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I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, public service employment programs have played important roles in employment and training initiatives launched by the federal government. Public service employment programs have been widely used to combat both cyclical and structural unemployment. Essentially, public service employment programs involve the use of federal funds to create public sector jobs for individuals meeting specified eligibility criteria established in the authorizing legislation for these programs. Under recent public service employment programs, such as those funded under the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, the federal government has provided funds to units of local government to enable them to employ individuals meeting federally mandated eligibility criteria. In the Department of Labor monograph, Public Service Employment: CETA Program Models, public service employment has been defined in the following manner:

Public service employment can be defined as expenditure of public funds to employ, on the payroll of public agencies, those who would otherwise remain unemployed. . . . It differs from normal public employment in that the objective of a regular job is the good or service produced, with employment a byproduct, whereas in public service employment, the job is the objective and the output a byproduct.¹

During the 1970s, the federal government relied heavily on public service employment in its efforts to deal
with the problem of unemployment. Substantial sums of money have been appropriated for these programs and a large number of individuals have been employed under these types of programs. Beginning with the passage of the Emergency Employment Act of 1971, which authorized the Public Employment Program (PEP), the largest public service employment program since the Depression, considerable portions of the resources available for federal manpower programs have been devoted to public service employment programs. For example, $2.25 billion were appropriated to operate the Public Employment Program during the 1972 and 1973 fiscal years.\(^2\) Funding for public service employment was continued under Titles II and VI of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, reaching a peak in the 1977 fiscal year when $8.387 billion were appropriated to create 725,000 public service jobs.\(^3\)

Clearly the investment in public service employment programs has been considerable in terms of both financial and human resources. However, a number of questions concerning these programs have been raised by a wide range of people. Members of Congress, government officials, journalists, and private citizens, among others, have asked a variety of questions. Do these programs actually serve the groups that they are mandated to serve? Have the programs been effective? Have program administrators complied with the legal requirements of these programs? Are public service employment programs achieving their goals in an efficient manner?
The federal government has funded and/or conducted a number of evaluation studies in attempts to answer these questions and to deal with a wide range of other issues related to public service employment programs. Both the Emergency Employment Act and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) contained provisions for program evaluation. Since these programs have been in operation, a number of evaluation studies have been either conducted or funded by Congressional committees, the General Accounting Office, the Department of Labor, and other agencies. These studies have varied widely in scope, content, and methodology.

In this paper, a number of these evaluation studies will be reviewed and analyzed. The objectives of this paper are twofold--firstly, to critically examine previous evaluation studies of public service employment programs and, secondly, to make recommendations concerning the future evaluation of public service employment programs. As the public service employment programs funded under the Emergency Act of 1971 (EEA) and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 (CETA) represent the most significant recent efforts in this area, this paper focused exclusively on evaluation studies of these programs.

In order to achieve the objectives of this paper, it was necessary to proceed in the following manner. Firstly, the development of public service programs was traced in order to gain a historical perspective. After this was accomplished, evaluation studies of public service employment
under EEA were examined. Thirdly, evaluations of public service employment under CETA were reviewed. Based on this review of the EEA and CETA evaluation studies, certain general conclusions were drawn. Finally, recommendations concerning the conduct of future evaluations of public service employment programs were made.
II. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

Before examining the actual conduct of program evaluation under EEA and CETA, it will be useful to trace the historical development of public service employment programs. Although recent large scale efforts in this area began with the passage of the Emergency Employment Act in 1971, a number of other public service employment programs have been operated by the federal government during this century. These programs have ranged from the large scale work relief programs enacted during the Depression to the public sector employment and work experience programs implemented during the 1960s as components of the War on Poverty. An examination of the development of these public service employment programs will provide a sound foundation for the study of recent program evaluation efforts in this field.

In the United States the first major federally subsidized public service employment programs were launched in the 1930s. Faced with massive unemployment, the Roosevelt administration implemented a number of public service employment programs in attempts to ease the economic hardships of the Great Depression. These programs ranged from youth employment programs such as the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) to large scale work relief programs for the general population such as the Works Progress Administration (WPA). Although the WPA was the largest and most significant of
these programs, several other important public service employment programs were instituted prior to its inception in 1935. Beginning in 1933, the Roosevelt administration implemented a number of programs to provide public sector employment for the unemployed. The first of these programs was authorized under the Federal Emergency Relief Act (FERA) of 1933. Under the FERA, funds were allocated to state governments for both direct relief payments to eligible individuals and the employment of eligible individuals in work relief projects. Under the work relief component of the FERA, individuals eligible for relief were provided jobs on a variety of projects sponsored by units of state and local government. The work relief component of the FERA was implemented quickly; during April and May, 1933, approximately 2 million people were employed under this program. The work relief component of the FERA remained in operation until December, 1935, when relief program responsibilities were transferred to state governments. Another large scale public service employment program was operated by the Civil Works Administration, which was established by an executive order in November, 1933. The Civil Works Administration (CWA) was designed as a short term work relief program to deal with the hardships of the needy and the unemployed during the winter of 1933-34. Under this program, units of state and local government acted as project sponsors sharing project costs with the federal government. The CWA reached a peak enrollment of 4,264,000 in January, 1934, and was eventually phased out in May, 1934.
During the same period, the Roosevelt administration also implemented a youth public service employment program, the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). The CCC, which performed a variety of projects related to conservation and reforestation, was operational between April, 1933, and August, 1942. Enrollment in the CCC reached a peak of 505,000 in August, 1935. The program was primarily targeted towards unemployed males between the ages of 18 and 25 years who were members of unemployed families eligible for relief payments.  

With the passage of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act in 1935, the most significant Depression Era work relief program, the Works Progress Administration (WPA), was created. Under this program, individuals meeting specified eligibility criteria were assigned to work on various public service projects which were primarily sponsored by units of state and local government. Although the federal government assumed the full cost of the wages paid to workers assigned to WPA projects, the local sponsoring jurisdictions were required to pay varying shares of other project costs. WPA enrollees completed a variety of worthwhile projects ranging from painting murals in public buildings to repairing roads. The WPA was operational for approximately eight years; the program was phased out in 1943 due to a marked decrease in unemployment during World War II. During its operational period, the WPA employed an average of 2 million people per year and spent approximately $1.4 billion per year in enrollee wages. Enrollment in the WPA, which reached a peak of 3.33 million in November, 1938, totaled approximately 8.5 million
over the life of the program. Total federal and local sponsor expenditures for the WPA exceeded $13 billion.

Clearly the WPA was the largest public service employment program conducted by the federal government during this century. Although assessments of the effectiveness of the WPA and similar programs vary widely, most authorities would agree that these Depression era programs were substantially different from later public service employment efforts. Due to the social and economic climate of the 1930s, public service employment programs such as the WPA were primarily viewed as a form of relief. As Kesselman has stated:

My analysis leads to the characterization of the 1930s work relief programs as primarily a camouflaged form of direct relief; the value of output produced was of secondary importance. Work programs furnished widespread income support to needy households.

Due to this emphasis on work relief for large numbers of people, many of the elements found in later public service employment programs were not present in the Depression era programs. On this Russell Nixon wrote:

The job programs of the 1930s were primitive by today's standards. They did not include systematic on-the-job or off-the-job training, had no program of employability, creating remedial or support services, and included nothing at all in the direction of career development, upgrading or upward mobility.

However, in spite of their deficiencies the WPA and similar programs did provide a relatively large number of jobs for the unemployed. In addition, these programs also provided policy makers with lessons that could be used in the design of future large scale public service employment programs. In an article on federal job creation, the
Department of Labor has stated:

On balance, the WPA experience led to several important conclusions. First, it proved that very large numbers of people could be rapidly employed in a period of high unemployment, although questions were raised about the inefficiencies which the WPA approach entailed. Secondly, the program indicated that, on the scale at which it was implemented, it could be only one of the many policy initiatives required to raise the economy out of its doldrums.

The next significant events in the development of public service employment programs occurred during the 1960s. During this period a number of public service employment programs were implemented as work experience components of manpower development and anti-poverty programs. However, the public service employment programs of the 1960s differed considerably in both size and scope from those of the Depression. For one thing, the public employment programs of the 1960s were on a much smaller scale than the Depression era programs. Also the programs enacted during the 1960s had different objectives than the Depression era programs. While the programs of the 1930s had attempted to deal with the problem of cyclical unemployment, the programs of the 1960s attempted to deal with problems associated with structural unemployment. Concerning the programs of the 1960s, the 1975 Manpower Report of the President stated:

Unlike the New Deal programs, which were primarily countercyclical, the aim of the programs initiated in the 1960s was to reduce the employment problems of the disadvantaged which persisted even when there were plenty of jobs and few unemployed. Older, younger, minority, and other disadvantaged workers became the focus of most public employment programs.
In the 1960s federally subsidized public employment programs for the economically disadvantaged and the structurally unemployed began with the passage of an amendment to the Social Security Act in 1962. Under this amendment, a Community Work and Training Program was authorized for individuals receiving public assistance under the provisions of the Social Security Act. This program provided for the placement of public assistance recipients in public sector agencies and private non-profit organizations. The enrollees were not paid wages; in effect, they were working for the value of their public assistance payments.15

In 1964, the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act signaled the beginning of the War on Poverty. A number of federally subsidized public service employment programs were authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act and subsequent amendments to the Act. One such program was the Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) which provided public sector employment for economically disadvantaged young people. Another program designed for chronically unemployed older workers, Operation Mainstream, was authorized by an amendment to Title I of the Economic Opportunity Act in 1965. Beginning in 1966, workers assigned to Operation Mainstream completed a variety of public service employment projects involving community improvement and beautification. This program was responsible for the creation of 33,000 federally funded public sector jobs.16 Finally, Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act authorized a work experience program for welfare recipients.
In addition to the previously mentioned programs, several other public service employment programs were instituted during the 1960s. In 1966 the New Careers program was implemented; this program provided entry-level paraprofessional jobs in public agencies to the economically disadvantaged. The New Careers Program was succeeded by the Public Service Careers Program, which began operations in 1970. In 1967 another public sector employment program for welfare recipients, the Work Incentive Program (WIN), was established by an amendment to the Social Security Act.

As this brief survey indicates, there was a multiplicity of public service employment and work experience programs during the 1960s. Each program was designed to provide services for specific target groups; however, the objectives of these programs often overlapped. Yet the public service employment and work experience programs of the 1960s did represent a substantial investment of public funds. According to the Department of Labor, in the fiscal years 1965 through 1970 federal outlays for these types of programs totaled $2.5 billion.\(^{17}\)

Although substantially smaller in terms of funding and enrollment levels, the programs of the 1960s were more sophisticated in terms of program design than those of the 1930s. According to the Department of Labor, there were at least two elements present in the public service employment programs of the 1960s that were absent in the programs of the 1930s. Firstly, in the design and operation of the public service employment programs of the 1960s there was more
emphasis on efficiently providing public sector services. Secondly, in the 1960s public service employment programs were linked with other manpower program goals such as employability development and the removal of institutional barriers for the economically disadvantaged.¹⁸
After the public service employment programs of the 1960s, the next significant development in this field came with the passage of the Emergency Employment Act (EEA) of 1971. This Act established the Public Employment Program (PEP), which at the time was the largest public job creation effort that had been launched by the federal government since the Great Depression. While the public employment programs of the 1960s were essentially work experience components of manpower programs designed to provide training and supportive services for the structurally unemployed, PEP was a relatively large scale public employment program implemented to combat the cyclical unemployment that was associated with the recession of 1970-71. In this chapter, the history of the PEP program will be traced. After this has been accomplished, several of the more significant PEP evaluation studies will be analyzed in detail.

During the recession of 1970-71, rising unemployment rates created pressure for a policy response at the federal level. Although the need for a public employment program was recognized by both officials of the Nixon administration and members of Congress, there was widespread disagreement over actual program design. During 1971, three proposed bills establishing public employment programs were considered by policy makers. In March, 1971, the Nixon administration
proposed the Manpower Revenue Sharing Act of 1971 which contained provisions for the operation of a public service employment program by state and local governments. On April 4, 1971, the Emergency Employment Act, S. 31, was passed by the Senate; this bill was essentially a modified version of another bill that had been vetoed by President Nixon in 1970. Also, in June, 1971, the House passed H.R. 3613, another bill authorizing a public service employment program. A conference committee was established to resolve the differences between S. 31 and H.R. 3613. An amended version of S. 31 was reported from the Conference Committee and accepted by both houses of Congress. This amended bill was the product of a number of compromises between members of the Senate and House of Representatives and administration officials. On July 12, 1971, the bill became law when President Nixon signed the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 (Public Law 92-54). ¹⁹

In its final form, the Emergency Employment Act authorized a large scale decentralized public employment program that was designed to serve a wide variety of groups. Funds appropriated under the EEA were to be allocated to eligible applicants through grants and contracts administered by the Department of Labor. Section 4 of the EEA specified that the eligible applicants for funding under the Act were units and subdivisions of state, local, and federal government and Indian tribes on reservations. Funds were to be allocated to the eligible applicants according to mechanisms
based on national and local unemployment rates. Section 5 of the Act authorized the appropriation of $750 million during the first year of the program and $1 billion during the second year. These funds were to be obligated when the national unemployment rate equaled or exceeded 4.5 percent for three consecutive months. In addition, Section 6 of the Act provided for the allocation of $250 million each year to units of government in areas with unemployment rates equal to or in excess of 6 percent for three consecutive months.\(^{20}\)

According to the Act the funds allocated to the eligible applicant were to be used primarily for the provision of transitional public service employment opportunities for the unemployed and underemployed. Although a number of other activities such as training, supportive services, and civil service reform were authorized in the Act, Section 3(b) of the EEA specified that not less than 85 percent of the funds appropriated under the Act must be spent on participant wages and fringe benefits. The Act further specified that these transitional public service jobs should be located in fields with "unmet needs for public services" such as health care, environmental quality, and public safety. In addition, the Act also enumerated a broad range of target groups that were to be served through the provision of transitional public service jobs. According to Section 2 of the Act, these groups included individuals with low incomes, welfare recipients, migrant farm workers, recently discharged veterans, older workers, young labor force entrants, people of limited
English speaking ability, and, finally, workers who became unemployed as the result of technological change and changes in government spending.\textsuperscript{21}

The initial steps to implement the Public Employment Program were taken soon after the passage of the EEA. On August 9, 1971, Congress passed the initial appropriation for the program. By Labor Day, 1971, 3,000 PEP participants had been hired and by December 29, 1971, $939 million had been allocated under the Act and 95,971 individuals were employed in PEP jobs. Approximately one year after the EEA had been signed, $983.5 million had been allocated and 168,724 PEP participants were working in public service jobs.\textsuperscript{22}

Throughout the early stages of the program, there was constant pressure for rapid implementation at the federal level, ranging from letters sent by President Nixon to local officials, to contacts between local officials and regional representatives of the Manpower Administration of the Department of Labor.

During its operational period, PEP was able to provide employment for a relatively large number of people. At its peak period of operation, 192,675 authorized positions were funded through 1,098 grants between the Manpower Administration and 657 program agents across the nation.\textsuperscript{23} As of April, 1974, a cumulative total of 340,000 regular PEP workers had been employed under the program. In addition, another 317,000 summer youth workers had been employed under the program.\textsuperscript{24}
Clearly PEP was a large scale public service employment program that was implemented rapidly. However, how effective was PEP in achieving the many goals that were set out for the program in the Emergency Employment Act? Sections 5(c) and 11(f) of the EEA authorized the Secretary of Labor to expend funds for program evaluation and to require program agents to submit data concerning the characteristics of program participants, the placement of terminated program participants in unsubsidized employment, and program costs. In order to obtain this data, the Manpower Administration required program agents to submit monthly project status reports and individual transaction reports on the enrollment and termination of each program participant. In addition, each program agent was subject to two onsite monitoring visits per year by the staff of the Regional Manpower Administration Office in its area. The purpose of these monitoring visits was to ensure compliance with appropriate regulations and program objectives. Also, fiscal audits of program agents were to be performed each year by the Office of Program Review and Audit of the Department of Labor and by certified public accountants under contract to the Department of Labor.25

In addition to the internal monitoring and evaluation effort conducted by the Department of Labor, a number of outside program evaluation studies were also conducted by other individuals and agencies. These evaluations
were conducted either by other governmental agencies such as the General Accounting Office or by individuals or organizations under contract to the Department of Labor or other governmental agencies. As these outside evaluations were generally more comprehensive and more accessible than the internal evaluations performed by the Department of Labor, this chapter will focus on several of the more significant of these outside evaluation studies. Specifically the following PEP evaluation studies will be examined: The Emergency Employment Act: An Interim Assessment; Evaluation of the First 18 Months of the Public Employment Program; Case Studies of the Emergency Employment Act in Operation; and Longitudinal Evaluation of the Public Employment Program and Validation of the PEP Data Bank. In reviewing these evaluation studies the following general areas will be examined: the extent to which program objectives were addressed in the study; the data and methodology employed in the study; and the usefulness of the study's findings and conclusions.

The first of the evaluation studies to be examined, The Emergency Employment Act: An Interim Assessment, was prepared for the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the United States Senate. This study was conducted under the direction of the National Manpower Policy Task Force, a non-profit corporation funded by grants from the Ford Foundation and the Department of Labor. The study evaluates the first eight months of PEP operations from both the national and
local perspectives. The study itself is comprised of two distinct sections. Part I, entitled "The Emergency Employment Act: An Interim Assessment," which was prepared by Sar Levitan and Robert Taggart, examined PEP at the national level. In contrast, Part II consisted of a series of nine case studies which examined the operations of PEP program agents in various parts of the country.

Part I of this study, "The Emergency Employment Act: An Interim Assessment" by Sar Levitan and Robert Taggart, presented an evaluation of the first eight months of PEP operations from the national perspective. In their seventy-two page study, the authors addressed a number of issues relevant to the implementation of PEP. In doing this, two different data bases were utilized. Due to the decentralized nature of PEP, the authors felt that some program objectives could best be addressed by an examination of program statistics collected by the Department of Labor (DOL) while other program objectives could be best assessed through an analysis of the case studies that comprise the second part of this evaluation study.

After briefly outlining the legislative history of EEA, the authors proceeded to examine what they characterized as "the basic structural features of the Public Employment Program" by an analysis of program data and reports that had been submitted to DOL by the program agents. In commenting on the need for this approach, they stated:

While analyses of state and local conditions are necessary to determine how well the program is adapted
to the needs of the public and the unemployed, aggregate statistics can suggest in a general way whom the program is serving and how it is applied.\textsuperscript{27}

The authors made use of aggregate program statistics in examining the following aspects of PEP: (1) characteristics of PEP enrollees, (2) speed of program implementation, (3) public service areas in which PEP jobs were located (i.e., law enforcement, education, social services, etc.), and (4) the wage rates of PEP participants before and after participation in the program.

In examining these areas, Levitan and Taggart presented the data and then, based upon the data, attempted to determine if program objectives were being achieved. For example, in analyzing the characteristics of PEP participants, Levitan and Taggart employed the following approach. Firstly, they commented on the nature of the available data. Secondly, the authors presented in tabular form the percent distribution of PEP participants in the following categories: age, sex, race, veteran status, education, length of unemployment, welfare status, and labor force status. Finally, they compared the percent of PEP enrollees in the various sub-groups of these categories to the percent of the unemployed population estimated to be in the same sub-groups to determine if the various target groups mentioned in the EEA were being served in proportion to their rates of unemployment.

After they had examined aggregate statistics relating to PEP, they proceeded to examine the data obtained from the nine case studies that comprise the second part of this
evaluation study. In this section, the authors synthesized the findings of the various case studies in order to draw conclusions regarding aspects of local PEP implementation. In this section the authors examined the following areas:

1. Local responses to unmet public service needs and unemployment rates.
2. Local program administration.
3. The equity of the allocation of funds by program agents.
4. The impact of unions, community groups, and political organizations on local program design.
5. The procedures for creating and allocating PEP jobs.
6. Local emphasis on specific target groups.
7. Coordination of PEP with other manpower programs at the local level.
8. Civil service reform by local employing agencies.
10. Arrangements for the transition of PEP participants to permanent jobs.

In examining each of these areas, Levitan and Taggart tried to identify certain general trends or approaches for dealing with PEP at the local level. They then assessed how effective these approaches had been in contributing to PEP implementation. Finally, they recommended certain approaches for the implementation of future public service employment programs.
The second part of this study was composed of nine case studies of PEP program agents located in various parts of the country. Overall, the implementation of PEP in four counties, six cities, four state governments, and the District of Columbia was examined. Although only a relatively small number of program agents were examined, there was considerable diversity in the sizes and types of program agents that were studied. The program agents ranged in size from large metropolitan cities such as New York and Los Angeles to small rural governmental units such as Laredo, Texas, and Boone County, Missouri. All of the studies were prepared by members of the National Manpower Policy Task Force.

Although there was considerable variation in the amount of consideration given to each topic, all of the authors examined the same basic topics relating to PEP implementation. All of the case studies addressed the following areas: (1) allocation of funds, (2) program administration, (3) participant characteristics, (4) allocation of jobs between employing agencies, (5) PEP job classifications established by employing agencies, (6) speed of program implementation, (7) recruitment and selection procedures, and (8) coordination with other manpower programs. However, the amount of attention given to particular topics varied greatly between case studies. Some studies concentrated almost exclusively on a single topic and neglected other aspects of PEP. For example, Vernon Briggs, who wrote "Houston, Laredo, and the State of Texas," seemed to devote
an inordinate amount of attention to discussing allocations that Texas had received from the Department of Labor and justifying the need for more funds while neglecting other aspects of the program. In addition to the basic topics mentioned above, certain authors also analyzed other aspects of program operation. For example, Marilyn Gittell, who studied PEP operations in New York City, presented a thorough analysis of civil service reform associated with the PEP recruitment effort.

Although the attention given to PEP objectives varied widely from case study to case study, the data employed in the case studies were similar. The authors of the case studies relied almost exclusively on data obtained from the program agents that they were studying. Data relating to such topics as program administration and job allocation procedures appeared to have been obtained through interviews with program agent staff members and from documents supplied by the program agents. In regard to some topics, data provided by the program agent staff were simply reproduced and incorporated into the case study. All of the authors presented lists of PEP job classifications created by the program agents. Also, in determining the characteristics of PEP participants served, the researchers appeared to have reproduced standard characteristic reports that had been compiled by the staffs of the program agents without attempting to verify the accuracy of the information that was presented.

The methods of analysis used by the researchers varied substantially according to the topic being addressed
and to the relative importance that the individual researcher attached to the particular topic. In general, most researchers placed greater emphasis on analyzing procedures and policies which had a substantial impact on the speed of program implementation. In this area most researchers spent considerable amounts of time in analyzing job allocation procedures and recruitment and selection procedures to determine if these procedures had helped or hindered rapid implementation of PEP for the program agent.

In addition to their contribution to *The Emergency Employment Act: An Interim Assessment*, Sar Levitan and Robert Taggart also prepared a subsequent evaluation of PEP; this forty-three page study was entitled, *Evaluation of the First 18 Months of the Public Employment Program*. In this study, Levitan and Taggart examined the performance of PEP from the period July, 1971, through January, 1973. Again, the authors viewed PEP performance and goal achievement from a national perspective.

In preparing their study, Levitan and Taggart relied on statistical data collected by the Department of Labor. The data were compiled from PEP enrollment and termination transaction records and monthly project status reports submitted to the Department of Labor by PEP program agents. Although Levitan and Taggart did acknowledge that there were problems with the accuracy and timely submission of the reports and documents from which the statistics were derived, no attempt was made to test or validate the accuracy of the
statistical data upon which this study was based. The authors made use of the aggregate statistical data to evaluate the performance of PEP in a number of areas. Specifically, Levitan and Taggart examined the performance of PEP in the following areas:

1. Reduction in unemployment, including the effect of rapid program implementation and the cost per PEP job.
2. Public service areas and occupational categories in which PEP jobs were established.
3. Service to PEP target groups specified in the authorizing legislation.
4. Rate of transition of PEP participants into unsubsidized jobs in the public and private sectors.
5. Changes in hourly earnings of PEP participants before, during, and after participation in the program.
6. Regional variations in types of jobs created and categories of participants served.

In each of these areas, the authors examined the aggregate program statistics to determine if program goals were being met. The data were presented in tabular form and percent distributions were calculated for the elements and sub-categories presented in the tables. In addition, other relevant data were also presented for comparison with the PEP data; for example, the authors presented unemployment rates for various target groups to determine if these groups were being served in proportion to their representation among the unemployed. In their analyses, the authors also considered
the impact of such factors as Department of Labor program administration policies, national and local economic conditions, and the pressure for rapid implementation on program goal attainment.

After they had examined the performance of PEP operations, Levitan and Taggart then drew certain conclusions regarding the reasons for standard or sub-standard performance in particular areas. In dealing with sub-standard performance, the authors were careful to consider the multiplicity of goals contained in the EEA and to draw conclusions regarding their impact on program performance. In some instances, Levitan and Taggart felt that the multiple program goals had diffused the impact of the program to a considerable extent, making it difficult for PEP to adequately service those target groups most in need of assistance. Finally, the authors made certain recommendations for the design of future public service employment programs.

In addition to the evaluation studies previously mentioned in this chapter, the National Manpower Policy Task Force was also responsible for the preparation of another major evaluation effort concerning PEP. The results of this effort are contained in a 1,410 page work entitled, Case Studies of the Emergency Employment Act in Operation, which was prepared for the Subcommittee on Employment, Poverty, and Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the United States Senate. This volume is composed of sixteen case studies of PEP program agent operations during
the period September, 1971, through October, 1972. The case studies were conducted by members of the National Manpower Policy Task Force. With the exception of two case studies (one concerning PEP Indian grants and one conducted by a non-profit corporation), all of the case studies were prepared by faculty members or researchers associated with colleges or universities located in the same areas as the program agents they were evaluating. Some of the studies contained in this volume are expanded and updated versions of the case studies presented in *The Emergency Employment Act: An Interim Assessment*.

In addition to the case study on PEP Indian grants, these case studies covered PEP operations in nine states and the District of Columbia. Within each of the states listed below, programs operated by the following governmental units were examined:


2. *Illinois*; Chicago, Champaign County, City of Decatur, and City of Springfield.


5. *Missouri*; State Emergency Employment Section and Boone County.
7. North Carolina; Winston-Salem and Robeson County.
8. Texas; State Department of Community Affairs, Houston, Laredo, and Webb County.
9. Utah; State Manpower Planning Council.

As the above listing indicates, there was considerable diversity in the size, responsibilities, and geographical location of the governmental units studied; however, the studies do not indicate that any sampling strategy was employed to ensure that a representative sample of program agents was obtained. In all, the PEP operations in five state agencies, thirteen cities, seven counties, six Indian reservations, and the District of Columbia were examined.

Although there was a substantial amount of variation in the emphasis placed on the examination of certain aspects of PEP operations due to the interests of the researchers and the characteristics of the units of government that were operating the PEP programs, the case studies adequately examined questions relating to PEP goal achievement. In addition to dealing with the topics addressed in the previous case studies, these case studies were also able to examine program agent performance in some areas which had not been addressed adequately in the previous case studies. Specifically, these areas were: (1) local monitoring and evaluation systems; (2) the long range impact of PEP on local civil service reform; (3) maintenance of effort by employing agencies; (4) the effect of participant characteristics, job
classification systems, and recruitment and selection procedures on the transition rates of PEP participants; (5) the job turnover and non-positive termination rates of PEP participants; and (6) the extent to which program agents established training programs for PEP enrollees. As the time frame covered by these latter case studies was considerably longer than the time frame covered by the earlier case studies, the researchers were able to go into greater depth in examining certain aspects of PEP operations.

In compiling their case studies, the researchers relied heavily on data obtained from PEP program agents. The researchers utilized a variety of reports, budgets, organizational charts, and participant statistical data. In addition, the researchers also interviewed individuals associated with the administration of PEP programs. Although the researchers utilized a wide variety of information sources, in most cases they accepted data without any attempt to independently verify it. For example, most of the authors presented extensive lists of PEP job classifications; however, few researchers performed any sort of job analysis to determine what the actual duties of the positions were. In addition, the quality of the data was not always suited for the purposes for which it was employed. For example, in discussing the acceptance of PEP participants by departments of the City of Milwaukee, Peter Kobrak presented a summary of supervisor's evaluation reports on PEP participants assigned to their departments.

The analytical methods utilized by the researchers
in their studies depended on the particular aspect of the program that they were considering and on the nature of the data that were available to them. In examining those aspects of PEP relating to program administration, such as job allocation procedures and recruitment and selection procedures, the researchers usually presented the information and then made a judgment as to whether or not the procedure had been effective. In analyzing quantitative data and dealing with topics such as service to target groups and transition rates, the researchers usually compared the program data to other statistics such as labor force characteristics or unemployment rates to determine if target groups were being adequately served or if there were differential program outcomes due to demographic characteristics. However, in most cases, formal research designs were not specified and no tests were made to determine if statistically significant relationships did in fact exist. Two researchers, Martin Oettinger and C. Daniel Vencill, who studied the PEP operations of the California State Human Resources Development Agency (HRD), did present a formal design employing statistical tests to examine factors affecting participant termination and placement rates. However, this design was actually developed and conducted by HRD.

The conclusions reached by the authors as a result of their evaluations covered a wide range of questions relating to PEP. The researchers addressed both local program operations and the design and intent of PEP in their conclusions. Due to the use of the case study method, the conclusions were
primarily, if not solely, based on the program's operation in a specific locality and on the factors shaping program design in that area. Although the use of this approach is valuable in a decentralized program, the observation of PEP in a particular area would not necessarily enable the researcher to make reliable generalizations about the overall design of the national program.

The final PEP study to be examined, Longitudinal Evaluation of the Public Employment Program and Validation of the PEP Data Bank, was primarily concerned with participant data reporting systems and program outcomes for PEP participants. The study, which was prepared by Westat, Inc., under contract to the Department of Labor, had two primary objectives. The first objective was to evaluate the success of the program in regard to serving and transitioning PEP participants. The second objective was to validate the accuracy of participant information records submitted to the Department of Labor by the program agents.

The study employed a formal research design to accomplish its objectives. The study was longitudinal in nature covering a three and one-half year period. During this period, four waves of interviews were conducted with PEP participants. Westat researchers utilized a two stage sampling procedure to select the participants to be interviewed. In the first stage, a sample of program agents stratified by unit of government (city, county, or state) and by geographic location was drawn. In the second stage, the researchers drew a random sample of PEP participants from the files of the program
agents selected in the first stage of the sampling procedure. The participants were then selected from program agent files and rosters by means of a set sampling interval with a random start. In all, 6,191 PEP participants were selected for the four waves of interviews.36

The data gathered from these interviews were used to examine PEP in three general areas. The first of these general areas involved the accuracy of information contained in the PEP data bank. The data bank information was compiled from participant records forwarded to the Department of Labor by the program agents. In this study, individual participant records in the data bank were compared with the information gained from interviews with the same participants. As information contained in the PEP data bank formed the basis for many of the findings of previously mentioned PEP evaluation studies, it is interesting to note that the Westat researchers found that approximately 20 percent of the PEP participants interviewed were not in fact eligible for the program37 and that there were "serious problems with errors, omissions, and delays" in the PEP reporting system.38

The second general area covered in this study was related to the analysis of basic program data and was primarily descriptive in nature. In this section, the researchers presented general data about program participants, PEP job classifications, and public service areas in which the participants were working. PEP participant characteristics were compared with the characteristics of other manpower program
enrollees and with the characteristics of the unemployed population and the labor force to determine the levels of service to the various target groups mentioned in the authorizing legislation. In addition, the characteristics of PEP participants working in various public service areas and job classifications were also displayed and analyzed.

The third general area involved the effects of PEP on program participants. In this section, the following topics relating to participation in PEP were examined:

1. Duration of program participation.
2. Earnings while enrolled in PEP.
3. The comparison of pre- and post-program earnings.
4. Training and supportive services received.
5. Labor force status before and after PEP participation.
6. Rates of transition to unsubsidized employment in the public and private sectors.

In examining these areas, the researchers did conclude that there were differential program outcomes based on such factors as race, sex, and education. However, the analysis of the relationships between participant characteristics and program outcomes by mathematical modeling techniques did not prove successful. After having used multiple regression models and Automatic Interaction Detection models, the researchers stated:

The results were interesting, but their analytic value was, in general, disappointing. The predictive power of the various models proved to be rather low as did the measure of association between characteristics of terminees and corresponding outcome variables.
Before examining the conduct of the public service employment (PSE) program evaluation under CETA, it will be useful to briefly summarize the review of EEA evaluation studies that was conducted in this chapter. In total, four separate EEA evaluation studies were examined; two of these studies contained collections of individual case studies of EEA program agent operations. Based on a review of these studies, it is possible to make several generalizations. Firstly, the researchers relied heavily on the use of the case study method and on the analysis of secondary data in completing their studies. With the exception of the Westat, Inc., study, the researchers did not employ formally stated research designs nor collect data through independent surveys. Secondly, although the overall evaluation effort addressed a wide range of stated program objectives, there were wide variations in the emphasis placed on specific program objectives in the individual studies. This was especially true in regard to the case study collections. Thirdly, the overall evaluation effort stressed compliance oriented monitoring at the expense of long-range program outcome evaluation. There were few, if any, attempts to measure the long-term impacts of the EEA program.
IV. CETA: THE EVALUATION EFFORT

In late 1973, while the Public Employment Program was still in operation, a significant event in the recent history of public service employment programs took place. On December 28, 1973, a number of important innovations in the design and operation of manpower programs were introduced with the enactment of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-203). During the 1970s, CETA authorized the largest public service employment programs operated by the federal government since the Great Depression. Since 1973, there have been a number of amendments to the original legislation, which have altered the objectives and design of CETA public service employment (PSE) programs; however, these programs are still important components of the federal government's policy initiatives in this area.

Since 1974, when CETA PSE programs first became operational, a number of evaluation studies concerning various aspects of these programs have been either conducted or funded by agencies of the federal government. These studies have ranged in scope from large scale, comprehensive evaluations of program impact funded by the Department of Labor to investigations of certain aspects of program operations in a specific geographical area conducted by the General Accounting Office. In this chapter a number of these evaluation
studies will be examined; however, before actually examining the studies, it will be useful to briefly review the development of public service employment under CETA.

The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 was enacted in response to two trends among national policy makers. The first trend involved a growing awareness of problems relating to the multiplicity of manpower programs that were implemented during the 1960s. Regarding this trend, O'Keefe, Ainsworth, and Crawford of the National Commission for Manpower Policy stated:

It became increasingly apparent that the nation's employment and training efforts were fragmented, duplicative and in need of reorganization if they were to meet their potential. Therefore, policy-makers began to focus on the need for an improved administrative and organizational structure and efforts were begun to develop "comprehensive" employment and training legislation.

The other trend shaping the development of CETA was the emphasis placed by the Nixon Administration on the use of revenue sharing to implement the concepts of the "New Federalism." Concerning this, O'Keefe, Ainsworth, and Crawford stated:

The other major factor influencing the development of legislation was a commitment by the Executive Branch during this period to the use of special revenue sharing as a means of discharging federal responsibilities in several social welfare areas.

These trends were reflected in the final version of CETA. CETA did not authorize any major innovations in the types of employment and training activities that were funded by the federal government; however, it did authorize substantial changes in the manpower planning and service delivery
systems. According to O'Keefe, Ainsworth, and Crawford, these changes were best described by the terms decentralization and decategorization; concerning the CETA legislation, they stated:

... It consolidated the authorization for many existing employment and training services and it accomplished two significant administrative changes in the process:

It shifted to a substantial degree the authority for planning, implementing, operating, monitoring and assessing programs from the federal government to the state and local prime sponsors (i.e., it decentralized the program).

It allowed the prime sponsors the flexibility to design the services and the service mix around the needs of the jurisdiction's target population (i.e., it decategorized the program). 43

The initial PSE program funded under CETA was authorized by Title II of the Act. CETA Title II authorized a program of transitional public service employment for the unemployed and the underemployed. Under this program, eligible individuals were given federally subsidized jobs on the payrolls of state and local governments. The Title II program was to be restricted to "areas of substantial unemployment." According to Section 201 of CETA, an "area of substantial unemployment" was "any area . . . which has a rate of unemployment equal to or in excess of 6.5 per centum for three consecutive months ... ." 44

Title II PSE was originally designed as a relatively small scale program targeted towards structural unemployment in specific geographical areas. Appropriations for CETA Title II during fiscal year 1975, the first year of CETA operations, totaled $370 million. 45 Due to pressures caused by rising unemployment associated with the recession of
1974-75, the Title II program was implemented rapidly, and CETA prime sponsors were encouraged by the Department of Labor to accelerate enrollments in the program. By June, 1975, enrollments in CETA Title II totaled approximately 125,000.

In addition to the rapid implementation of the CETA Title II PSE program, there was another response at the national level to the high unemployment rates associated with the recession of 1974-75. On December 31, 1974, the Emergency Jobs and Unemployment Assistance Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-567) was enacted. This Act revised the original CETA legislation, creating a new CETA Title VI PSE program which was designed to combat cyclical unemployment. Section 601 of the Act authorized the appropriation of $2.5 billion to operate the program through December 31, 1975. According to William Mirengoff and Lester Rindler of the National Academy of Sciences, the design of the Title VI program differed substantially from that of the Title II program; they stated:

Title VI differed from Title II in several respects. It extended public service employment to all areas, not just those with substantial unemployment. In addition to those who were given preference in Title II—persons who had exhausted unemployment insurance or who were not eligible for UI benefits were to receive preferred consideration. To encourage rapid implementation, Congress relaxed the requirement that sponsors attempt to find jobs for participants in unsubsidized employment. Thus, one of the major objectives of public service employment—to provide a bridge to permanent employment—was sacrificed to encourage speedy implementation.

The Title VI program was implemented rapidly. According to the Department of Labor, over 110,000 individuals were enrolled in the program as of March 31, 1975, and approximately 125,000 individuals were enrolled in the program as
The Title VI PSE program was originally enacted as a short term measure designed to combat cyclical unemployment. However, the unemployment rate did not decrease as expected. In response to the persistently high rate of unemployment, the Emergency Jobs Program Extension Act of 1976, Public Law 94-444, was enacted on October 1, 1976. In addition to extending the authorization for the CETA Title VI PSE program, this Act also introduced substantial changes in the design of the program and in the program eligibility criteria. According to Mirengoff and Rindler, these changes were made in order to deal with perceived substitution problems and to target the program to serve the most disadvantaged clients.

Concerning these changes, they wrote:

With that act, Congress also attempted to correct some shortcomings in the public service employment program. It attempted to contain substitution of federal for local funds by directing that funds allocated above the amount needed to sustain existing levels of Title VI enrollment be used for special projects (i.e., activities of limited duration that are not part of the regular public service structure). It also sought to redirect the program toward those most in need by requiring that half of any Title VI vacancies, as well as all project-created jobs, be filled with long-term, low-income unemployed persons or welfare recipients.

In essence, the changes in Title VI eligibility criteria transformed a program that was originally designed to deal with cyclical unemployment into one that was designed to deal with structural unemployment. Although Congress extended the Title VI program, it did not appropriate any additional funds to expand the Title II and Title VI programs beyond their current levels of enrollment.
However, soon after the Carter Administration came into power, plans for a rapid expansion of the CETA PSE programs were implemented. As part of his economic stimulus program, President Carter proposed that the CETA Titles II and VI programs be expanded. Subsequently, Congress passed the Economic Stimulus Act of 1977 (Public Law 94-474) which was signed into law on May 13, 1977. This Act provided appropriations of $1.14 billion for Title II and $6.847 billion for Title VI. When combined with the $400 million appropriation of fiscal year 1977, which had been previously authorized for Title II, the total CETA PSE funding equaled $8.387 billion. The additional funding increased the number of authorized PSE jobs to a new level of 725,000 by adding 415,000 new jobs to those that had already been funded. Once again, there was pressure for the rapid enrollment of CETA PSE participants. By September 30, 1977, 597,000 individuals were enrolled in these programs. The Title II and VI programs reached a peak enrollment in March, 1978, when over 750,000 PSE jobs were filled. Since then, enrollments in these programs have declined substantially due to reduced levels of funding.

Since the passage of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act in 1973, numerous evaluation studies concerning various aspects of CETA PSE programs have been conducted. These evaluation studies have covered all the stages in the development of the CETA II and VI programs from initial program implementation to the expansion of the PSE programs.
under the Economic Stimulus Act of 1977. In this chapter, several CETA PSE evaluation studies that have been directly conducted by governmental agencies or that have been funded by governmental agencies will be examined. Specifically, this examination of CETA PSE evaluation studies will focus on those studies that have been performed by the following governmental agencies or their subcontractors: the General Accounting Office, the Department of Labor, and the National Commission for Manpower Policy. In examining these evaluation studies, the following approach will be employed; each evaluation study will be analyzed to determine the objectives of the study, the data and methodology used in completing the study, and the nature of the findings of the study.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) has performed several evaluation studies relating to the operation of PSE programs funded under Titles II and VI of CETA. In our examination of CETA PSE program evaluation, the following studies conducted by the GAO will be reviewed: Public Service Employment in Delaware Under Title VI of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, Employment Programs in Buffalo and Erie County Under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Can Be Improved, Public Service Employment in Southwestern New York State, and More Benefits to Jobless Can Be Attained in Public Service Employment. In general, these reports dealt with the early implementation stages of CETA II and VI programs, covering the first year or so of program operations. The GAO evaluation studies were most
often concerned with the program operations of local CETA II and VI prime sponsors. The studies were made in response to requests by members of Congress for specific information concerning CETA program performance.

The first GAO evaluation study concerning the CETA Title VI program, Public Service Employment in Delaware Under Title VI of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, was made in response to a request from Congressman Du Pont. This report was concerned with CETA VI operations by the City of Wilmington and the Counties of New Castle, Kent, and Sussex, during the period January, 1975, through June, 1975.54

The study covered a number of procedural questions relating to the implementation of the Title VI program in Delaware. Specifically, this GAO study dealt with the operations of Delaware prime sponsors and their sub-agents in the following areas: (1) timeliness of expenditure of funds and program implementation, (2) procedures employed in the processing and selecting of program applicants, (3) the types of work performed by program enrollees and their job classifications, and (4) the possible use of CETA funds to rehire regular employees of local governments. In addressing these issues, the GAO apparently did not employ formal research design or systematic data collection methods. The study relied heavily on documents collected by GAO auditors and on conversations with various officials.55

The conclusions presented in this study were limited in their applicability as they were primarily concerned with
program operations in Delaware. However, the GAO did make recommendations concerning the independent verification of applicant eligibility information and improved procedures for monitoring the rehiring of former regular government employees, which could be applied on a nationwide basis. The GAO recommendations were accompanied by responses from the Department of Labor and local prime sponsor officials.

At the request of Congressman Jack Kemp, the GAO also examined CETA II and VI programs operated by the City of Buffalo and the Erie County Consortium, New York. This study, *Employment Programs in Buffalo and Erie County Under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Can Be Improved*, covered the CETA II and VI programs during the period July 1, 1974, through June 30, 1975. In completing the study, the GAO employed data gathered from field visits to the prime sponsors and their sub-agents, the regional Department of Labor office, and the national Department of Labor office. According to the GAO, the data employed in this study were obtained from the inspection of financial and personnel records, interviews with program administrators and participants, and a random sample of CETA II and VI participant application files.

Overall the objectives of this GAO report were to determine if the Buffalo and Erie County PSE programs were being operated in an effective manner and if the programs were in compliance with CETA regulations. Specifically, the GAO examined the following areas:

1. The adequacy of participant selection and eligibility determination procedures.
2. The financial management of program funds.
3. The types of PSE jobs funded.
4. Rates of transition to unsubsidized employment by program participants.
5. Procedures used in allocating funds and positions.
6. Speed of program implementation.\(^{58}\)

Based on their research into these areas, GAO auditors found a number of serious problems in the management of CETA programs in the City of Buffalo and in the Erie County Consortium. According to the GAO, these problems included the hiring of ineligible participants, violations of nepotism and political activity regulations, the lack of adequate and accurate financial records and reports, and a relatively low rate of transition to unsubsidized employment. However, in some areas, the methodology employed by GAO auditors would raise questions concerning the validity of their findings. For example, the GAO based its conclusions regarding the enrollment of ineligible applicants on a random sample of 175 participant records drawn from a universe of 2,676 enrollments in the II and VI programs.\(^{59}\) In its response, the Department of Labor questioned the validity of the GAO findings in this area, based on the size of the sample. However, the GAO maintained that the sample size was large enough to demonstrate the inadequacy of internal controls on eligibility determination.\(^{60}\)

On the balance, it appeared that the GAO researchers
did not exercise sufficient care in determining the sample size to be used in this study. Specifically, there was no indication in the report that the researchers had considered such factors as the desired confidence level and the degree of variance present in the population of PSE participants in determining the sample size. The ineligible participants found in the sample may have indicated that there were problems in relation to eligibility determination procedures; however, in the absence of more carefully specified sampling procedures, generalizations regarding the percentage of ineligible participants enrolled in the program and the extent and severity of weaknesses in eligibility determination procedures would seem to be of questionable value.

A third study conducted by the GAO, Public Service Employment in Southwestern New York State, examined CETA PSE programs operated by the Chautauqua Consortium, which is comprised of the Counties of Chautauqua, Cattaraugus, and Allegany. This review dealt with PSE program operations in these counties during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975. The study focused on the following aspects of CETA II and VI program operations:

1. The allocation of funds and jobs.
2. The number of jobs filled with available funds.
3. Participant selection procedures.
4. Types of work performed by PSE participants.
5. Transition rates into unsubsidized employment for program participants.61

The data employed in this GAO study were similar to the types of data employed in the previously mentioned GAO
studies. The GAO made use of financial and participant reports in assessing program performance in regard to the allocation of funds and jobs, the type of work performed by program participants, and participant transition rates. A random sample of participant files was taken and information contained in these files was independently verified in order to evaluate the effectiveness of participant selection and eligibility verification procedures. Possible maintenance of effort violations were investigated by examining participant records to determine if program participants had been previously employed as regular employees of the prime sponsor or its sub-agents and by interviewing local officials.

In their conclusions, the GAO auditors made a number of recommendations regarding improvements in the administration of CETA II and VI programs operated by the Chautauqua Consortium. Most of these recommendations concerned improvements in participant selection and eligibility verification procedures. In addition, it was also recommended that funds paid to ineligible participants be recovered from the prime sponsor by the Department of Labor.62

The final GAO study to be examined in this chapter is more comprehensive than the other three GAO evaluation studies that have been previous examined. In the final GAO study, More Benefits to Jobless Can Be Attained in Public Service Employment, the PSE programs of 12 prime sponsors in five states, Arizona, California, Massachusetts, Michigan, and Ohio, were examined. This study covered CETA II and VI
programs operated by the twelve prime sponsors and their sub-agents during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.63

The objectives of this study were broader in their implications than the objectives of the previous GAO studies. Instead of focusing on specific questions relating to the operations of particular prime sponsors, the GAO analyzed aspects of CETA II and VI programs which were more applicable to the operations of all prime sponsors and to the overall design of CETA PSE programs. In addition, the GAO also evaluated the effectiveness of the Department of Labor in administering the PSE program. According to the GAO, this study attempted to determine:

1. the program's impact on unemployment,
2. the program's effect on the participants and communities involved, and
3. labor's effectiveness in administering the program, including the review and approval of program plans and the monitoring of program implementation.64

In making their determinations regarding these objectives, GAO auditors made use of the same types of data and the same research methods that had been employed in the previous GAO studies. In general, they relied on reviewing financial and personnel reports, budgets, and other documents, on interviewing program participants, their supervisors, and other officials involved in the administration of the program and on drawing random samples of participant records and independently verifying participant eligibility information. The auditors also made use of program information obtained from the Department of Labor.65
As a result of their research, the GAO auditors cited a number of deficiencies in the administration of CETA II and VI programs operated by the twelve prime sponsors. Among the problems found by the GAO were maintenance of effort violations, lack of training for participants, low rates of transition into unsubsidized employment, failure to enroll the most disadvantaged participants, the hiring of ineligible applicants, nepotism, and political patronage. In addition, they also found that the Department of Labor was deficient in its efforts to monitor the II and VI PSE programs. The GAO also made a number of recommendations for the improvement of program administration. In general, these recommendations focused on more stringent administrative controls on the operations of prime sponsors and on more intensive monitoring of the prime sponsor's CETA programs.

In addition to the evaluation effort mounted by the GAO, there was also a fairly substantial evaluation effort undertaken by the Department of Labor. This evaluation effort was authorized by Section 311(a) of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, which states, "The Secretary is authorized to conduct, either directly or by way of contract, grant, or other arrangement, a thorough evaluation of all programs and activities conducted pursuant to this Act to determine the effectiveness of such programs and activities." Four Department of Labor evaluation studies will be examined in this chapter; all of these studies were completed by individuals or organizations working under contract to the
Department of Labor. One of these studies focused exclusively on Title II and VI PSE programs while the other three studies dealt with PSE programs as components of a comprehensive examination of all CETA funded programs. In this chapter, the following Department of Labor evaluation studies will be examined: The Implementation of CETA in Eastern Massachusetts and Boston, Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey, Report No. 6, Expanding Public Service Employment Under CETA: Preliminary Assessment, and CETA: Manpower Programs Under Local Control.

The first Department of Labor evaluation study to be examined, The Implementation of CETA in Eastern Massachusetts and Boston, actually consisted of two separate case studies. The first study, which was prepared by Thomas Barocci and Charles Myers of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, was concerned with CETA programs operated by four prime sponsors during the 1975, 1976, and 1977 fiscal years. The prime sponsors examined in this case study were the Cambridge Consortium, the Lowell Consortium, the New Bedford Consortium, and Massachusetts Balance of State (BOS). The second case study, which was concerned with CETA programs operated by the City of Boston, was prepared by Irwin Herrnstadt, Morris Horowitz, and Marlene Seltzer of Northeastern University. Both case studies examined Title II and VI programs within the context of a comprehensive review of CETA implementation.

In general, the study of the four Eastern Massachusetts
prime sponsors was concerned with the administrative mechanisms and processes used in the implementation of CETA programs and with program participant outcomes. Specifically, the following aspects of CETA programs were examined:

1. Prime sponsor planning processes.
2. The roles of elected officials in program administration and planning.
3. Participant characteristics and placement rates.
4. Prime sponsor relationships with the regional Department of Labor office.
5. Monitoring and evaluation procedures utilized by the prime sponsors and the Department of Labor.
6. Perceptions of CETA programs by Boston minority groups.

The study relied extensively on data gathered by MIT graduate students who were employed as research assistants in this project. The data employed in this study were gained through interviews with individuals involved in the administration of CETA programs and from documents, reports, and records supplied by the Department of Labor and the prime sponsors. With the exception of the section concerning program participant outcomes, little quantitative data were either presented or analyzed; most of the conclusions drawn by the researchers were in the words of the authors, "generalized impressions." In dealing with participant outcomes, the researchers compared various factors with placement rates to determine if there were differential program outcomes due
to demographic characteristics, prime sponsor location, or program activity.

The authors presented a number of conclusions regarding those aspects of program operations which they had studied and made several recommendations for improvements in the operation and administration of CETA programs. The conclusions and recommendations of the researchers dealt primarily with prime sponsor planning processes and operations, Department of Labor program administration, the relationships between the Department of Labor and the prime sponsors, and the overall design of CETA programs.

The second case study, "The Implementation of CETA in Boston 1974-1977," was concerned with the operations of the Boston Manpower Association (BMA) and its sub-agents. In examining the Title II and VI programs operated by this prime sponsor, the following areas were covered: (1) administrative structure, (2) Title II and VI goals, (3) client characteristics, (4) allocation of funds, (5) PSE occupations and wage rates, and (6) PSE-Department of Labor relations.

The research methodology and data employed in this study were similar in nature to the methodology and data used in the study concerning the four Massachusetts prime sponsors. On the methodology and data employed in the study, the authors stated:

The methodology used involved interviews with strategic members of the City, State, and private institutions which were engaged either in the planning or operating of employment and training programs. Program data on client characteristics, enrollments, termination and work experiences were collected and analyzed in order to assess the results of local employment and training decisions.
Overall, the researchers found that the Title II and VI PSE programs failed in their efforts to transition participants into unsubsidized employment. The researchers attributed this failure in part to economic conditions in Boston. However, they also found serious problems in the design and implementation of the programs. Specifically, these problems included the lack of training for participants, delays in hiring, the lack of adequate selection procedures, and the failure to establish linkages that would facilitate the placement of program participants. In short, the authors concluded that while the PSE programs may have been successful as income maintenance programs, they did not substantially improve the employability of program participants. 71

The second evaluation study, Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey, Report No. 6, was prepared by Westat, Inc., under contract to the Department of Labor. This report, which dealt with the characteristics of individuals enrolling in CETA programs during the 1976 fiscal year, is one of a series of reports in an evaluation study employing a longitudinal research design. Westat describes the Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey as, "... A continuous, longitudinal survey with no specified cut-off date, designed to collect and analyze data on a national sample of enrollees in employment and training programs funded under CETA Titles I, II, and VI..." 72 According to Westat, the Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey has two major objectives; these objectives are described as follows:
The first is to obtain cross-section profiles of the CETA participants not available from the national prime sponsor reporting system. The profiles include baseline data for the impact evaluation. The second principal CLMS objective is to provide measures of the impact of CETA programs on participants, particularly participants' earnings.73

Data for this study are gathered by interviewers using a standardized interview schedule. Each year 15,000 new CETA enrollees, including 3,000 PSE enrollees, are interviewed. After the initial interview the enrollees are given follow-up interviews six months, eighteen months, and thirty-six months after enrollment.74 The interviewees are selected by means of a stratified cluster sampling design. The primary sampling units in this design were 403 CETA prime sponsors. The universe of prime sponsors was stratified according to type of governmental unit and geographic location. In this stage, 147 prime sponsors were selected. In the second stage, a given number of CETA enrollees were randomly selected from all the individuals enrolled in the given prime sponsors CETA programs during the previous quarter.75

As the research design for the program impact component of this study has not been finalized, this report was concerned with the demographic characteristics and pre-program experiences of new CETA enrollees. Specifically, the researchers reported on participant information in the following areas:

1. Demographic characteristics (age, sex, race).
2. Labor force status during the year prior to enrollment.
3. Family income and individual wage rates prior to enrollment.
4. Family size.
6. Veteran status.

In each of these areas, data obtained for the new enrollees in PSE programs were presented in tabular form and percent distributions of the various sub-categories were calculated. These distributions were then compared with the distributions of enrollees in PSE programs in previous years and with the distributions of enrollees in other CETA funded employment and training activities. The tables were accompanied by narrative descriptions and explanations of various trends in the characteristics of enrollees.

Another Department of Labor funded evaluation study was concerned exclusively with the expansion of the Title VI PSE programs under the Economic Stimulus Appropriations Act. This study, Expanding Public Service Employment Under CETA: Preliminary Assessment, was prepared by William Mirengoff, Lester Rindler, and Harry Greenspan of the National Academy of Sciences. The study was a preliminary report on PSE expansion covering the activities of twenty-eight prime sponsors in 15 states during the period July, 1977, through December, 1977.76

In their report, the authors concentrated on factors associated with the PSE expansion and with compliance with changes in program design and participant eligibility requirements introduced as a result of the enactment of the Emergency Jobs Program Extension Act. The authors made assessments
of the following aspects of the Title VI PSE program:
(1) rapidity of program expansion, (2) the characteristics of participants enrolled during the expansion period, (3) administrative arrangements for the implementation of Title VI projects, (4) types of projects funded, and (5) occupational areas in which project participants were employed.

To assess program performance and to determine compliance with CETA regulations, the authors relied on data collected by field research associates assigned to study the operations of the twenty-eight prime sponsors. The field research associates interviewed prime sponsor officials and reviewed records and reports obtained from the prime sponsors. The authors then aggregated and analyzed data to determine the overall performance of the prime sponsors in the study sample. In addition, the authors also made use of participant characteristics data obtained from the Department of Labor to determine national levels of service to specific CETA target groups such as welfare recipients, veterans, and ethnic minorities.

The authors found that there was a trade-off in the achievement of Title VI program goals. The Title VI expansion program was implemented rapidly; however, in the process attainment of other goals involving changes in program design was sacrificed. As the authors stated:

But speed did take its toll. The rapid buildup emphasized hiring schedules over the new Title VI requirements; . . . . The Title VI expansion suggests that when speed is emphasized for countercyclical reasons, specific participant targeting requirements and other program restrictions are not likely to be implemented fully and efficiently.
The final Department of Labor evaluation study to be examined, CETA: Manpower Programs Under Local Control, was also prepared by William Mirengoff and Lester Rindler of the National Academy of Sciences. This study was part of a comprehensive evaluation effort of CETA employment and Training Activities funded under Titles I, II, and VI during the period 1974 through 1977.

In addressing the PSE programs funded under CETA Titles II and VI, Mirengoff and Rindler dealt with the following areas:

1. The allocation of PSE jobs by prime sponsors.
2. Types of PSE jobs.
3. Selection and hiring procedures and their impact on types of clients served.
4. Job creation impact of PSE and its relationship with the substitution of federal for local funds.
5. Net impact on unemployment of PSE programs.
7. Transition rates into unsubsidized employment of PSE participants.

In studying these aspects of CETA PSE programs, Mirengoff and Rindler made use of two sources of data. The primary source of data was information collected by field research associates concerning the operations of twenty-eight prime sponsors. The twenty-eight prime sponsors were selected from over four hundred CETA prime sponsors through a stratified sampling technique, which stratified the prime sponsors according to type of sponsor, variations in population, and
unemployment rate. The data gathered by the field research associates were used in conjunction with national CETA reporting data provided by the Employment and Training Administration of the Department of Labor and other governmental agencies.

The data gathered by the field research associates were aggregated and analyzed to determine overall patterns of performance by the twenty-eight prime sponsors in the areas addressed in the study. These data were also used to identify differences in specific areas of program performance between prime sponsors operating under varying administrative arrangements and economic conditions. In addition, the field research data were also used in conjunction with national program performance data to assess the overall performance of CETA programs and to verify trends in program operations and client service levels identified at the local level. Based on this analysis, the authors formed a number of conclusions regarding the performance of PSE programs in meeting their legislatively mandated objectives. The authors also developed a number of recommendations for improvements in program design. In general, the improvements in program design were policy-oriented requiring substantial modifications to CETA legislation.

The final PSE evaluation to be examined was prepared for the National Commission for Manpower Policy by the Brookings Institution. This study, Monitoring the Public Service Employment Program, was a preliminary report of a longitudinal study of CETA II and VI programs being performed
by the Brookings Institution under contract to the National Commission for Manpower Policy. This preliminary report is based on data gathered in July, 1977, and covers the first phases of the Title II and VI PSE expansion.\textsuperscript{80} The study is based on data gathered from a representative sample of forty-two jurisdictions operating CETA PSE programs. According to the Brookings Institution, these forty-two jurisdictions accounted for over 20,000 PSE jobs or approximately 5 percent of the PSE jobs that were filled in July, 1977.\textsuperscript{81}

The primary objectives of the study were to assess the net job creation effect of the PSE program and to determine the degree of substitution of federal funds for state and local funds that was due to the PSE program. Commenting on the job creation and displacement issues, the researchers stated:

One of the most critical issues relating to public employment programs—and one of the most difficult to assess—is the extent to which jobs are actually created, as opposed to these federal funds being used by governments either deliberately or inadvertently, for displacement purposes—that is, for employment that would have been supported in the absence of the program.\textsuperscript{82}

In addition to the displacement and job creation issues, the study also examined the following aspects of CETA PSE programs: (1) occupations, public service activities, and wage rates of PSE participants; (2) characteristics of PSE participants; (3) fiscal effects of CETA PSE funds on recipient entities; and (4) the administration of PSE programs by prime sponsors and their sub-agents.
Data for the study were collected by field research associates and then compiled and analyzed by the central project staff of the Brookings Institution. The field research associates relied on "interviews with local officials, available fiscal and program data, and personal observations" to complete a standard forty-seven page questionnaire on each of the governmental units under study. The raw data were then aggregated by the central staff; percent distributions were calculated and presented in tabular form. From these distributions, the researchers analyzed the overall performance of the PSE program in the areas addressed in the study and, also, determined if there were significant differences in program performance based on type of prime sponsor, population of prime sponsor, degree of local fiscal distress, and several other factors. This approach was utilized in dealing with all of the research objectives with the exception of the examination of program administration. In this area, there was more reliance on the written impressions of the research associates to develop generalizations concerning program administration and intergovernmental relationships under CETA.

Based on their analysis, the researchers drew a number of conclusions regarding the Title II and VI PSE programs. For example, in regard to the job creation vs. displacement issue, the researchers concluded that 18 percent of the PSE jobs included in the sample could be classified as being displacement. In addition to conclusions regarding the specific areas identified in the study, the researchers also
presented a number of conclusions regarding the effectiveness of CETA PSE as a countercyclical employment policy option, as a social program designed to benefit participants, and as a form of fiscal relief for local governments. In this discussion, the researchers stressed the existence of trade-offs between the multiple objectives of the program.  

In this chapter, nine CETA evaluation studies have been reviewed. Before proceeding to a critical examination of PSE program evaluation under both EEA and CETA, it will be useful to highlight several major points regarding the CETA evaluation studies that were reviewed in this chapter. Firstly, the primary emphasis in the overall evaluation effort was in determining compliance with regulations and short-term program objectives. In general, the examination of long-range program outcomes was neglected. Secondly, in regard to the examination of program objectives in the individual studies, the CETA researchers tended to concentrate their efforts on a relatively small number of program objectives rather than employ the shotgun approach that was adopted in many of EEA evaluation studies. Thirdly, on the whole, little use was made of formal research designs to test specified hypotheses. Fourthly, as in the EEA evaluation effort, the use of the case study method was predominant. However, the CETA studies made greater use of central research staffs to analyze and summarize data that were gathered independently by field researchers working in different locations. This approach assisted the reader in the identification of broad trends in program operations.
V. PSE PROGRAM EVALUATION: A CRITICAL EXAMINATION

In the last two chapters, thirteen evaluation studies relating to various aspects of public service employment programs funded under EEA and CETA have been examined. In reviewing the EEA evaluation effort, four studies were examined. Two of these studies actually consisted of individual case studies of EEA program agent operations. The Emergency Employment Act: An Interim Assessment contained nine separate case studies, and Case Studies of the Emergency Employment Act in Operation contained sixteen individual case studies of EEA program agents. In reviewing PSE program evaluation under CETA, nine evaluation studies were examined. Three of these studies dealt with PSE programs in conjunction with a comprehensive review of all CETA funded employment and training programs; the remaining six studies focused exclusively on PSE programs funded under Titles II and VI of CETA. In general, the examination of each of these studies covered the following areas: the study objectives, the methodology employed in conducting the study, and the nature of the conclusions presented in the study.

Having examined each of these evaluation studies on an individual basis, it is now possible to identify certain general characteristics of PSE program evaluation under EEA and CETA. Based on the review of individual evaluation studies conducted in the previous two chapters, a number of
observations can be made regarding various aspects of the design and execution of PSE program evaluation studies. In this chapter, observations will be made regarding the coverage and treatment of PSE program objectives, the research methodologies used in conducting the studies, and the value of the findings reached as a result of the studies. After these specific areas of concern have been considered, an overall assessment of the effectiveness of EEA and CETA program evaluation can be made.

In regard to the first area of concern to be addressed, the coverage and treatment of program objectives, it can be stated that, while the studies were fairly comprehensive in dealing with a wide range of program objectives, there were certain problems in relation to the treatment of program objectives both in individual studies and in the overall evaluation effort. Specifically, these problems were related to the relative degree of attention given to certain program objectives in some studies and to the failure to adequately address some PSE program objectives in the overall evaluation effort.

While the evaluation studies covered a wide range of program objectives, there were, as has been mentioned, certain problems in the treatment of these objectives. On the level of the individual PSE evaluation study, deficiencies in the examination of program objectives most frequently resulted from attempts to consider too many program objectives within the framework of a single study. Although this tendency was
more pronounced in the EEA evaluation studies, it was also present to a lesser extent in some of the CETA evaluation studies. This failure to limit the number of program objectives to be considered in a single evaluation study had at least two unfortunate consequences. Firstly, by considering a relatively large number of program objectives within the context of a single evaluation study, researchers were, in effect, limiting the amount of attention that could be given to any single program objective. As a result, certain program objectives, which may have required more detailed study and analysis, were not adequately examined, and the conclusions reached by the researchers were rather superficial. Secondly, the inclusion of a wide range of program objectives in an individual study made the successful design and execution of that study more difficult. To adequately examine the full range of PSE program objectives, the researchers would have been required to employ several distinct research designs, data bases, and analytical techniques in a single study. Often, this was not done; and, consequently, researchers employed evaluation techniques that were inappropriate and data bases that were inadequate for certain program objectives. The end result was a decrease in the quality of the evaluation studies.

Considering the overall PSE evaluation effort under EEA and CETA, the most serious deficiency in the treatment of program objectives was the failure to fully assess the impact of program participation on PSE enrollees. While a great deal
of effort was spent to determine whether or not the programs were operating in compliance with legal requirements and administrative directives, relatively little effort was devoted to systematically determining what benefits accrued to the enrollees as a result of their participation in the PSE programs. In other words, short-term compliance oriented monitoring was emphasized at the expense of long-range program outcome evaluation. Although many of the studies included discussions of short-term outcome indicators, such as unsubsidized employment transition rates, only a few of the studies provided detailed examinations of the impact of the PSE programs on program participants. In short, the evaluation effort left basic questions relating to the effectiveness of the PSE programs unanswered.

In reviewing the PSE evaluation effort, the next major area of concern to be addressed relates to the research methodologies that were employed in conducting the EEA and CETA evaluation studies. This examination of research methodologies will entail the consideration of a number of distinct subtopics; therefore, the following approach will be adopted. Firstly, the adequacy of the research designs used in the studies will be assessed. Secondly, the effectiveness of the data collection techniques employed by the researchers will be evaluated. Thirdly, the analytical techniques utilized by the researchers in the development of their findings will be critically examined. After these subtopics have been considered individually, certain observations will be made
regarding the value of the conclusions presented in the PSE evaluation studies.

Perhaps the most common type of research design employed in the PSE evaluation effort was the case study. Although a few of the evaluation studies relied either totally or partially on data gathered by survey instruments or extracted from Department of Labor program reporting systems, the predominant approach was to conduct an intensive study of the operations of a single program agent or of a group of program agents over a given period of time. The case study method was widely used in both the EEA and CETA evaluation efforts; however, the organization and presentation of case study data varied considerably between the two programs. Under EEA, case studies were most often presented as distinct and independent evaluations of program agent operations. Each researcher studied the operations of a given program agent or group of program agents in a specific geographic area and then prepared a report detailing his findings. In contrast, under CETA, individual field research associates conducted case studies of program operators and then forwarded the results to a central research staff that organized the data and made conclusions about overall program operations. Data gathered through case studies of individual program operators were used to make generalizations about CETA PSE program operations on a nationwide basis. On the whole, the latter approach was more useful in that it provided a more coherent and accessible view of program operations on a broader scale.
Although the case study approach would seem to be appropriate for the evaluation of highly decentralized programs such as EEA and CETA, it does have certain disadvantages. As the PSE evaluation effort relied heavily on this type of research design, these deficiencies ultimately had a negative impact on the quality of the evaluation effort. In discussing the case study approach, most authorities would cite at least two major weaknesses. Firstly, there are difficulties in drawing valid generalizations from case study research. On this topic, Issac and Michael have stated:

Because of their narrow focus on a few units, case studies are limited in their representativeness. They do not allow valid generalizations to the population from which their units came until the appropriate follow-up research is accomplished, focusing on specific hypotheses and using proper sampling methods.86

Secondly, case studies may be rather low in objectivity; the basic nature of the method does not provide for adequate controls against biases introduced by the researcher. Concerning this, Issac and Michael stated:

Case studies are particularly vulnerable to subjective biases. The case itself may be selected because of its dramatic, rather than typical attributes, or because it neatly fits the researcher's preconceptions. To the extent selective judgments rule certain data in or out, or assign a high or low value to their significance, or place them in one context rather than another, subjective interpretation is influencing the outcome.87

When the attempts of the researchers to investigate possible causal relationships, such as the relationship between program participation and changes in earnings and employment status, are considered, the deficiencies of the
research designs used in the evaluation studies become apparent. As a rule, the basic elements of a formal research design that would have been necessary to test causal relationships between PSE program participations and participant outcomes were not developed and specified. In fact, most of the studies did not include statements of research hypotheses or of the independent and dependent variables that were involved. In addition, when analyzing participant outcomes, the researchers almost uniformly failed to develop mechanisms that would adequately control for the possible effects of extraneous variables, such as changes in economic conditions or the aging of program participants. For example, with the exception of the Westat, Inc., study, Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey Report Number 6, which is still in progress, none of the studies used comparison groups to isolate the impacts of the PSE programs on participants. While the use of a true experimental design may have been difficult, if not impossible in this setting, the researchers could have incorporated certain features, which could have contributed to the validity of their findings, into their research designs.

In reviewing PSE evaluation research methodology, the next major topic to be addressed relates to the collection of data. To completely examine this topic, it is necessary to evaluate two distinct aspects of the data collection process. Firstly, the methods that were used to select PSE program operators and participants for inclusion in the evaluation studied must be reviewed. Essentially, the examination of
this phase of the data collection process involves a determination as to the adequacy of the measures taken by researchers to insure that data elements selected for use in the studies were representative of the populations from which they were drawn. Secondly, it is also necessary to critically examine the methods that were used to collect data from the program operators and participants and the nature of the data that was collected. The examination of this phase of the data collection process relates to the effectiveness of data collection instruments and to the actual quality of the data that was collected.

In most cases, the conduct of PSE evaluation studies entailed the selection of data elements from two populations, the population of PSE program operators and the population of PSE participants. There was wide variation in the methods that were used to select data elements from these two populations. At the one extreme, some evaluation studies, for example, The Emergency Employment Act: An Interim Assessment, did not specify what methods, if any, were used to select data elements for use in the studies. In contrast, other studies such as the two Westat, Inc., works, Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey Report Number 6 and Longitudinal Evaluation of the Public Employment Program and Validation of the PEP Data Bank, relied on relatively sophisticated sampling designs. In general, when a sampling design was specified, the most common approach was to use a stratified sampling strategy. However, there were exceptions; for example, the Brookings
Institution study, Monitoring the Public Service Employment Program, relied on a representative sampling design rather than on a random design due to cost considerations and the lack of an adequate listing of all CETA program operators below the prime sponsor level. 88

Did the researchers employ sufficient safeguards to ensure the representativeness of the data elements selected for study? While some studies gave adequate attention to sampling design, there were a number of problems in relation to the selection of representative data elements in a majority of the studies. Specifically, there were problems in regard to the manner in which certain program operators were selected for study, the sample sizes used in some of the studies, and the absence of appropriate sampling designs in certain studies.

In the first place, several jurisdictions were not randomly selected for study; they were studied as the result of specific requests by government officials. This situation applied to three of the GAO studies, Public Service Employment in Delaware Under Title VI of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, Employment Programs in Buffalo and Erie County Can Be Improved, and Public Service Employment in Southwestern New York State. Certainly, it was appropriate for the GAO to study these program operators and make conclusions about their operations. However, in some cases, conclusions reached as a result of these studies were applied to all CETA program operators and recommendations were made concerning program operations on a nationwide basis.
Considering the manner in which these operators were selected, the application of findings that were reached as a result of studying them to other program operators without confirming evidence from other more carefully designed studies would seem to be of questionable value.

In the second place, several researchers did not select a large enough number of data elements to assure adequate representation of the various sub-groups that were present in the respective populations. In most studies, the sample sizes were relatively small in relation to the populations under study. However, most authorities would agree that the relative size of a sample is not as important as the absolute size of the sample and the methods that were used to draw the sample. Specifically, regarding sample size, it must be large enough to insure that population sub-groups relevant to the study are represented. In discussing the relationship between population variance and sampling size, C. William Emory stated:

Two other factors which affect size of sample concern the population. First is the size of the population variance. The greater this dispersion, the greater is the sample size needed to provide a given quality of representation. . . .

Considering the degree of variance present in the populations under study, several researchers did not use large enough samples to assure a reasonable quality of representation. For example, the GAO study, More Benefits to the Jobless Can Be Attained in Public Service Employment, relied on a sample of twelve CETA prime sponsors. In view of the wide
range of economic, political, and social conditions under which prime sponsors operated, the types and relative sizes of governmental units serving as prime sponsors, and the regional differences in the characteristics of PSE participants, it does not seem possible that this number of data units could adequately represent the number of relevant subgroups present in the population. If certain relevant subgroups were not included in the sample, serious questions could be raised as to the validity of the generalizations made by the researchers.

In the third place, a number of the researchers did not give sufficient attention to the design and specification of sampling strategies. In fact, a number of the evaluation studies did not give any indication that any sort of random or purposive sampling strategy had been employed. In the absence of any specification of sampling design, it is open to speculation exactly how data elements were selected and how representative these data elements were of the populations from which they were drawn. While time constraints and cost considerations may have prevented the use of sophisticated sampling designs, it does seem that certain researchers could have devoted more attention to the design of sampling strategies to increase the representativeness of the data elements that were selected for study.

Having examined the methods by which program operators and participants were selected for study, it is now possible to examine the means by which data were collected from them.
Generally speaking, most researchers collected data through the use of interviews and through the inspection of secondary data sources. The researchers interviewed a variety of individuals involved in PSE program operations, including program administrators, PSE participants, local government officials, and representatives of community groups. In addition, the researchers also inspected a variety of documents, including participant files, statistical and financial reports, and program agent grants and contracts.

Considering the relative complexity of the questions addressed in the evaluation studies and the decentralized nature of program administration, interviewing was an effective data collection method in most cases. In fact, in regard to the examination of certain aspects of program administration, it was absolutely necessary to employ interviewing in order to gain a sufficient depth and breadth of information. However, there were certain deficiencies in the actual interviewing techniques employed by a number of the researchers. Although there were notable exceptions, in a large number of the studies it did not appear that sufficient safeguards were developed to insure uniform treatment of research objectives by field researchers, to eliminate possibly ambiguous questions, and to control for interviewer bias. To be more specific, many of the researchers did not employ such basic procedures as the development and pretesting of standardized interview schedules. While the use of these procedures may not have been appropriate for the gathering of data relating
to some of the more complex aspects of PSE program administration, the use of these commonly accepted interviewing techniques could have contributed, in most cases, to the reliability of the findings reported by the researchers.

The other widely used data collection method, the inspection of secondary data sources, such as program reports and records, was an efficient means of gathering information on certain aspects of program operations. By making use of data that had been collected previously in the course of program administration, the researchers eliminated what could have been a costly duplication of effort and were able to complete their studies in a timely fashion. However, the use of secondary data presents problems; on this, Emory has stated:

Secondary sources also have their limitations. The most important, probably, is the unavailability of data that will meet our specific research needs. Information has been collected by someone else for other purposes and often does not fit our needs. Definitions may be different, units of measure do not match, and different time periods may be involved. There is also the problem that available information may not be as accurate as needed. To assess accuracy we need to know how the data was collected. . . .

Clearly, these limitations were present in the program records that were used in the PSE evaluation studies. For example, most researchers made extensive use of data presented in participant characteristic reports. These data were collected during intake interviews in which program eligibility was established. In addition, many of the categories shown on the reports were based on administrative definitions relating primarily to eligibility determination. The conditions under
which the data were collected and the manner in which they were classified raise questions as to the accuracy and the suitability of the data. Many researchers relied exclusively on program records without making any attempts to independently validate the information contained in those records. In view of the limitations of secondary data sources, this tendency could have had serious implications for the accuracy of the evaluation findings.

The use of unvalidated program data in the CETA evaluation studies is particularly hard to justify in view of findings made in regard to the accuracy of EEA program data. The Westat, Inc., study, Longitudinal Evaluation of the Public Employment Program and Validation of the PEP Data Bank, found a number of serious problems with information in the EEA reporting system. In fact, based on their independent survey, Westat researchers concluded that approximately 20 percent of EEA enrollees were not even eligible for the program. In their assessment of the EEA data base and reporting system, they stated:

A carefully designed and executed sample survey, preferably longitudinal, will yield more information, more timely information, and better information than any universe reporting system yet devised. Our validation study of the program reporting system associated with PEP revealed serious problems with errors, omissions, and delays. The problems arose from the sheer volume of records to be handled, the variability of the people creating initial records, and the almost complete lack of self-correcting mechanisms within the system.

What methods did the researchers employ to analyze the data that had been collected during the course of the
evaluation studies? In completing their studies, the researchers used both qualitative and quantitative data analysis methods. Viewing the overall PSE evaluation effort, qualitative analysis was employed more frequently than quantitative analysis.

In most of the instances in which it was used, qualitative analysis was appropriate due to either the nature of the PSE objectives under examination, the lack of available quantifiable data, or the research design of the study. Although its use may have been appropriate in view of these conditions, this method does have certain limitations and these limitations must be recognized in any comprehensive assessment of research findings. As performed in many of the PSE evaluation studies, qualitative analysis was heavily dependent on the judgment of the researchers and, consequently, was vulnerable to possible subjective biases. In performing qualitative analysis, the researchers reviewed data collected through interviews and the inspection of program records, recorded their observations, and then made generalizations regarding PSE program operations. While generalizations reached in this manner are useful, they do not offer precise, definitive statements as to actual conditions and relationships.

When quantitative data were examined, the researchers' approach was primarily descriptive in orientation. Most frequently, quantitative data were presented in tabular form, and percent distributions were calculated for the various
categories presented in the table. In fact, in many studies, the researchers simply reproduced various reports that had been prepared previously by local program agents and the Department of Labor. The researchers also made use of descriptive statistics in their studies; usually, this involved the calculation of measures of central tendency such as the mean and median. In general, conclusions formed by the researchers were based on their assessments of trends as displayed in the tables. As a rule, the researchers did not make use of tests of statistical significance or of correlation or regression analysis. As most of the researchers did not state testable hypotheses, there was little use of tests of statistical significance. Only one study, Longitudinal Evaluation of the Public Employment Program and Validation of the PEP Data Bank, employed a multiple regression model to test associations between subcategories of participant data.

Before proceeding to an overall assessment of the PSE evaluation effort, it will be useful to examine the value of the findings presented by the researchers in light of the preceding review of PSE evaluation research methodology. Generally, specific observations relating to research methodology raise serious questions as to the validity and reliability of the conclusions reached by the researchers. Firstly, in a majority of cases, the research designs were not sufficiently rigorous to test causal relationships or to make precise descriptive statements. While they may have been adequate to determine if program agents were in compliance
with regulations and administrative directives, they were not adequate for investigating questions relating to the long-range effectiveness of the PSE programs and to the relative effectiveness of variations in program design. Secondly, the predominant use of the case study method raises questions as to the generalizability of the findings made by the researchers. Thirdly, in most of the studies, there were serious deficiencies in the techniques used to select data elements for study; these deficiencies raise questions as to the representativeness of the data elements selected for study, and ultimately, as to the external validity of the research findings. Fourthly, there were certain problems such as the absence of interview schedules, in regard to the reliability of actual data collection techniques used by the researchers. Fifthly, the extensive use of unvalidated program data, in view of previous findings regarding the quality of these data, raises questions as to the accuracy of the research findings. Sixthly, the analytical techniques used in the research studies were open to subjective biases; most researchers neglected to use more sophisticated analytical techniques, which could have yielded more objective and more precise findings.

Although these problems were present, to varying degrees, in many of the PSE evaluation studies that were examined, there were notable exceptions. For example, the two Westat, Inc., studies, Longitudinal Evaluation of the Public Employment Program and Validation of the PEP Data Bank and Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey Report...
themselves and the difficulties in conducting evaluation research, definitive answers to these questions may be difficult if not impossible to obtain. In spite of these limitations, information regarding the effectiveness of the PSE programs could play an important role in the policy-making process and in the allocation of scarce resources.
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS: TOWARD A PSE PROGRAM EVALUATION MODEL

Having reviewed a number of EEA and CETA evaluation studies, it is now possible to make certain recommendations concerning the conduct of PSE program evaluation. In the last chapter, PSE program evaluation under EEA and CETA was critically examined; this critical examination indicated that there were deficiencies both in the overall evaluation effort and in the research methods that were used in some of the EEA and CETA evaluation studies. Based on this critical examination, it is possible to identify a number of areas in which the conduct of PSE program evaluation could be improved. In this chapter, certain recommendations for improving the PSE program evaluation process will be developed. Specifically, recommendations will be made concerning the types of evaluation studies that would be needed for a comprehensive PSE evaluation effort and research methods that could be used to carry out the various types of evaluation studies. Taken together, these recommendations will provide a suggested model for the evaluation of public service employment programs.

In order to perform a comprehensive evaluation of PSE programs, it is necessary to examine several aspects of program implementation and operations. At a minimum, a comprehensive evaluation effort should provide policy makers and program administrators with information concerning the
compliance of the program with laws and regulations, the
effectiveness of the program in meeting its stated goals and
objectives, and the relative effectiveness of various pro-
grammatic designs and strategies. The development of informa-
tion relating to these topics requires the use of several
distinct types of program evaluation within the overall
evaluation effort; the PSE evaluation effort should make use
of compliance monitoring, program outcome evaluation, and com-
parative program evaluation. Moreover, in order to present a
complete picture of program operations, the use of these
three broad types of program evaluation should be relatively
well balanced in the overall evaluation effort. In the
remainder of this chapter, the use of these three types of
program evaluation in the PSE evaluation process will be dis-
cussed in detail.

Compliance monitoring would be the most fundamental
component of a comprehensive PSE evaluation effort. Essen-
tially, compliance monitoring, which is also referred to as
program process evaluation, attempts to determine the degree
to which the program is operating in accordance with appro-
priate laws, regulations, and administrative directives. As
related to the evaluation of federal programs, the General
Accounting Office has stated that this type of evaluation
involves:

examining whether the implementation and execution
of actual program activities and operations (processes)
meet the perceptions and expectations of responsible
political officials and individuals and groups affected
by the program, and are in compliance with applicable
laws, regulations, and guidelines governing the imple-
mentation and operation of the program.\textsuperscript{94}
Obviously, this type of evaluation provides policy makers and program administrators with valuable feedback concerning problem areas in program implementation and operations. In addition, it can also provide researchers with basic data that can be used in assessing program effectiveness.

On the whole, compliance monitoring of the EEA and CETA public service employment programs was adequate; however, certain steps could be taken to improve the manner in which compliance monitoring is performed in future PSE evaluation efforts. Firstly, compliance monitoring could be accomplished more efficiently if it were largely conducted in-house by governmental agencies. Secondly, the scope of compliance monitoring should be expanded to include all of the organizational units that are involved in PSE program operations. Thirdly, the accuracy and reliability of compliance monitoring findings could be improved if certain changes in research methods were made.

In order to allocate the limited resources that are available for PSE program evaluation more efficiently, the bulk of all compliance monitoring should be performed directly by appropriate governmental agencies. In a number of the CETA and EEA evaluation studies, outside contractors were employed to perform what was, in essence, compliance monitoring. Due to the nature of compliance monitoring, the use of outside contractors to perform this type of evaluation seems to be an inefficient use of the limited funds available for the overall PSE evaluation effort and an inappropriate use of
the relatively sophisticated research skills possessed by outside contractors. In comparison to other types of program evaluation, compliance monitoring is relatively simple; in general, it does not require the use of more sophisticated research techniques that may be required in other types of program evaluation. In view of this, it would seem that compliance monitoring could be performed adequately in-house by governmental agencies such as the Department of Labor and the General Accounting Office provided that safeguards, such as the use of administratively independent monitoring units, were maintained. If this approach were adopted, outside contractors could concentrate on the more difficult types of program evaluation and the resources available for the overall PSE evaluation effort could be allocated more efficiently.

Another area in which the conduct of compliance monitoring could be improved relates to the scope of the monitoring effort. To gain a system perspective, researchers should examine the operations of all the organizations that are involved in program administration. Under EEA and CETA, most researchers concentrated on monitoring the activities of local program operators; for the most part, the researchers did not examine in detail the activities of the Department of Labor in administering PSE programs. As actions taken by the Department of Labor at the national and regional office levels could have a substantial impact on the functioning of PSE programs at the local level, the activities of these organizational units should also be examined in a comprehensive compliance monitoring effort. By examining the activities of units at
all levels of the decentralized administrative system and interactions between these units, researchers could more accurately determine the degree of compliance existing in the system and more accurately identify possible factors contributing to non-compliance.

In addition to the preceding recommendations, certain improvements could also be made in the research methods used in the performance of compliance monitoring. Due to its relative simplicity in comparison to other types of program evaluation, compliance monitoring would not usually require the use of more sophisticated research techniques, such as the use of control or comparison groups. However, several basic safeguards should be employed, whenever possible, to insure the reliability and accuracy of research findings. Firstly, the use of case studies should be balanced with the use of survey based research designs. While case studies can provide valuable insights into program operations, survey research can provide a broader picture of the degree of compliance present in the total system. Secondly, when researchers are attempting to determine the degree of compliance that is present in the overall system rather than investigate specific allegations of non-compliance, they should make use of appropriate sampling designs to insure that their findings are generalizable. Thirdly, standardized research instruments, such as interview schedules, should be employed to minimize possible interviewer bias and to provide a greater degree of reliability in data collection techniques. Fourthly, data
obtained from program reports and files should be independently validated to determine its accuracy. Previous findings relating to this type of data would appear to indicate that independent verification is necessary.

While compliance monitoring focuses on procedural and legal aspects of program operations, outcome evaluation, the second major component of a comprehensive evaluation effort, is concerned with program effectiveness. More specifically, outcome evaluation measures the degree to which programs have attained their stated goals and objectives.

Regarding outcome evaluation, the GAO stated:

"Outcome evaluations gauge the extent to which a program effects changes in desirable or undesirable directions. Results or impacts are identified, measured, and compared with objectives, desired accomplishments, or expected results." 95

According to the GAO, a comprehensive outcome evaluation effort must address both primary results and secondary impacts. In distinguishing between these two aspects of outcome evaluation, the GAO has stated:

"Primary results usually relate to agency management goals for a program while long-term, indirect, or secondary impacts usually relate to ultimate values and objectives such as reducing crime, inflation, or unemployment. . . ." 96

Considering the manner in which outcome evaluation was conducted under EEA and CETA, it would appear that several improvements could be made in future PSE outcome evaluation efforts. In the first place, the examination of short-term or primary results should be balanced with the examination of long-term or secondary program impacts to present a more
complete view of program effectiveness. In the second place, certain research designs and methods should be employed, whenever their use is appropriate, in order to improve the outcome evaluation effort in general and the measurement of long-term impacts in particular. Specifically, greater use should be made of the following research design features: longitudinal studies with adequate time spans for the measurement of long-range program impacts; provisions for the statistical testing of formally stated research hypotheses; control or comparison groups to isolate program impacts on participants; and collection of data through independently conducted surveys.

As was noted in the previous chapter, EEA and CETA outcome evaluation efforts tended to concentrate on examining program performance in relation to relatively short-term goals and objectives, such as enrollment schedules and participant transition rates. While the measurement of primary program results is necessary, it does not provide a complete picture of program effectiveness, especially program effectiveness in regard to combating structural unemployment. As PSE programs are being increasingly targeted towards the structurally unemployed, the measurement of long-term program impacts becomes more important. For the most part, the effectiveness of PSE programs in creating jobs and in dealing with cyclical unemployment can be determined by examining program performance in relation to short-term program management goals, such as enrollment schedules. However, to assess the effectiveness
of these programs in dealing with structural unemployment, it is necessary to measure the long-range impacts of PSE program participation on former participants. Studies measuring short-term effectiveness should be balanced with studies designed to measure changes in employment status and income levels among former participants to determine if the programs have lasting effects. Until such long-range studies have been completed and replicated, the effectiveness of PSE programs cannot be accurately assessed.

To allow for the measurement of long-term program impacts, more use should be made of appropriate longitudinal research designs. These designs should include provisions for a number of measurements to be taken over a time period which is long enough to determine if the programs have lasting effects on PSE participants. Although the use of longitudinal research designs to determine program outcomes would seem to be fairly obvious, many PSE evaluation studies relied heavily on program termination records and did not include adequate provisions for follow-up studies on former participants. In fact, a report prepared for the National Commission on Manpower Policy has cited "... restricted time horizons that preclude measurement of longitudinal impact" as one of the "most serious and familiar failings" of previous outcome evaluations of manpower programs.97 Of course, in determining the appropriate time span for longitudinal studies of PSE program outcomes, methodological considerations must be balanced with cost factors and with the need of policy makers for feedback concerning program
effectiveness.

In addition to allowing sufficient time for the measurement of program impacts, research designs should also include provisions for the testing of research hypotheses. At a minimum, this would entail the specification of the different types of variables that could be involved; the development of models linking the variables; the statement of research and null hypotheses; and the use of appropriate tests of statistical significance to determine if the hypotheses should be accepted or rejected. The use of such features would be particularly useful in examining long-term program impacts and in testing relationships between short-term indicators such as transition rates to unsubsidized employment and long-term changes in income levels and employment status. Hypotheses could be developed and tested regarding not only overall program effectiveness but also program effectiveness in relation to specific target groups, for example, ethnic minorities and veterans, to determine if differential program outcomes exist. By testing specific hypotheses, researchers would be able to make more precise statements regarding program outcomes.

Another feature which should be incorporated into outcome evaluation research designs, whenever practical, is the use of control or comparison groups. The use of control or comparison groups would allow researchers to more effectively assess the actual impact of PSE programs on participants. On the use of these groups in manpower program evaluation,
Perry et al. have stated:

The key to the assessment of program impact is the measurement of change in individual status which is uniquely attributable to participation in the manpower program. The isolation of program effects from all other influences on the individual requires the selection of a control or comparison group.98

Due to ethical and political considerations, the use of true control groups in the evaluation of PSE programs would be difficult, if not impossible; however, the use of comparison groups would seem to be a practical alternative. In describing the characteristics of comparison groups, Weiss stated:

Here there is no random assignment to program and control as there would be in a true experiment, but available individuals or intact groups . . . with similar characteristics are used as controls. Non-randomized controls are generally referred to as "comparison groups."99

Although none of the completed EEA and CETA evaluation studies have used comparison or control groups to isolate program impacts, plans are underway to use a comparison group in the Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey, which is being conducted by Westat, Inc.100

The final recommended improvement in PSE outcome evaluation research design relates to data collection methods. Specifically, it is recommended that researchers utilize data that have been collected through independent surveys rather than data that have been extracted from program reports and files. As has been noted previously, there are serious problems in regard to the accuracy of the data contained in program reports and files. Comparisons between pre-program and post-program earnings and employment status, which are
frequently used to assess participant outcomes, are particularly vulnerable to distortion due to the circumstances under which program data are collected and reported. Pre-program participant data, which form the baseline for evaluating program impact, are gathered during eligibility interviews in which applicants may be inclined to understate earnings and overstate length of unemployment in order to establish eligibility. Post-program data are collected during termination interviews by program operators, who may be motivated to overstate improvements in earnings and positive transitions, as these factors are used as program performance indicators by the Department of Labor. Clearly, in view of previous assessments of the accuracy of program data and of the potential for the distortion of such data, the use of data gathered through independent surveys would be preferable.

In a sense, comparative program evaluation, the third major component of a comprehensive PSE evaluation effort, is closely related to program outcome evaluation. However, while outcome evaluation attempts to measure the effectiveness of a program in meeting its stated objectives, comparative evaluation deals with questions relating to the relative effectiveness of a program in meeting those objectives. Relative program effectiveness can be examined on both an inter-program basis and an intra-program basis. In other words, comparative program evaluation, which is also known as program strategy evaluation, can be used to examine not only the effectiveness of a given program in relation to other
programs with similar objectives but also to examine the relative effectiveness of various programatic strategies that can be employed to attain the objectives of the given program. In describing this type of evaluation, Weiss has stated:

... Evaluation research can be designed to compare the effectiveness of several programs that have the same objectives but different content on the same set of outcome measures. Even within a single program, there are significant possibilities for comparative study... Cross program study—that is, evaluation of all or a sample of the local projects—can yield information on the relative success of different methods of program implementation for the attainment of the common goals. 101

In the EEA and CETA evaluation efforts, there were few, if any, attempts to assess relative effectiveness on either an inter-program or intra-program basis. Although the Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey offers a potential data base which could be used to assess the relative effectiveness of CETA programs, evidence concerning the relative effectiveness of CETA programs for the most part is lacking. In fact, to some authorities, there is little evidence concerning the relative effectiveness of previous manpower programs. Concerning this, Bradley Schiller wrote:

In view of the rapid and continuing growth of federal manpower programs, together with the deliberate shifts in programatic emphasis, it would seem reasonable to assume that the efficacy of manpower programs in their various forms, was well established. This is not the case, however. Not only is the efficacy of any single program more an article of faith than documented evidence, but also there are very few clues regarding the relative efficacy of alternative programatic approaches. 102

In view of previous deficiencies in this area, future PSE evaluation efforts should include studies designed to measure the relative effectiveness of alternate program
strategies on two levels. On the broader, inter-program level, studies could be designed to measure the effectiveness of PSE in relation to other employment and training activities funded under CETA which have similar objectives. The findings of these studies could assist policy makers in reaching decisions regarding the allocation of resources among the various employment and training activities funded under CETA. On the intra-program level, studies could be conducted to assess the relative effectiveness of available program designs in meeting PSE program objectives. This information could be used not only by policy makers but also by program administrators. Policy makers could use this information in designing future PSE programs while program administrators could use the information to identify effective program design elements which could be used in their operations.

On the inter-program level, studies should be designed to compare the relative effectiveness of PSE and other CETA funded programs with similar objectives and outcome indicators. This would entail designing studies which would compare PSE to those CETA activities which have the placement of participants into unsubsidized employment as a common goal and which have participant transition rates and changes between pre-program and post-program earnings as common outcome indicators. Specifically, in these studies, it would be necessary to compare the relative effectiveness of public service employment, classroom training, on-the-job training, and combined activities, such as STIP (Skill Training Improvement
Program), which has both classroom training and on-the-job training components. Relative effectiveness could be determined by comparing performance in relation to common outcome indicators. In addition to comparing the overall relative effectiveness of these programs, Schiller stated that it was also necessary to compare the relative effectiveness of programs in relation to specific target groups in order to determine which program or programs are most effective for serving specific target groups. On this, Schiller stated:

There is interest not only in the relative effectiveness of alternative programmatic models evaluated in toto but also in their relative effectiveness with respect to specific target groups. Which kind of programs best serve individuals with little employment experience? Do the same programs also best serve individuals with substantial work experience? 103

In order to examine the relative effectiveness of the various CETA programs, both in general and in relation to specific target groups, comparable outcome evaluation studies of the various CETA programs should be undertaken; the results of these studies could then be systematically analyzed and compared. In general, these studies should include the same research design features that were mentioned earlier in relation to PSE outcome evaluation (i.e., sufficient time frames to measure long-range program impacts, independent surveys to collect data, etc.). However, certain measures should also be taken in regard to these comparative studies. To control for the possible impacts of changing economic conditions on program outcomes, the studies should be conducted during the same time period rather than at different time periods. In
addition to permit assessments of relative effectiveness in regard to target groups, a stratified sampling strategy should be employed to insure that sufficient members of the target groups under examination were included in the samples used for each of the CETA programs.

In addition to examining the relative effectiveness of various program strategies on an inter-program level, it would also be useful to examine the relative effectiveness of program strategies on an intra-program level. On this level, comparative program evaluation techniques could be used to identify those program strategies and design elements which are most effective in contributing to the attainment of short-range and long-range PSE program goals. Researchers should study the operations of local PSE program agents to determine if relationships exist between the presence or absence of certain strategies and design elements and the successful attainment of PSE program goals and objectives. In this regard, there are a number of interesting questions which could be considered: Is there a relationship between certain participant selection procedures and success in meeting enrollment goals? Do independent PSE job classification systems contribute to high positive transition rates? Are local programs that are administered directly by elected officials, such as mayors, more effective in certain regards than those administered by personnel departments? Information relating to these questions and a number of other questions could prove valuable to both policy makers and program administrators.
Previous PSE evaluation studies, notably a number of the EEA case studies, have identified program designs and strategies which were effective for individual program agents; however, there is still a need for systematic study to determine if the relationships identified in these previous studies are in fact generalizable to other program agents operating under varying conditions. In order to determine the validity of previous findings and to uncover other possible relationships, it would be necessary to investigate relationships between program strategies and program outcome and performance indicators on a broader scale, using a greater number of program operators, preferably selected through the use of an appropriate sampling strategy. One approach to designing this type of study would be to systematically vary program design factors for a number of PSE program agents, operating under different conditions and then measure differences in program performance and outcomes on selected indicators. However, due to the number of possible variables that could be involved and to the difficulty of systematically varying program designs and strategies in on-going programs, this approach would be extremely difficult, if not impossible. A workable alternative to this approach is offered by Weiss who stated:

Within the program there are different emphases and different strategies. If the evaluator studies a large number of community mental health centers or Head Start or Peace Corps or employment programs, he can probably identify a few different types of theories that provide the bases for action. He can
categorize them and the program activities along a number of significant dimensions, and then relate the type of program to outcomes. In that way, although the design is not elegant, he can make some headway toward specification of what works and does not work under given conditions.104

Although the latter approach may not be as effective as the former approach in establishing causal relationships, it could nonetheless provide valuable information to individuals involved in program design and operations, and it would represent an improvement over the use of individual case studies.

In conclusion, this chapter has outlined the components of a comprehensive PSE evaluation effort. Specifically, recommendations have been made concerning the use of three major categories of program evaluation, compliance monitoring, program outcome evaluation, and comparative program evaluation, in a comprehensive PSE evaluation effort. These recommendations were developed in light of a review of a number of EEA and CETA evaluation studies conducted in preceding chapters. A PSE evaluation effort which included these three components could provide interested parties with information concerning the degree to which the programs are operating in compliance with relevant laws and regulations; the effectiveness of the programs in attaining their goals and objectives; and the relative effectiveness of alternate program strategies and design elements on both inter-program and intra-program levels. In short, an evaluation effort in which the use of compliance monitoring, outcome evaluation, and comparative program evaluation studies was fairly well
balanced would provide a reasonably complete view of the functioning of large scale federally funded PSE programs.
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