evaluating progress and results, and of plans to continue this multi-agency training project.

8. Timetable:

Ten training classes, averaging four days each with approximately 200 employees participating, will be conducted during the initial six months; following initial program implementation, an average of two courses per month will be conducted, with each course averaging four days each and with approximately 20 persons participating in each course.

PROGRAM OR PROJECT BUDGET

Program or Project Title: CONTRA COSTA MAYOR'S CONFERENCE

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	\$ 8,108	\$ 28,108

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		0%	-0-
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: <u>13</u> (13 at \$375 each est. 2.5% of \$15,000)		2-1/2%	\$4,875
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: <u>1</u>		25%	1,200
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost)			1,033
Subtotal:			7,108
2. TRAVEL:			300
3. EQUIPMENT:			-0-
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES:			20,000
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS:			700
Total Direct Costs:			\$28,108
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:			\$28,108

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

Direct Salary	\$6,075
Direct Fringe Benefit Costs	1,033
Mileage	300
Office Supplies and Printing	200
Postage	300
Facility Use Fees	200

\$ 8,108**2. From Other Sources****-0-****Total:****\$ 8,108****IV. BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR THE PROGRAM
OR PROJECT AFTER FIRST-YEAR**

	2ND YEAR	3RD YEAR	4TH YEAR	5TH YEAR
Total Program Budget After Initial 6-month Grant Period	\$52,800	\$52,800		

V. FURTHER DISCUSSION

The \$20,000 Contractual and Consulting Services amount includes \$10,000 for the Study Consultant firm, and \$10,000 for direct funding of training courses. Training course cost is based upon \$25 per day cost per participant, each course averaging 4 days; average of 20 participants per course, and 5 courses being given during the initial 6-month period.

No costs for the active participation of City Managers (other than steering committee members) has been budgeted for, even though their participation and guidance is an integral part of the project.

JURISDICTIONS COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION

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

City of Richmond
City of Antioch
City of Brentwood
City of Concord
City of El Cerrito
City of Lafayette
City of Martinez
City of Pinole
City of Pittsburg
City of Pleasant Hill
City of San Pablo
City of Walnut Creek
County of Contra Costa

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:

Auxiliary Foundation of California State College, Hayward
(Graduate Program of Public Administration)

2. Title of Project:

The Graduate Program in Public Administration at California State College at Hayward proposes the *development of a comprehensive continuing education program for the public service in the San Francisco Bay Area (Association of Bay Area Governments jurisdiction).*

3. Project Director:

Dr. Jacob Abers
Graduate Program in Public Administration
California State College
Hayward, CA 94542 — 415-884-3282

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$ 81,463
Local Share:	\$ 58,960
Total Project Cost:	\$140,423

5. Need for Project:

The need for a comprehensive and effective program of continuing education for the public service is both great and pressing. The cause of this need is the rapid change experienced in all sectors of society as a result of population growth, technological developments and changing values.

A recent study by the State's Council on Intergovernmental Relations confirms the critical need for continuing education for state and local employees at all levels in California and stresses the necessity of developing programs to help meet this need.

Studies have also been made of the continuing education "market" and needs in the San Francisco Bay Area - the area which our proposal addresses. According to the Institute for Local Self Government, the reasonable "market" for continuing education for an institution located in the general area of Cal State, Hayward exceeds 25,000 employees. This figure is consistent with that found in the survey of the San Francisco Bay Area done by the Council on Intergovernmental Relations.

The Municipal Management Assistants of Northern California (MMANC) surveyed its 130 members on the subject of continuing education in August of 1971. This survey further attested to the need for a comprehensive and flexible continuing education program for local governmental management. Cal State at Hayward was ranked by respondents as one of the top two schools offering public administration courses and its location in southern Alameda County was the most preferred location for taking courses. At an August 18, 1971, meeting of the City Managers Association of Alameda County, all the city managers present expressed a strong belief in the need for continuing education opportunities for their employees. The results of these surveys and our own informal observations stimulated us to initiate our own formal study of the continuing education needs among the local governments in the San Francisco Bay Area. The following are highlights of this study:

There is a relative scarcity of educational opportunities for public employees in Northern California. None of the educational institutions in the Bay Area offers a program of continuing education for public employees which compares to that of either the University of Southern California or San Diego State College. Only the Graduate Program in Public Administration at Cal State Hayward and the Masters Program in Public Administration at Golden Gate College in San Francisco can validly claim to provide some kind of continuing education opportunities for public employees in the Bay Area. However, the opportunities supplied by both programs are severely limited. Few courses in this subject area are offered through extension, and the graduate programs are essentially restricted to those public employees who already have a bachelor's degree and who either work or live near the campuses.

Resources which are devoted to the continuing education of public employees by other institutions in the Bay Area are also scarce. The Federal Executive Seminar in Berkeley does perform a continuing education function for high-level federal employees. However, the program is quite selective and too expensive for all but a few local governmental employees.

The administrators we interviewed were unanimous in their support for the development of the type of continuing education opportunities presented in our proposal. The majority of the administrators thought that the employees in their cities would take advantage of a relevant continuing education program for the public service. The replies to the questions on funds available for the continuing education and training of employees are encouraging. It seems clear from our own and other studies that public officials and educators in the San Francisco Bay Area believe that a need exists for a broad and flexible continuing education program for the public service.

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

The proposal consists of eleven elements:

1. Support of an undergraduate certificate program in public administration administered through our Extension Division. (We have had several requests from local government for such a program.)
2. Support for a graduate level certificate program in public administration through our Extension Division.
3. The improvement and modest expansion of our two-day conference program.
4. A small, experimental, master's degree fellowship program in public administration. (An inherent element of this program is provision for applied research coordinated jointly by the fellows, the faculty, and practitioners of public personnel management.)
5. Support for developing a capability to fulfill requests for custom-tailored training programs for local government. (We are often approached for cooperation in this kind of training and education, but limited resources have prevented us from giving assistance.)
6. Support for a modest minority intern program through which graduate students would assist cities and counties in pressing areas of need while acquiring practical professional experience.
7. An experimental educational program for professionals. (Professionals of various fields are continuing to rise to positions of senior management responsibility. Our own survey indicates a need for offering programs for these professionals which orient public administration training to the specific problems of social welfare departments, engineering departments, public health centers and most of the other professionalized segments of local government.)
8. Support for exploration and a pilot program for elected officials of local government in public administration. (This highly sensitive aspect of local government has been placed as the highest training priority by the Advisory Committee.) Based upon some quite tentative probings we feel the East San Francisco Bay Area may be a fruitful one in which to do further exploration and, possibly, develop a pilot program.
9. Modest support of an effort to establish a Bay Area Council for Training and Education of the Public Service. (Earlier note was made of the gap in this area between need and institutions.) Despite a plethora of organizations of city managers, county managers, councilmen, supervisors, etc., there is at present no institutional means of relating needs to appropriate institutions in the San Francisco Bay Area.
10. A modest investment to improve the library resources of this college on subjects related to local government problems to support all the above projects.
11. Provision for overall program coordination costs. (Our graduate program in Public Administration is now staffed on an austere basis intended only to meet its instructional obligations; coordination and direction of a program of the magnitude outlined above obviously calls for some minor augmentation.)

The development of this program will help meet the pressing need for an on-going comprehensive, multilevel and multifaceted program in continuing education for the public service in the San Francisco Bay Area. Such a program would be a critical factor in improving personnel practices, procedures and opportunities for advancement. The perhaps unique feature of this proposal is that it addresses itself to virtually all of the broad purposes intended by the Congress in passage of the Act.

7. Project Evaluation:

An evaluation committee will be established to evaluate the progress of the program and its elements continuously. This committee will be composed of faculty, students and members of the Bay Area Council. These evaluations will be based on written reports of faculty teaching the courses, local governmental officials supervising interns, the interns themselves, members of the committee and the chairman of the program. In short, we want the people involved in the program to tell us how we are doing our job. We anticipate sending a comprehensive summary evaluation of the program quarterly during the first year of funding and bi-annually the following year.

8. Timetable:

1) Undergraduate Certificate, April 1, 1972; 2) Graduate Certificate: Target date, September, 1972 - Alternative date, January, 1973; 3) Improvement and Expansion of the Two-day Conference Seminars, March, 1972; 4) Local Government Fellowship Program, March, 1972; 5) Internship Program Emphasizing Minority Placement, March, 1972; 6) Customized Courses and Seminars, April or May, 1972; 7) An Experimental Education Program for Professionals, July, 1972; 8) Training Program in Public Administration, March, 1972; 9) Development of Library Resources, March, 1972; 10) Intensive quarter, September, 1972; 11) Bay Area Coordinating Council for Education of the Public Service, February or March, 1972.

Program or Project Title: COMPREHENSIVE BAY AREA TRAINING PROGRAM

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		
Project Director @ \$22,236	25%	\$ 5,559
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: 52		
1 Coordinator - Intern Program @ \$9,600	33%	3,200
1 Project Assistant @ \$6,906	100%	6,906
50 Interns - part time (local cash)	----	33,750
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: _____		
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost)		2,494
Subtotal:		51,909
2. TRAVEL:		1,910
3. EQUIPMENT:		420
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES:		10,250
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS:		69,900
Total Direct Costs:		\$134,389
B. Indirect Costs: 8% of Federal share		\$ 6,034
(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:		\$140,423

III. SOURCE OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE *(Current-Year)*

1. From Grantee Resources (Show source by budget category)

\$

2. From Other Sources

\$

Cash

55,560

Donated Time

3,400

Total:

\$ 58,960

**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**V. FURTHER DISCUSSION - See Attachment**

JURISDICTIONS COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION

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

Cities and all counties in the nine-county ABAG (Association of Bay Area Governments) area.

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.

COMPONENT 1A

<p><u>Courses:</u> Courses will be given through our Extension Division and at their rate of \$12.75 per unit (see College Catalog). Historically, extension costs have broken down into 63% faculty costs, 19.9% administrative costs, and 17.9% operating and equipment costs. We anticipate 2 four unit courses per quarter X 25 students the first quarter, 45 students the second quarter, 70 students the third quarter, and 95 students the fourth quarter at the Extension Division rate of \$12.75 per unit.</p>	\$23,970.00
<p><u>Materials:</u> \$20.00 (3 books @ \$5.75 each and \$2.75 for writing materials) per 4 unit course X 2 courses per quarter X 20 students the first quarter, 45 students the second quarter, 70 students the third quarter, and 95 students the fourth quarter.</p>	9,200.00
<p><u>Clerical and Related Supplies:</u> Telephone: \$200.00. Office Supplies and Postage: \$100.00</p>	300.00
<p><u>Clerical Support:</u> Student Aid (20 hours at \$2.50 per hour).</p>	50.00
<p><u>Special Library:</u> Development of a Special Library: Books: \$1,125.00. Shelving: \$125.00</p>	1,250.00

COMPONENT 1B

<p><u>Courses:</u> Courses will be given through our Extension Division at the rate of \$12.75 per unit (see College Catalog). Historically, extension costs have broken down into: 63% faculty costs, 19.1% administrative costs, and 17.9% operating and equipment costs. We anticipate 2 four unit courses per quarter X 20 students the first quarter, 20 students the second quarter, 40 students the third quarter, and 40 students the fourth quarter at the Extension Division rate of \$12.75 per unit.</p>	\$12,240.00
<p><u>Materials:</u> \$25.00 (3 books @ 7.25 each and \$3.15 for writing materials) per four unit course X 2 courses per quarter X 20 students the first quarter, 20 students the second quarter, 40 students the third quarter, and 40 students the fourth quarter.</p>	6,000.00
<p><u>Clerical and Related Supplies:</u> Telephone: \$200.00. Office Supplies and Postage: \$100.00.</p>	300.00
<p><u>Clerical Support:</u> Student Aid: 20 hours X \$2.50 per hour</p>	50.00
<p><u>Special Library:</u> Development of a Special Library: Books: \$1,125.00. Shelving: \$125.00.</p>	1,250.00

COMPONENT 2

Contractual and Consulting Services:

A. Chairman: 1 day planning, 2 days at conference X \$100.00 per day for 3 days for 3 conferences.	\$ 900.00
B. Three (3) speakers X \$100.00 per speaker X 3 conferences.	900.00
C. Faculty design and supervision: 3 to 5 days per conference, at roughly \$300.00 per conference X 3 conferences.	900.00
<u>Other Direct Costs:</u> Conference Rooms: \$200.00 per conference X 3 conferences.	\$ 600.00
Printing Supplies and Postage: \$200.00 per conference X 3 conferences.	600.00
Telephone: \$50.00 per conference X 3 conferences.	150.00
Student Assistant: 20 hours X \$2.50 per hour per conference X 3 conferences.	<u>150.00</u>
	\$1,500.00 1,500.00

COMPONENT 3

<u>Travel:</u> 500 miles per year per fellow at \$0.08 per mile for program related "local" travel X 5 fellows.	\$ 200.00
<u>Contractual and Consulting Services:</u> 80 practitioner man hours estimated value at \$10.00 per hour. There will be office and department heads and city manager level input in the development of relevant research and study projects.	800.00
<u>Other Direct Costs:</u> Graduate student fees at \$255.00 per year (four quarters) X 5 fellows.	1,020.00
<u>Materials:</u> \$25.00 (3 books at \$7.25 each and \$3.15 for writing material) per four unit course X 3 courses per quarter X 4 quarters X 5 fellows.	1,500.00
<u>Clerical and Related Supplies:</u> Telephone: \$150.00	
Clerical Supplies and Postage: 100.00	
Miscellaneous Expense: 50.00	
	<u>\$300.00 300.00</u>
Total:	\$3,820.00

COMPONENT 4

Contractual and Consulting Services:

Faculty time or special seminars with local government managers, faculty and interns as well as supervision and counseling after the program starts. Roughly \$10.00 per hour X 10 hours per month for 8 months. \$800.00

Other Direct Costs: Telephone: \$300.00
Clerical Supplies and Postage: \$170.00
Miscellaneous Expenses: \$50.00 520.00

COMPONENT 5

Travel: Courses can be given at locations throughout a broad nine county area which will require a good deal of travel and perhaps some per diem. \$150.00 seems a reasonable figure for these costs per conference X 3 conferences. \$450.00

Contractual and Consulting Services: Three consultants (trainers/speakers) per program at \$100.00 per consultant X 3 programs. 900.00
Faculty design and supervision: \$150.00 per conference X 3 conferences. 450.00

Other Direct Costs: Telephone: \$50.00 per conference X 3 conferences. \$150.00
Supplies and Postage: \$100.00 per conference X 3 conferences. 300.00
Student Assistant: 20 hours X \$2.50 per hour per conference X 3 conferences. 150.00
Miscellaneous Expenses: \$50.00 per conference X 3 conferences. 150.00
\$750.00 750.00

COMPONENT 6

Travel: Courses can be given at locations throughout a broad nine county area which will require a good deal of travel and perhaps some per diem. \$150.00 seems a reasonable figure for these costs per conference X 3 conferences. \$450.00

Contractual and Consulting Services: Three consultants (trainers/speakers) per program at \$100.00 per consultant X 3 programs. 900.00

Faculty design and supervision: \$150.00 per program X 3 programs. 450.00

Other Direct Costs:
Telephone: \$50.00 per program X 3 programs \$150.00
Supplies and Postage: \$50.00 per program X 3 programs. 150.00
Student Assistant: 10 hours X \$2.50 per hour X 3 programs. 75.00
Miscellaneous Expenses: \$25.00 per program X 3 programs. 75.00
\$450.00 450.00

COMPONENT 7

Travel: This program may be given in any one of nine spread-out counties. This will require travel and perhaps some per diem. \$150.00 seems a reasonable figure for the costs per conference. \$150.00

Contractual and Consulting Services: Because of the broad role of elected officials, the service of four speakers at the program and one consultant for planning will be required. Each will receive \$100.00 per day. 500.00

Faculty design and supervision: \$150.00 150.00

Other Direct Costs:

Telephone:	\$ 75.00	
Supplies and Postage:	75.00	
Student Assistant: 20 hours X \$2.50 per hour	50.00	
Miscellaneous Expenses:	50.00	
	\$250.00	250.00

COMPONENT 8

Other Direct Costs:

Courses: Courses will be given through our Extension Division at their rate of \$12.75 per unit (see College Catalog). Historically, extension costs have broken down into: 63% faculty costs, 19.9% administrative costs and 17.9% operating and equipment costs. We anticipate one four unit course per quarter at 20 students per quarter X 4 quarters at \$12.75 per unit. \$4,080.00

Materials and Supplies: Since books are sent out prior to the student arriving on campus, the student is not assumed to have access to a college caliber library facility. Thus, a greater number of books are assigned to the program than would normally be the case. \$40.00 for books and supplies (\$7.25 per book X 5 books - \$36.25- and \$3.75 for writing materials) X 20 students X 4 quarters. 3,200.00

Clerical and Related Supplies:

Telephone: \$150.00		
Office Supplies and Postage: \$150.00		
Student Assistant at 20 hours X \$2.50: \$50.00		350.00

COMPONENT 9

Travel: Development of Council will necessitate visits to key officials and administrators throughout the nine county area. This travel is anticipated to be at 1000 miles per year at \$0.08 per mile. \$ 80.00

Contractual and Consulting Services: Released time of senior city, state, and regional government officials is calculated at 18 hours per year per participant X 10 participants (this figure will probably go up to 24 or more) at \$10.00 per hour. 1,800.00
Contribution of personal time of elected officials, 20 hours per member X 4 members at \$10.00 per hour. 800.00

Other Direct Costs:

Conference Rooms: \$75.00 per meeting X 3 meetings	\$225.00	
Telephone:	100.00	
Supplies and Postage:	45.00	
	\$370.00	370.00

COMPONENT 10

Equipment: Purchase of one IBM typewriter per discussion with Executive Staff of Coordinating Council. \$ 420.00

Travel: Program coordinator will be obliged to travel throughout the nine county area supervising the various elements of the program. This and possible emergency travel costs for other elements is estimated to be about \$300.00 per year. 300.00

Other Direct Costs:

Meeting Expenses: \$75.00 per day X 2 days	\$ 150.00	
Telephone:	300.00	
Supplies and Postage:	200.00	
Copy Machine Rental/Duplicating:	300.00	
Miscellaneous Expense:	50.00	
	\$1,000.00	1,000.00

1. Name of Applicant:

University of Southern California

2. Title of Project:

ORGANIZATION DEVELOPMENT IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT: INDIVIDUAL GROWTH AND ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS — Implementation of Organization Development Programs in Cities of Riverside, South Gate, and Glendora, California

3. Project Director:

Dr. Melvin J. LeBaron, Director
Center for Training and Development
University of Southern California
School of Public Administration
311 South Spring Street, Room 410
Los Angeles, CA 90013 — 213-626-8127

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$26,840
Local Share:	\$10,480
Total Project Cost:	\$37,320

5. Need for Project:

Local government is in a crisis. It has been asked to respond to an exponentially changing social, cultural, political and economic environment. Community confrontations, increased unionism, the need for intergovernmental cooperation, high unemployment, severe budget constraints, and the like all contribute to increasing demands upon local government officials and administration. Modern technology and an information revolution has brought obsolescence to many municipal functions and yet the same technology is not adequate to solve problems it has helped create. New problems and inevitable conflicts assail the organization from the outside and the inside. The old ways will work for some of these problems but for many more only new solutions and innovative approaches will succeed.

The situation becomes increasingly critical in the face of the severe financial constraints most cities now find themselves operating under. City managers and their councils no longer have the financial resources to initiate costly programs, contract with consultants, or increase personnel to handle the burgeoning needs of the citizenry. It has been found, however, that money oftentimes won't solve the complex problems in today's urban setting. Precious resources already exist in city government which have been untapped — the public employees themselves. There are people who have the potential to initiate and direct needed programs, to anticipate crisis instead of responding to crisis, to confront conflict instead of dampening conflict, and to engage in a longrange planning effort for their city instead of reacting to daily occurrences. These people are the same public administrators who now feel powerless to respond to the rapid changes bombarding them.

Organization development applied to local government organizations could create an environment for employee initiative, growth and development; an environment where local government employees are committed to improving the effectiveness of their organization as it responds to local demands.

The three cities interested in this program experience many of the problems described above and see organization development as an opportunity to develop a climate where city government wants to improve itself and its operations.

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

The intent of this project to assist the cities of Riverside, South Gate, and Glendora in the design and implementation of an organization development program for their city administration. This project will provide to the cities top-level organization development specialists who can assist the cities in (1) analyzing, assessing, diagnosing and evaluating their total organization and its needs, (2) help set the climate and overall conditions for maximizing the effectiveness of the cities administrative and professional staff, (3) develop in-house capabilities for conducting on-going organizational development activities.

The project will consist of series of activities conducted over the one-year period: Phase I - Pre-planning, problem-identification, and diagnosis; Phase II - Feedback and Planning of Intervention Strategies (determining where city organization is and where it should be); Phase III - Implementation of Developmental Activities (ways to get where we want to be); and Phase IV - Periodic Evaluation and Review.

It is hoped that the results achieved in the cities at the end of the year will be:

1. Human resources within the administrative, technical and professional fields will be more fully developed and utilized within the city organization.
2. Cities will more fully plan according to current and future needs rather than according to past practices.
3. Reward systems will be developed which support "doing a good job" (accomplishing the organization's mission) as well as individual efforts toward personal and career development.
4. Dysfunctional competition between departments will be decreased and collaborative efforts maximized.
5. An internal person trained in organization development skills will have evolved who can carry on the organization development process in his city so that it becomes a "developmental" process rather than a one-shot improvement attempt.

A major benefit of this project is the length of involvement with the cities as well as its comprehensiveness. This is not a "hit or miss" three-day involvement. We have found that much more time than a short team building session allows is necessary in order for needed system and interpersonal changes to take place. Thus, we feel a year's organization development involvement has greater possibilities for bringing about long lasting organizational changes.

7. Project Evaluation:

Organization Development results do not lend themselves to a strict scientifically controlled design but certain attempts can be made to measure the benefit to the three cities. It is important to note that OD is a slowly evolving process involving numerous people over an extended period of time and many variables, such as key personnel movements, can occur during the period studied.

Three approaches to evaluation will be used in this project: Quantitative Validation, Experiential Validation, and staff and participant on-going verbal evaluation.

8. Timetable:

January through March	PHASE I - Pre-planning, Problem Identification and Diagnosis
April and May	PHASE II - Feedback and Planning of Intervention Strategies
June through December	PHASE III - On-going Developmental and Training Activities; On-going and Periodic Consultation; Specialized outside training and education for individual development.
January through July	PHASE IV - Periodic Evaluation and Review

PROGRAM OR PROJECT BUDGET

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT: INDIVIDUAL

Program or Project Title: GROWTH AND ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

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-	\$26,840	\$10,480	\$37,320

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 Project Director @ \$20,000 Project Coordinator (Mrs. Joyce Ross) @ \$14,560	5% 50%	\$ 1,000 7,280
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: <u>2</u> Staff Organization Development Specialists - 1/4 time @ \$12,000 Administrative Assistant - 1/5 time @ \$9,100	25% 20%	6,000 1,820
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: <u>1</u> Secretary @ \$6,000	50%	3,000
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost) 10% (except Administrative Assistant)		1,728
	Subtotal:	20,828
2. TRAVEL: (local and in-and-out-of-town)		750
3. EQUIPMENT: Rental (VTR-Audio-Visual)		500
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES: Management Development Training		5,478
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS:		7,000
	Total Direct Costs:	\$34,556
		2,764

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

Total Project Budget: \$37,320

III. SOURCE OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE (<i>Current-Year</i>)	
1. From Grantee Resources (Show source by budget category)	\$
<u>CONSULTING SERVICES</u> - \$2,478 free tuition to OD liaison from city*	2,478
<u>PERSONNEL</u> - Administrative Assistant - Fringe Benefits (10%) Salary	182 1,820
2. From Other Sources	
<u>OTHER DIRECT COSTS</u> -	
Contributed time of City Organization Development liaison (3) Riverside, Glendora, South Gate - 1/8 time @ \$12,800 average salary x 3	4,800
Cash-in-kind contribution - \$400 per city	1,200
Total:	\$10,480

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

<p>V. FURTHER DISCUSSION</p> <p>*Cities OD liaison will participate in the following Center programs for his development.</p> <table> <tr> <td>(a) Challenge of Change for Local Government</td> <td>\$200</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Seminar in the Development of Human Resources</td> <td>338</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Skills in Organization Development</td> <td><u>288</u></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>\$826 x 3 =</td> <td>\$2,478</td> </tr> </table>		(a) Challenge of Change for Local Government	\$200		(b) Seminar in the Development of Human Resources	338		(c) Skills in Organization Development	<u>288</u>			\$826 x 3 =	\$2,478
(a) Challenge of Change for Local Government	\$200												
(b) Seminar in the Development of Human Resources	338												
(c) Skills in Organization Development	<u>288</u>												
	\$826 x 3 =	\$2,478											

JURISDICTIONS COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION

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

City of Riverside
City of Glendora
City of South Gate

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:

The Committee on Education in Business and Public Administration
California State Department of Finance

2. Title of Project:

Management Training Project for California Public Administrators and Professional Employees

3. Project Director:

Mr. James S. Dwight, Jr.
Chief Deputy Director
Department of Finance
State Capitol, Room 1145
Sacramento, CA 95814 — 916-445-9862

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$33,065
Local Share:	\$11,022
Total Project Cost:	\$44,087

5. Need for Project:

The problems of government administration are becoming increasingly complex due to the intricacies of intra- and inter-governmental relationships, the rapid pace of new knowledge and technology, and changing socio-economic structure. The acceleration of change is placing new demands on governmental administrators that they are not always prepared to meet.

More specifically, recent management audits of state and local jurisdictions have confirmed the need for training in the following areas:

Human Relations
Communications
Quantitative Analysis
Project Planning, Organizing, and Programming
Management Auditing
Data Gathering, Synthesis, and Analysis

Several local public and private colleges and universities offer courses in these subject areas. However, many state and local administrators are effectively blocked from active participation in such programs because of:

Limited enrollment capacity that encourages rigid entrance requirements.
Insufficient student financial means or lack of support from employers.
Job restraints such as travel and time of class offerings.

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

A certificate program of fully accredited graduate courses taught on an intensive semester basis during regular work hours to include the following course offerings:

Personnel Management in Governmental Organizations
Public Policies in Management Decisions
Quantitative Approaches to Management
Decision Making Through Systems Analysis
Management Information Systems
Administrative Organizations and Management
Public Financial Administration
The Individual and Society in Public Administration

Several local educational institutions have indicated a willingness to undertake this project. Formal proposals will be requested at a later date.

It is expected that each trainee will complete 15 units of credit to earn the prescribed certificate. It is further expected that most trainees will subsequently complete requirements for a graduate degree on their own initiative.

By removing the traditional institutional barriers, this project will present opportunities not otherwise available to most governmental administrators.

7. Project Evaluation:

Evaluations will represent a combined effort of all participants including trainees, teaching staff, the Committee, college administrators, and supervisors of trainees. Subjective and objective evaluations will be attempted at these points:

- At the completion of each course.
- Interim evaluation after three terms.
- End of project.

The following project elements will be evaluated:

- Course content.
- Quality of instruction.
- Application of knowledge on the job.
- Subsequent trainee development.
- Project relevance.
- Course grades.
- Drop rates.
- Certificates issued.

8. Timetable:

December 15, 1971	Submit project summary and letters of commitment.
February 14, 1972	State and local government planning meeting.
February 21, 1972	Draft request for proposal (RFP) to colleges and universities.
February 28, 1972	Send RFP's to colleges and universities.
March 13, 1972	Conduct pre-RFP conference for proposing colleges and universities.
March 27, 1972	Receive RFP's.
April 3, 1972	Acceptance of successful proposal.
May 1, 1972	Begin project.

PROGRAM OR PROJECT BUDGET

MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROJECT FOR CALIFORNIA PUBLIC ADMINISTRATORS

Program or Project Title: AND PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES

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-	\$ 33,065	\$ 11,022	\$ 44,087

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 Chief Deputy Director, State Department of Finance	5%	\$ 1,407
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: <u>1</u> Committee on Education in Business and Public Administration (4 Management Auditors @ 25% each)	100%	14,176
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: <u>1</u>	25%	1,280
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost) 12%		2,024
Subtotal:		18,887
2. TRAVEL:		600
3. EQUIPMENT:		900
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES:		19,200
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS:		4,500
Total Direct Costs:		\$44,087
		-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:		\$44,087

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

Cash

Personnel salaries and wages

\$

6,000

5,022

2. From Other Sources

Total:

\$11,022

**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 2/3 year pilot

\$55,464

- 0 -

- 0 -

- 0 -

V. FURTHER DISCUSSION

4. Direct cost of contractual services includes
all costs of instruction and instructional materials.

\$19,200

5. Other direct costs includes the cost of furnishing
classroom space in State buildings.

4,500

JURISDICTIONS COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION

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

State Government - Department of Finance

County Government - Counties of Sacramento, Placerville and San Joaquin

City Government - City of Sacramento

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

Local and county jurisdictions will fill 50 percent of the slots for the pilot project.

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

1. Name of Applicant:

The Regents of the University of California — Los Angeles

2. Title of Project:

Inter-agency Training and Management Development in Transportation

3. Project Director:

Alex J. Norman
The Department of Urban Affairs
University Extension
10995 Le Conte Ave., Room 640
Los Angeles, CA 90024 — 825-2342

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$ 75,003
Local Share:	\$ 25,101
Total Project Cost:	\$ 100,104

5. Need for Project:

For too long, transportation sub-systems have undertaken problem solving in isolation from each other and without major concern for the impact of decisions on users and communities.

Freeway construction, for example, has advanced without concern for local community boundaries and lifestyles, the health effects of noise and exhaust pollution, natural ecology, interfacing with other traffic and transportation sub-systems (e.g., inclusion of right-of-way property for mass urban transit), or the economic reordering of local land, business, and residential neighborhoods.

Today, there is a rapidly growing interest among traffic and transportation management personnel in stressing that (1) the transportation system must interface with other systems as part of the total society; (2) greater inter-agency coordination, information transmittal, and integrated problem-solving is vital to the transportation system; and (3) the system and its various components must be subservient to the needs and concerns of users.

As yet, no procedures exist for transforming these concerns into concrete programs for improving organizational structure and personnel training, nor do any of the sub-systems exhibit any long-range planning perspective that integrates these concerns into policy and practice.

It is the intent of this project to provide, through a training program for eight transportation agencies in Los Angeles County, a model for training, organizational development, and systemic change regarding inter-agency coordination and community involvement.

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

This project, Inter-agency Training and Management Development in Transportation, is to design and conduct a University based inter-agency training and education program for selected management staff of eight city, regional, and state agencies concerned with transportation.

The purpose of the project is to provide a model for developing inter-agency coordination and community involvement in the transportation system. To that end, agency staff will be involved in a series of structured learning experiences involving seminars, workshops, and problem-solving.

The program will be undertaken by UCLA's Institute of Transportation and Traffic Engineering (ITTE) and the Department of Urban Affairs, University Extension.

The focus of the program is upon problem resolution by means of multi-agency training activities. The intent is to develop teamwork capabilities for problem-solving between transportation sub-systems at line and management levels, strengthen information transmittal practices, develop community awareness among participants, and develop procedures and policies for inter-agency coordination within each participating agency.

Principal concrete results include the following:

Enable participants to study the decision-making process in other comparable agencies.

Provide a forum for the exchange of technical information.

Provide participants with citizen education skills so that they can function more effectively within the different communities of metropolitan Los Angeles.

Provide information on new hardware delivery and system concepts, including projections for future needs.

Develop substantive educational content and materials around traffic and transportation problems, community involvement, organizational development, and the interfacing of sub-systems within a major system.

Develop the problem-solving skills of participants around persistent and/or ad hoc multiple agency coordination problems.

Enable participants to increase their supervisory skills with technical and professional personnel.

7. Project Evaluation:

Trainees will be pre- and post-tested by means of a questionnaire for each learning experience included in the training curriculum to determine what change has taken place vis-a-vis organizational and systematic problems.

Based on the objectives identified by the Curriculum Advisory Committee, a follow-up to the post-test will be conducted using an open and closed interview schedule. The purposes of the interview schedule are to identify changed participant attitudes toward parent agency and other participating agencies, identify the formation of new inter-agency committees and/or new formal organizational structures within agencies for on-going inter-agency coordination. Such changes will be noted to identify causality between change per se and training project activities.

8. Timetable:

1. Curriculum - Advisory Committee	—	January 15, 1972
	—	February 15, 1972
	—	June 15, 1972
	—	August 15, 1972
	—	December 15, 1972
2. Curriculum - Design	—	February - March, 1972
	—	July - September, 1972
	—	December, 1972 - January, 1973
a. Video tape development	—	February - March, 1972
	—	August - September, 1972
b. Stimulation training exercise development	—	April - July, 1972
3. Core Seminar A	—	March - June, 1972
	—	October - December, 1972
4. Core Seminar B	—	March - June, 1972
	—	October - December, 1972
5. Retreat Workshop	—	July 1, 1972
	—	December 15, 1972
6. Problem-solving clinic	—	April 15, 1972
	—	May 15, 1972
	—	November 15, 1972

7. Field experience	—	November 1, 1972
8. Evaluation	—	May - June, 1972
	—	December, 1972
9. Reports	—	June - August, 1972
a. Preparation	—	September, 1972
b. Submittal		

PROGRAM OR PROJECT BUDGET

Program or Project Title: INTER-AGENCY TRAINING AND MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT IN TRANSPORTATION

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-	\$75,003	\$25,101	\$100,104

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 <div style="margin-left: 40px;">Program Coordinator - \$15,300</div>	100%	\$15,300	
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: <u>0</u>			
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: <u>6</u> <div style="margin-left: 40px;"> Program Assistant Research Assistant Evaluation Assistant In-kind Contribution (including benefits, indirect costs) </div>	100% 50% 10%	6,672 3,235 809 10,097	
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost) Employee Benefits		3,136	
Subtotal:		39,249	
2. TRAVEL:		7,418	
3. EQUIPMENT:		500	
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES: (including Agency participation)		34,704	
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS:		12,677	
Total Direct Costs:		\$94,548	
B. Indirect Costs:		5,556	
(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:		\$100,104	

III. SOURCE OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE (Current-Year)

1. From Grantee Resources (Show source by budget category)

Cash	\$ 2,500
In-kind contribution - Personnel	10,097

2. From Other Sources

Agency Participation (Curriculum Advisory Committee)	\$ 12,504
---	-----------

Total:	\$25,101
--------	----------

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	\$120,000	\$140,000		

V. FURTHER DISCUSSION

Travel

Staff	\$ 2,804
Consultants	3,089
Participants	<u>1,525</u>
	7,418

Contractual Services

Transportation Experts	\$ 4,000
Evaluation designers	500
Statistical and Data Analysts	700
Academic Consultants	1,500
ITTE	13,000
Agency Participation	12,504
Miscellaneous (UCLA Cash)	<u>2,500</u>
	\$34,704

Other Direct Costs

Supplies	1,800
Telephone	1,200
Rent	2,652
Conference Materials	5,250
Miscellaneous	<u>1,775</u>
	\$12,677

JURISDICTIONS COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION

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

City of Los Angeles

State of California

Southern California Rapid Transit 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:

American Society for Public Administration – Orange County Chapter

2. Title of Project:

Public Manpower Requirements in Orange County During the 1970's

3. Project Director:

Gifford W. Miller, President
Orange County Chapter – ASPA
300 East Chapman Avenue
Orange, CA 92666 – 714-633-2300

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$25,000
Local Share:	\$ 8,342
Total Project Cost:	\$33,342

5. Need for Project:

The challenges faced by local government in Orange County during the past two decades have been unparalleled in any other area of the nation. Beginning with a 1950 population of 216,000, Orange County has vaulted to a 1970 total of over 1.4-million residents – a two decade increase of nearly 1.2-million people. The most rapidly growing county and now the second largest in California, Orange County has undergone many distinct changes. An economy, primarily agricultural and service-oriented, has been dramatically transformed into an urban industrial society which provides local employment for most of its labor force.

The current decade will find far more attention being given toward how and where to find the money to pay the bills of expanded public services. As the cost of various service programs spiral upward throughout the county, increasing demands will be put on not only the earnings, but the capital resources of the taxpayer. This dilemma clearly indicates a common intergovernmental requirement for the 1970's – manpower planning of a far more sophisticated and thoughtful order.

At this crucial point in time, there exists no intergovernmental mechanism in Orange County for ascertaining the manpower requirements essential to bridge the gaps for on-rushing growth in local government services. Without such an interface, needless duplication and overlapping of jurisdictional efforts to produce the goods and services demanded by our urban society will soar beyond acceptance.

If current staffing practices and common intergovernmental manpower needs are allowed to continue as unknown factors in the years that lie just ahead of us, local government and public educational institutions in Orange County will surely fail their common mission to their most important benefactors – the people, who have a basic right to be served in the most cost-effective manner obtainable. Manpower forecasting in the public service is corollary to meeting the urban challenge faced by people of every circumstance. This proposal, then, seeks to address itself to that primary success element of any organizational system – the quality and quantity of its work force.

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

It is proposed that the Orange County Chapter of the American Society for Public Administration be the sponsor and prime mover of this project. A special steering committee, comprised of five seasoned personnel managers representing the cities of Anaheim, Garden Grove, Santa Ana, and Huntington Beach (the most populated municipalities in Orange County) and the County of Orange Personnel Department would form the nucleus of this effort. It is further proposed that two project staff members would be hired on a full-time basis to conduct the fact finding requirements and field work essential to the success of the overall study. The special steering committee and two manpower analysts would be responsible for the following sequence of events:

A. Preliminary Planning and Study Procedures - Steering Committee

1. Determine required data to accomplish study objective.

2. Determine study procedures and methods of data collection.
3. Determine skill requirements of two full-time staff analysts to conduct field research and report factual information.
4. Recruit and select two full-time manpower analysts.
5. Establish modular study deadlines and maintain project control with timely progress reports submitted to the Executive Board of ASPA, Orange County Chapter.

B. Document Factual Information and Data Projections - Manpower Analysts

1. Manpower analysts familiarize themselves with appropriate methodology and working procedures for conducting field research.
2. Establish timetable and sequence of field interviews in cooperation with appropriate public officials from each local governmental agency.
3. Obtain available copies of public agency personnel data relating to individual manpower policies, staffing criteria, and work force parameters.
4. Obtain organization tables which specify or indicate a description of current positions and incumbent personnel, both full-time and part-time.
5. Obtain personnel turnover data and determine manpower recruitment problems for each individual public agency.
6. Ascertain the additional number of personnel that local management believes will be required on an incremental basis through 1979.
7. Determine shifts or estimated changes in variety and magnitude of positional requirements in future years.
8. Highlight the various skills and experience that future personnel should possess to meet shifts in local demands.
9. Determine seasonal or cyclical fluctuations in demands for local public services.
10. Document and verify factual information for purposes of preparing final report to be entitled Public Manpower Requirements in Orange County for the 1970's.

This proposal represents an initial approach toward meeting the intergovernmental challenges of personnel administration in Orange County during this crucial decade of urban growth and changing organizational priorities.

7. Project Evaluation:

The goals of this project are simplistic in both scope and magnitude. Attainment of the study objectives will be assured by the steering committee members who shall direct and schedule the workload to meet modular deadlines as outlined below. The worth of the final report will be substantiated by its acceptance and utilization by those jurisdictions participating. As such, the final report shall serve as a base map for further studies directed toward personnel recruitment, selection, and training functions throughout the county.

8. Timetable:

<i>Task</i>	<i>Work Description</i>	<i>Estimated Completion</i>
1.0	START PROJECT AND ORIENT STAFF	1 Month
1.1	Steering Committee prepares detailed study prospectus	
1.2	Recruit two full-time manpower analysts	
1.3	Refine and duplicate data collection instruments	
1.4	Explain study scope and techniques to public agencies	
1.5	Set modular deadlines and progress reporting system	
1.6	Schedule field interviews	
1.7	Collect available personnel data from participating agencies	

2.0	CONDUCT FIELD SURVEY	4 Months
2.1	Obtain organization tables and authorized employee levels	
2.2	Determine personnel turnover and recruitment problems	
2.3	Ascertain personnel needs on incremental basis through 1979	
2.4	Determine future employment shifts or changes in variety of position requirements	
2.5	Highlight employee skills and experience needed to meet future service levels and changes	
2.6	Determine seasonal or cyclic fluctuations in local demands for personnel services	
2.7	Verify personnel requirements and manpower trends through 1979	
3.0	DOCUMENT AND PREPARE FINAL REPORT	1 Month
3.1	Refine field data into findings and conclusions	
3.2	Develop final report format	
3.3	Write and produce Final Report	
3.4	Explain study results to participating agencies and assess implications	
3.5	Develop IPA proposal for future manpower studies	

PROGRAM OR PROJECT BUDGET

Program or Project Title: PUBLIC MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS IN ORANGE COUNTY DURING THE 1970's

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
	\$	\$25,000	\$ 8,342	\$ 33,342

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 Project Steering Committee Personnel Managers of Anaheim, Garden Grove, Santa Ana, Huntington Beach, and Orange County		
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: <u>2</u> 2 Manpower Analysts	50%	\$22,000
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: <u>0</u>		
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost)		
Subtotal:		22,000
2. TRAVEL:		
3. EQUIPMENT:		
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES:		8,342
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS: Printing of Final Report		3,000
Total Direct Costs:		\$33,342
		-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: \$33,342

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

5 Personnel Directors x \$90 a day x 13 days = \$5850

3 Clerical x \$28 a day x 13 days = 1092

2 City Managers x \$70 a day x 10 days = 1400
\$8342**Total:** \$ 8,342**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 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -

V. FURTHER DISCUSSION

We propose to augment this initial study of manpower requirements with projects under the IPA program that will result in more substantive intergovernmental cooperation and coordination in the areas of public policy making and planning for public policy decisions, team building and development, and intergovernmental training activities. But first, we need funding for ascertaining our manpower requirements as outlined in the attached narrative.

JURISDICTIONS COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION

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

This initial IPA project will be comprised of the manpower forecasts of:

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. The City of Anaheim | 14. The City of Newport Beach |
| 2. The City of Brea | 15. The City of Orange |
| 3. The City of Buena Park | 16. The City of Placentia |
| 4. The City of Costa Mesa | 17. The City of San Clemente |
| 5. The City of Cypress | 18. The City of San Juan Capistrano |
| 6. The City of Fountain Valley | 19. The City of Santa Ana |
| 7. The City of Fullerton | 20. The City of Seal Beach |
| 8. The City of Garden Grove | 21. The City of Stanton |
| 9. The City of Huntington Beach | 22. The City of Tustin |
| 10. The City of Laguna Beach | 23. The City of Villa Park |
| 11. The City of La Habra | 24. The City of Westminster |
| 12. The City of La Palma | 25. The City of Yorba Linda |
| 13. The City of Los Alamitos | 26. The County of Orange |

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

This proposal has the approval of the full Council of the American Society for Public Administration, Orange County Chapter, whose active members are in full support of this application and are representative of each of the above jurisdictions.

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

1. Name of Applicant:

University of Southern California

2. Title of Project:

AN ORGANIZATIONAL APPROACH TO INTERCULTURAL AWARENESS — Development and Implementation of a Prototypal Ethnic Relations Program with a pilot to be conducted for Los Angeles County Probation Department and the City of Monterey Park.

3. Project Director:

Melvin J. LeBaron, Ed.D., Director
Center for Training and Development
School of Public Administration
University of Southern California
311 South Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90013 — 213-626-8127

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$ 98,688
Local Share:	\$ 33,393
Total Project Cost:	\$132,081

5. Need for Project:

The traditional assumption that our country is a "melting pot" is being seriously questioned. The pressure for re-examination has come from members of the "minority ethnic groups" in this country who have been denied the opportunity to move into the economic and social mainstreams of this nation, and from the growing numbers of young people who are disillusioned by the inconsistencies between what our nation advocates and what it practices. The basic nature of the nation is multicultural; it is traditionally described as a unicultural society which evolved from the input of various ethnic groups, mostly European. This accepted unicultural theory has been one component leading to the ethnic prejudice which has shaped our history decisively in the past and has led to the current social polarization threatening our nation today. Modification of the unicultural concept for individuals no longer associated with large organizations — has been neglected. Many adults still function from a unicultural frame of reference where the concepts of "If you don't play the game my way, you can't play at all"; and "I made it, — so should he," are predominant.

Improving ethnic relations has been stated as a high priority for personnel management although little money has been put into the development of an effective "in house" training program for public agencies. Much has been done to hire and train members of ethnic minorities. Little has been done to prepare organizational employees for these programs or to assist in retaining these employees. There is a need to educate working adults to the significance of the multicultural aspects of organizations and society. This need is critical among persons providing social services.

However, important and urgent as the problems of ethnic relations are acknowledged to be, attempts to respond have typically been to provide brief reference to them in existing organization training programs and/or to send selected personnel to programs of this nature offered by outside agencies. Traditional ethnic relations programs have been heavily dependent on the training staff and group mix for success, thereby limiting the training capacity of large organizations. This typically results in the organization having a small core of personnel familiar with and committed to concepts of ethnic relations while the majority of personnel remain unfamiliar with these concepts. The University of Southern California, Center for Training and Development, the City of Monterey Park, and the Department of Probation of the County of Los Angeles propose the development of a prototypal course on Intercultural Awareness which will fulfill the need for all personnel to broaden their knowledge and skills in ethnic relations.

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

The intent of this project is to develop a semi-instrumented prototypal course in Intercultural Awareness to be tested in two Southern California organizations. The proposal provides for the development and testing of a

quality prototypal approach to Intercultural Relations which incorporates necessary flexibility for adapting to unique issues and manifestation of ethnic problems within organizations. Ethnic relations is acknowledged to be a key problem in most organizations, particularly large public organizations. The project addresses itself to this problem and is designed to meet the need for *all* organizational personnel to update their knowledge about various ethnic groups and to improve their intercultural relations skills. Project tasks include: (a) developing necessary educational materials for a sixteen hour, four session prototypal Course of Intercultural Awareness; (b) designing evaluation systems which will provide project data for timely review by project managers and organizational executives; (c) presenting the course to a representative sampling of organizational units; (d) ascertaining program effectiveness, and, (e) developing an "in-house" capability to conduct the course for all other employees.

This project will develop an effective, feasible "in house" ethnic relations program designed to establish greater ethnic understanding, to reduce ethnic tensions, to improve agency service to clientele, and to develop a generally improved organization climate through concrete behavioral changes of employees.

Once developed and tested, program materials will be provided at cost to state and local governmental agencies. Training programs designed to provide "in-house" personnel with skills for presenting the course will also be provided.

7. Project Evaluation:

The effectiveness of the program will be ascertained by the use of Multi Objective Evaluation technology which includes pre- and post-project measurements. Measurements will be taken in terms of project management, design and content. The organizational questionnaire (described in Section 6) plus self reporting forms will be developed for computer processing in order to make use of the data as the program is being developed and presented in addition to the use of this data for the project's final evaluation.

The criterion for measurement of goal accomplishment will be developed by departmental personnel and ethnic relations specialists through the use of a modified DELPHI technique.

8. Timetable:

<i>STAGES</i>	<i>MONTHS AFTER AUTHORITY TO PROCEED</i>
1. Program Development**	
a. Evaluation Instruments	First through third month
b. Participant Workbook	Second through fourth month
c. Intercultural Awareness Film	Third through sixth month
2. Conducting Organizational Questionnaire	Fifth through seventh month
3. Course Presentation	Seventh through tenth month
4. Program Analysis	Fifth through eleventh month
5. Preparation of In House Capability	Ninth through twelfth month
6. Preparation of Final Report	Twelfth month

**It is anticipated that program development may be completed prior to the six months allotted time. If this is true, course presentations will begin earlier than indicated.

PROGRAM OR PROJECT BUDGET

Program or Project Title: AN ORGANIZATIONAL APPROACH TO INTERCULTURAL AWARENESS

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
	\$	\$ 98,688	\$ 33,393	\$132,081

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) Project Director @ \$20,628/ annum	5%	\$ 1,000
2) Project Coordinator @ \$14,560/annum	75%	10,920
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: <u>3</u>		
1) Staff Training Officer-L.A.C. Probation @ \$16,116/annum	50%	8,000
2) Staff Training Officer-City of Monterey Park \$16,000/annum	25%	4,000
3) Project Associate @ \$10,000/annum	100%	10,000
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: <u>3</u>		
1) Intermediate Steno (1) @ \$6,660/annum	100%	6,660
2) Clerical Assistance (1) @ \$6,660/annum (1/2 time)	50%	3,330
3) Administrative Assistant Finance @ \$9,100/annum	25%	2,275
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost) 10% of a.2, b.3, c.1 & 2 (Personal Services)		3,091
Subtotal:		49,276
2. TRAVEL:		1,511
3. EQUIPMENT:		2,500
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES:		42,000
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS:		27,010
Total Direct Costs:		\$122,297
8% of Total Direct Costs		9,784

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: \$132,081

III. SOURCE OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE (Current-Year)

1. From Grantee Resources (Show source by budget category)	\$
a. Project Director (5% @ \$20,628/annum)	1,000
b. Administrative Assistant Finance (25% @ \$9,100/annum)	2,275
c. Fringe Benefits - 10% of a. and b. above	328
d. Participants Workbook (Cash Match) 5.D.1.	2,500
e. Equipment (Cash Match)	1,000
f. Equipment	1,500
2. From Other Sources	
a. Staff Training Officer-L.A.C. Probation (50% @ \$16,116)	8,000
b. Staff Training Officer - City of Monterey Park (25% @ \$16,000/annum)	4,000
c. Employee time (Organizational Questionnaire and Course Feedback)	12,790

Total: \$ 33,393

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	\$20,000	- 0-	- 0-

V. FURTHER DISCUSSION

SEE APPENDIX "B"

JURISDICTIONS COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION

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

County of Los Angeles
City of Monterey Park

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.

Appendix B

V. Further Discussion

3. Equipment ----- \$ 2,500

III. 1-e Cash Match (Typewriter, Transcribing
and Dictating Equipment) - \$1,000

1-f Audio-Visual and Office Equipment -
\$1,500

4. Contractual and Consulting Services ----- 42,000

A) Research Design and Evaluation
50 days @ \$100/day \$5,000

A research consultant will be hired to assist the Coordinator and Research Assistant in designing, processing and interpreting evaluation and program materials. By hiring a consultant, the credentials for the full-time Research Assistant can be reduced, therefore, increasing available manpower for this position.

B) Curriculum Development
40 days @ \$100/day \$4,000

Consultants will be hired to translate the raw data collected at the planning conference and develop in final form the ethnic monographs plus other sections of the program workbook.

C) Training Consultants (Instructors)
20 sessions x 2 days @ \$100/day
(two trainers) \$8,000

Trainers will be hired on a team basis to facilitate participant learning, and provide for a discussion group ratio of 10:1.

D) Contract for Producing Training Film
(commercial estimate of
\$1,000/min.) \$25,000

The film is an essential part of the program package. It will be used to initiate training sessions, to act as an introduction to the Ethnic Monographs in the workbook, and to reduce cost of resource personnel for future programs. The film will be approximately 30 minutes in length.

5. Other Direct Cost -----\$27,010

A) Planning Conference

3 days @ \$25/diem for
35 participants

\$2,625

Thirty-five individuals will be invited to a planning conference to assist with the initial development of materials for the program. The conference is a way to acquire consultant input from various resource people without having to pay exorbitant consulting fees.

B) Computer Cost (10 hrs. IBM @ \$250/hr.)

\$2,500

The use of the IBM 360 will be required for processing project data collected from the Organizational Questionnaire and the participant feedback forms. The rental charge for its use is based on an estimate furnished by the University of Southern California.

C) Supplies:

\$2,520

Consumable (Est. @ \$100/month @ \$1,200)

Computer Supplies (Est. @ \$20/month
\$240)

Xerox (Est. @ \$60/month \$720)

Postage (2,250 mail and return @
0.08¢ \$360)

D) Publication Cost:

\$2,825

- 1) Participant Workbook 3,000 copies
30 pages, multi-color, varitype. (\$2,500)
- 2) Final Report - 300, 30 pages in-
house production (\$325)

The Participant Workbook is an essential part of the program package. It provides for a semi-instrumented approach to Intercultural Awareness. The cost for the Participant Workbook is based on a commercial estimate for 3,000, 30-page workbooks,

multi-color, varitype with a significant amount of art work and/or charts. Copies available after the first year will be used as the program is presented to additional employees in the second and third year. The final report is based on "in-house" production cost and is therefore significantly less.

- E) Office Rental \$3,750
 (6.25/sq. ft. per year x 600)

The additional staff requested by the Grantee will require additional office space. Space rental has been estimated according to the per unit cost of space and maintenance that is used in the cost accounting operations of the University of Southern California at the Civic Center Campus.

- F) Employee Time for Organizational
 Questionnaire and Course Feedback \$12,790
 Employee Time: \$5/per hr. average
 wage 382 (3 hours) plus representa-
 tive sample of all organizational
 employees \$706 (2 hours)

Organizational time will have to be provided for course feedback and for completing the Organizational Questionnaire.

Questionnaire: 650 - 10% of the L.A.
 County Probation
 6,500 employees
 56 - 20% of Monterey Park
 280 employees.

1. Name of Applicant:

California Special Districts Association

2. Title of Project:

Training Program for Special Districts

3. Project Director:

Jack W. Harris, Chairman
Education Committee
Office of the President, CSDA
10595 Jamacha Blvd.
Spring Valley, CA 92077 – 714-465-8150

4. Federal Funds Requested:	\$39,894
Local Share:	\$19,783
Total Project Cost:	\$59,677

5. Need for Project:

Special Districts are a significant part of the government of California. Statewide, there are over 2,000 independently governed non-school Special Districts. They provide 45 different types of services ranging from airport services to water conservation. Special Districts levy approximately 13% of all property taxes—about the same as cities, and slightly less than the counties. In terms of personnel, Special District boards account for more than 8,000 of the state's elected officials. Employees number many times that. There are few, if any, Californians who do not receive fire protection, recreation or park facilities, sanitation, sewage, water, or other community services from a Special District.

The importance of Special Districts is evident from their number, types, geographical extent, functions, number of personnel and financial impact. Deeply rooted in the concept of home rule, they have a long history of service in California. However, the increasing cost of government has lately focused unprecedented attention on district effectiveness and efficiency. Better management, improvement of services, and decreased costs of operation become essential goals.

The need for training programs specifically designed for Special Districts became apparent, but no such programs existed until California Special Districts Association president, Ralph W. Chapman, established the organizational objective of a program of training for Special District managers and policy makers. Training requirements were developed which included goals in the following specific areas of need:

Training programs in management of public services.

Training of elected officials in the process of public policy making and planning for public policy decisions.

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

The objective of the Training Program for Special Districts is the development, implementation and evaluation of comprehensive, integrated training projects for California Special Districts, utilizing the planning, research, teaching and public service resources of the University of California.

The Program presently consists of two projects:

Advanced Studies Program in Special Districts Management

Special Districts Presidents' and Board Members' Institute

These are model projects developed for dissemination through the California Special Districts Association and University of California Extension. They are designed to focus on high priority training objectives immediately, while long-range comprehensive projects and programs are concurrently developed.

The Advanced Studies Program in Special Districts Management is designed for those who now hold administrative, managerial, or supervisory positions in Special Districts and other local government agencies. It is a two-year program which provides an opportunity for Special District executives to upgrade their management skills through participation in specially designed advanced management training. The program is of value also to citizens active in local civic affairs, elected or appointed officials in local, state and federal government, and for those in private organizations who have extensive contacts with Special Districts.

Managers will be updated in the latest and most advanced techniques in Special District administration, planning and control. They will improve their ability to communicate with boards and user groups. They will improve their ability to set goals, and to evaluate and ascertain whether Special District objectives are being met. They will improve decision-making capability in the areas of finance, personnel management and equipment use.

The Program is a two-year program. In the first year, the student is introduced to the elements which make up the profession of Special District Management, and to the skills, techniques and methods necessary for effective management, e.g.:

- Organization and Public Administration
- Financial Management and Control
- Human Factors in Management
- Law and Legislation
- Communication

The second year courses are designed to give the student a broader insight into the management process, and a more detailed knowledge of the specific skills and abilities for carrying out the responsibility he has for Special District programs, projects and activities. The second year will include a computer oriented simulation and gaming exercise, in addition to workshops or seminars as follows:

- Public Relations and Public Opinion
- Communications II
- Financial Administration and Control
- Management Decision Making
- Operations Planning and Controlling

The Special Districts Presidents' and Board Members' Institute is a residential seminar designed for newly elected or appointed presidents and members of boards of commissions, trustees, or directors in special districts. The program consists of two three-day sessions.

It is designed to improve the effectiveness of the board, and to help the new officer gain a comprehensive view of his duties and responsibilities. At the conclusion of the program, 80% of the students attending will utilize one or more of the techniques learned, or apply one or more aspects of the knowledge gained to his board duties on a regular basis.

The program consists of five seminars with the synergistic goal of improving the policy making and planning skills of directors, commissioners and trustees. It is designed for policy level participants from large, medium and small organizations, and from various backgrounds representing a broad cross-section of experience and responsibilities.

Faculty are selected from the academic staff of the University of California and other institutions of higher learning, practicing management specialists in various relevant fields, special district personnel, and consultants.

In order to achieve the objective that 80% of the participants will utilize one or more of the learned techniques in their board management duties, practical problem solving will be an integral part of the approach. Problems will be selected for classroom work which have applications at the home district. In addition, the evaluation procedure will provide for interviews with participants and studies of their work to provide evidence of program effectiveness and to facilitate program improvement.

The program consists of the following seminars:

- Board Level Management
- Personal Effectiveness on the Board
- Facilities Development
- The Board of Directors and the Law
- The Board in Action: Techniques for Expediting Board Action

7. Project Evaluation:

Each of the seminars within each project has as an integral part a "performance goal" stated in specific terms. An example is: "The director will be able to apply methods and techniques of system design to his planning problems." Attainment of these performance goals will then be evaluated by tests or other means as appropriate. For example, the evaluation objective for the above performance goal is: "Based on pre-post tests, 75% of the participants will show a significant increase (at the .05 level) in knowledge of the relationship of primary board functions to systems concepts."

A comparison will be made of knowledge and attitude towards each of the performance goals using a pre- and post-questionnaire technique. Tests will be constructed individually based on the performance goals listed. Participants may be called upon to evaluate the effectiveness of the seminar in light of their responsibilities. The post-evaluation will be conducted by means of a follow-up questionnaire and personal interviews with selected participants. Workshop situations will also be used in which participants will work in small groups to create and present to other class members solutions to problems which, in turn, will be evaluated by instructors and peers.

A feature which will be applied to all projects is the participant feedback loop. Involvement of students in future planning for improvement of the program through an alumni committee provides a continuing means to ensure that ideas and suggestions are considered in program planning. In addition, evaluation consultants will be employed to develop and apply effective evaluation techniques.

8. Timetable:

Advanced Studies Program in Special Districts Management — First Year Class:
July 23 - July 28, 1972

Advanced Studies Program in Special Districts Management — Second Year Class:
July 22 - July 28, 1972

Special Districts Presidents' and Board Members' Institute:
November 17 - November 19, 1972 and January 19 - January 21, 1973

PROGRAM OR PROJECT BUDGET

Program or Project Title: TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SPECIAL DISTRICTS

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-	\$ 39,894	\$ 19,783	\$ 59,677

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 Program Director, Special District Training Program @ \$16,000*	15%	\$ 2,415
b. Total Number of Administrative, Professional and Technical Staff: <u>3</u>		
1) Project Coordinator 1 @ \$14,600 (20% time for 9 months) (100% time for 3 months)	20%	2,920
2) Continuing Education Specialists - 2 @ \$13,100*	100%	3,650
3) Instructors**	5% ea	1,310
		4,200
c. Total Number of Clerical and other Support Staff: <u>2</u>		
1) Program Assistant @ \$6,672*	50%	3,336
2) Clerical Assistance - 150 hrs. @ \$2.23/hr**		335
Fringe Benefits (If direct cost) *Staff Benefits	\$2,130	
**Workmen's Compensation	15	2,145
	Subtotal:	20,311
2. TRAVEL:		1,660
3. EQUIPMENT:		3,918
4. CONTRACTUAL AND CONSULTING SERVICES: Guest Lecturers		1,000
Evaluators		1,950
5. OTHER DIRECT COSTS: Instruc. supplies, classrooms, trng. aids		8,880
Enrollee per diem and lodging		17,640
	Total Direct Costs:	\$55,359
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		
Univ. Extension Administrative Costs - 5.5% of total direct costs		3,045
(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		
CSDA Administrative Costs - 2.3% of total direct costs		1,273
	Total Project Budget:	\$59,677

III. SOURCE OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE (Current-Year)	
1. From Grantee Resources (Show source by budget category)	\$
Personnel	4,284
Equipment	294
Other Direct Costs	1,250
Indirect Costs Contribution	455
2. From Other Sources	
Enrollee Fees	
100 @ \$50 - ASP in SDM - First course	5,000
50 @ \$50 - ASP in SDM - Second course	2,500
120 @ \$50 - PBMI	6,000
Total:	\$ 19,783

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	\$125,000	\$80,000	\$50,000

V. FURTHER DISCUSSION	
<u>Equipment</u> Telephone, postage \$1,478 Audio-visual and film rental 90 Video tape rental 1,130 Computer time 1,220 \$3,918	\$3,918
<u>Other Direct Cost</u> Office supplies \$ 545 Classroom rental 560 Duplicating 1,850 Instructional supplies and texts 4,925 Publicity 1,000 \$8,880	8,880

JURISDICTIONS COVERED BY THIS APPLICATION

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

Special Districts in the State of 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.

N

INTERGOVERNMENTAL PERSONNEL ACT (IPA) SCHEDULE - 1971-72

Date	Activity
August 19, 1971	IPA Meeting — Sacramento
September 19, 1971	IPA Meeting — San Francisco
October 4, 1971	Distribution of State Priorities
October 21, 1971	Deadline for submission of proposals
November 1, 1971	Distribution of proposals to Council members
November 30, 1971	Committee recommendations transmitted to staff
December 15, 1971	IPA Meeting — Los Angeles; Approval of State Plan
January 3, 1972	Submission of State Plan to Governor
January 26, 1972	IPA Meeting — Los Angeles
February 23, 1972	IPA Meeting — Sacramento
March 29, 1972	IPA Meeting — San Clemente
April 26, 1972	IPA Meeting — Los Angeles; Establish State priorities
May 1, 1972	Request for proposals
June 30, 1972	Deadline for submission of proposals