

DOCUMENT RESUME

02258 - [A1392399]

[Survey of Equal Employment Opportunity Training]. FPCD-77-27; B-70896. May 12, 1977. 5 pp.

Report to Alan K. Campbell, Chairman, Civil Service Commission; by H. L. Krieger, Director, Federal Personnel and Compensation Div.

Issue Area: Personnel Management and Compensation (300); Personnel Management and Compensation: Equal Employment Opportunity (302).

Contact: Federal Personnel and Compensation Div.

Budget Function: Education, Manpower, and Social Services: Training and Employment (504).

Organization Concerned: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Department of Housing and Urban Development; Department of the Navy: Naval Air Station, Pensacola, FL.

Congressional Relevance: House Committee on Education and Labor; Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Authority: Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972. Executive Order 11478.

A survey of Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) training provided to Federal employees in selected agencies focused on the kinds of courses offered, selection of participants, and the evaluation of training results. The survey covered training provided in-house by the Civil Service Commission (CSC) and by other organizations to employees in the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare's Region IV; Housing and Urban Development's Region IV; and Navy's Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida. Findings/Conclusions: CSC's Regional Training Center provided about 50% of the EEO training received by employees in the agencies surveyed. CSC's training was based on its annual survey of agencies' training needs. Each agency also conducted an annual training needs survey, but these were done after the CSC survey. The results of EEO training provided by the regional training center had not been properly evaluated, so its impact on EEO was unknown. The surveys show a need for the agencies to make sure that employees designated for EEO training receive it, maintain reliable training data, and evaluate training results. Recommendations: The Chairman of the CSC should reevaluate existing procedures for the annual training needs survey and develop guidelines to coordinate CSC's survey with agency surveys. The Chairman should also devise a method for effectively evaluating CSC's EEO training to determine what impact it is having on the achievement of EEO goals. (SC)



UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

MAY 12 1977

FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND
COMPENSATION DIVISION

B-70896

The Honorable Alan K. Campbell
Chairman, U. S. Civil Service
Commission

Dear Mr. Chairman:

We have completed our survey of Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) training provided, in-house by the Civil Service Commission (CSC) and by other organizations to employees in the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare's Region IV; Housing and Urban Development's Region IV; and the Department the Navy's Naval Air Air Station, Pensacola, Florida.

The survey focused on the kinds of courses offered, selection of participants, and the evaluation of training results. We have sent reports to each of the agencies for their action. Copies of these reports are enclosed for your information. The reports show a need by the agencies to:

- Make sure that employees designated for EEO training receive it,
- Maintain reliable training data, and
- Evaluate training results.

The survey also showed a need for the Civil Service Commission to (1) coordinate its annual training needs survey with surveys conducted by agencies, and (2) evaluate course content and results of Commission training to determine the effectiveness of EEO. Our recommendations relating to these matters appear on page 4.

COORDINATING CSC AND AGENCY
TRAINING NEEDS SURVEYS

The Commission's Atlanta Regional Training Center provided about 52 percent of the EEO courses participated in by employees in the three agencies we surveyed. This training was based on an annual assessment of the demand for CSC courses by the

region. Each agency was sent a listing of available CSC courses and was instructed to list the:

- desired courses,
- desired dates,
- desired locations, and
- expected participation.

The Regional Training Center used the agency responses to plan and schedule training for the following year.

Each agency included in our survey conducted a similar assessment to determine training needs within the Atlanta region. However, the agencies' assessments were conducted after the CSC assessment.

Training officers at each installation told us that their response to the CSC was simply a guess, but that more reliable information could be provided if the Commission's assessment were conducted after the agency assessments. We noted several instances where CSC courses were canceled or rescheduled because of lack of agency participation. For example, a course on personnel management for EEO specialists was canceled six of the eight times it was scheduled.

EVALUATING TRAINING RESULTS

Agency EEO training needs are met substantially through CSC courses. We noted that neither the Commission nor individual agencies have conducted indepth evaluations to determine the impact of the EEO training.

Executive Order 11478 and the EEO Act of 1972 require CSC to review and evaluate agency EEO programs. These EEO programs provide that EEO principals, managers, supervisors, and others will be given EEO training. The Executive Order and Federal personnel regulations also require Federal agencies to periodically evaluate the effectiveness of their own EEO programs.

The Federal Personnel Manual makes agency heads responsible for evaluating the results of training programs to determine whether they are contributing effectively to achieving agency

missions and attaining management goals. The Federal Personnel Manual urges that--at a minimum--evaluations include analysis of:

- the extent to which specific training courses or programs produce desired changes in employee knowledges, skills, attitudes, or performance;
- the extent to which the training courses or programs that are provided cover the areas of greatest need; and
- the need for modification in the coverage or conduct of these training courses or programs to meet changing agency needs.

However, we found that only employee self-evaluations--student critiques--were made. Although student critiques may assist in determining whether students were paying attention--increasing the possibility for learning--they do not provide an objective evaluation of course content or training results.

We noted two instances where CSC had used pre- and post-course questionnaires in evaluating EEO courses given during the period surveyed. In both instances, the evaluators agreed that the evaluations did not assess course content or results. In March 1975 the Regional Training Center completed an assessment of its evaluation efforts. The report classified the center's evaluation efforts to be at the primitive state noting that evaluations are primarily focused on obtaining student reactions. It further noted scattered efforts to determine what students learned from training and only rare and sporadic stabs at evaluating changes to on-the job behavior and work-related results.

CSC and agency personnel management evaluations provided limited coverage of EEO training. The evaluations focused primarily on determining whether individuals had been trained rather than whether training was accomplishing expected results.

In a report entitled "Better Evaluation Needed for Federal Civilian Employee Training" (FPCD-75-120, August 12, 1975), we pointed out that departments' and agencies were not effectively evaluating the training of their employees. We recommended that the Commission (1) reemphasize that it is the department's

and agencies' primary responsibility to evaluate the effectiveness of employee training, and (2) promote successful evaluation methods among the agencies.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CSC's Regional Training Center provided about one-half of the EEO training received by employees in the agencies surveyed. CSC's training was based on its annual survey of agencies' training needs. Each agency also conducted an annual training needs survey.

Because agency surveys were done after the Commission's survey, the needs information provided to CSC was inconsistent with CSC's own needs information. Also, the results of EEO training provided by the regional training center had not been properly evaluated; therefore its impact on EEO was unknown.

We recommend that the Chairman, Civil Service Commission

--Reevaluate existing procedures for the annual training needs survey and develop guidelines to coordinate CSC's survey with agency surveys.

--Devise a method for effectively evaluating CSC's EEO training to determine what impact it is having on the achievement of EEO goals.

As you know, section 236 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, requires the head of the Federal agency to submit a written statement on action on our recommendations to the House and Senate Committees on Government Operations not later than 60 days after the date of the report and to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations with the agency's first request for appropriations made more than 60 days after the date of this report.

We are sending copies of this report to the Chairmen, House Senate Committees on Appropriations and Government Operations, and to the Director, Office of Management and Budget. Copies are also being sent to the Chairman, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities.

B-70896

We appreciate the cooperation and assistance extended to us by the Commission during this survey.

Sincerely yours,

H. L. Krieger

H. L. Krieger
Director

Enclosures