AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

# STREAMLINING FEDERAL EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE PROGRAMS: A LOOK AT THE GAO REPORT ON GOVERNMENT WASTE

## HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
AND THE WORKFORCE
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, APRIL 6, 2011

**Serial No. 112–16**

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and the Workforce

Available via the World Wide Web:
*http://www.gpoaccess.gov/congress/house/education/index.html*
or
Committee address: *http://edworkforce.house.gov*

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

65–499 PDF WASHINGTON : 2011

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

JOHN KLINE, Minnesota, *Chairman*

Thomas E. Petri, Wisconsin
Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, California
Judy Biggert, Illinois
Todd Russell Platts, Pennsylvania
Joe Wilson, South Carolina
Virginia Foxx, North Carolina
Duncan Hunter, California
David P. Roe, Tennessee
Glenn Thompson, Pennsylvania
Tim Walberg, Michigan
Scott DesJarlais, Tennessee
Richard L. Hanna, New York
Todd Rokita, Indiana
Larry Bucshon, Indiana
Trey Gowdy, South Carolina
Lou Barletta, Pennsylvania
Kristi L. Noem, South Dakota
Martha Roby, Alabama
Joseph J. Heck, Nevada
Dennis A. Ross, Florida
Mike Kelly, Pennsylvania
[Vacant]

George Miller, California,
*Senior Democratic Member*
Dale E. Kildee, Michigan
Donald M. Payne, New Jersey
Robert E. Andrews, New Jersey
Robert C. "Bobby" Scott, Virginia
Lynn C. Woolsey, California
Rubén Hinojosa, Texas
Carolyn McCarthy, New York
John F. Tierney, Massachusetts
Dennis J. Kucinich, Ohio
David Wu, Oregon
Rush D. Holt, New Jersey
Susan A. Davis, California
Raúl M. Grijalva, Arizona
Timothy H. Bishop, New York
David Loebsack, Iowa
Mazie K. Hirono, Hawaii

Barrett Karr, *Staff Director*
Jody Calemine, *Minority Staff Director*

# C O N T E N T S


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Hearing held on April 6, 2011 | 1 |
| Statement of Members: | |
| Kline, Hon. John, Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce | 1 |
| Prepared statement of | 3 |
| Additional submission: Letter, dated April 22, 2011, from Hon. Hilda L. Solis, Secretary, U.S. Department of Labor | 57 |
| Miller, Hon. George, senior Democratic member, Committee on Education and the Workforce | 4 |
| Prepared statement of | 5 |
| Rokita, Hon. Todd, a Representative in Congress from the State of Indiana, prepared statement of | 52 |
| Statement of Witnesses: | |
| Dodaro, Hon. Gene, Comptroller General, U.S. Government Accountability Office | 6 |
| Prepared statement of | 9 |
| Additional submissions: | |
| "Employment and Training Programs That Have Shown Positive Results" | 53 |
| "Teacher Quality Programs That Have Shown Positive Results" | 54 |
| Table: "Federal Programs That Support Teacher Quality and Allow Funds to be Used for Activities Aimed at Improving the Performance of School Administrators" | 56 |

# STREAMLINING FEDERAL EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE PROGRAMS: A LOOK AT THE GAO REPORT ON GOVERNMENT WASTE

**Wednesday, April 6, 2011**
**U.S. House of Representatives**
**Committee on Education and the Workforce**
**Washington, DC**

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. John Kline [Chairman of the Committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Kline, Petri, Foxx, Roe, Thompson, Walberg, DesJarlais, Hanna, Bucshon, Gowdy, Barletta, Noem, Roby, Heck, Ross, Kelly, Miller, Kildee, Payne, Scott, Woolsey, Tierney, Kucinich, and Wu.

Staff present: Katherine Bathgate, Press Assistant/New Media Coordinator; James Bergeron, Director of Education and Human Services Policy; Kirk Boyle, General Counsel; Casey Buboltz, Coalitions and Member Services Coordinator; Heather Couri, Deputy Director of Education and Human Services Policy; Daniela Garcia, Professional Staff Member; Ben Hoog, Legislative Assistant; Barrett Karr, Staff Director; Brian Melnyk, Legislative Assistant; Mandy Schaumburg, Education and Human Services Oversight Counsel; Alex Sollberger, Communications Director; Linda Stevens, Chief Clerk/Assistant to the General Counsel; Alissa Strawcutter, Deputy Clerk; Tylease Alli, Minority Hearing Clerk; Jody Calemine, Minority Staff Director; Jamie Fasteau, Minority Deputy Director of Education Policy; Sophia Kim, Minority Legislative Fellow, Education; Brian Levin, Minority New Media Press Assistant; Jerrica Mathis, Minority Legislative Fellow, Labor; Celine McNicholas, Minority Labor Counsel; Megan O'Reilly, Minority General Counsel; Julie Peller, Minority Deputy Staff Director; Meredith Regine, Labor Minority Policy Associate; Alexandria Ruiz, Minority Administrative Assistant to Director of Education Policy; Melissa Salmanowitz, Minority Communications Director for Education; Minority Press Secretary; Laura Schifter, Minority Senior Education and Disablity Advisor; Michele Varnhagen, Minority Chief Policy Advisor and Labor Policy Director; and Michael Zola, Minority Chief Investigative Counsel.

Chairman KLINE [presiding]. A quorum being present, the Committee will come to order. Well, good morning and welcome.

I would like to thank the U.S. Comptroller General, Mr. Dodaro, for joining us today as we shed light on wasteful federal govern-

ment spending. Your time is valuable and we appreciate the opportunity to get your thoughts on duplicative teacher and workforce training programs.

At a time when our nation faces an historic fiscal crisis we must make a concerted effort to reduce federal spending. A necessary step in this process is to eliminate and streamline federal programs. Now more than ever it is critical to ensure taxpayer dollars are spent wisely.

Thanks to the work of Senator Tom Coburn, of Oklahoma, and the Government Accountability Office, we have recently learned of massive amounts of waste and duplication within federal programs. According to the March 2011 report, billions of dollars are being squandered on redundant programs. As our nation continues to borrow 40 cents of every dollar spent, this muse of tax—misuse of taxpayer funds is unacceptable.

This committee is particularly concerned about the 82 individual teacher quality programs and the 47 separate job training programs detailed in the report.

We all recognize the importance of placing more qualified and better prepared individuals in our schools and workplaces. This will help provide our children with a quality education and keep our nation competitive in the global economy. But the magnitude of duplication and overlap among the programs listed in the GAO report is counterproductive to the achievement of these fundamental goals.

Of the 82 distinct programs focused on improving teacher quality, several aren't administered by the Department of Education. Ten separate agencies are responsible for overseeing various teacher quality programs, including the Departments of Defense, Interior, State, Agriculture, and Energy.

In 2009, $4 billion in taxpayer funds was dedicated to improving teacher quality. Instead of instituting a government-wide strategy to ensure these funds were being used wisely and effectively, communication between agencies was limited and programs continued to be implemented without coordination or concern about existing initiatives. As a result of this fragmented process, taxpayer dollars were wasted and student achievement saw little improvement.

Nine federal agencies, including the Departments of Labor, Education, Health and Human Services, Interior, Agriculture, Defense, Justice, and Veterans Affairs, are currently responsible for implementing 47 different employment and job training programs that cost the taxpayers approximately $18 billion in 2009. Forty-four of the 47 programs overlap with at least one other program.

In fact, many of the programs provide the same services to the same populations through separate administrative structures. This lack of coordination in workforce training programs and teacher quality programs is irresponsible, wasteful, and careless.

We must act now to return fiscal sanity to Washington. This report illustrates considerable opportunities to cut federal spending and consolidate wasteful government programs. If we allow taxpayer funds to be wasted and federal spending to continue unchecked we are putting our children in a more precarious position and risking the future stability of our country.

We all have a responsibility to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse of taxpayer dollars and make the tough choices necessary to streamline federal programs within this committee's jurisdiction. A failure to act when confronted with such compelling evidence of waste would be indefensible.

And again, I would like to thank the Comptroller General for joining us.

And I will now recognize my distinguished colleague, George Miller, the Senior Democratic Member of the Committee, for his opening remarks.

[The statement of Chairman Kline follows:]

**Prepared Statement of Hon. John Kline, Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce**

A quorum being present, the committee will come to order.

Good morning and welcome. I'd like to thank the U.S. Comptroller General, Mr. Gene Dodaro (DOE-DAR-OH), for joining us today as we shed light on wasteful federal government spending. Your time is valuable and we appreciate the opportunity to get your thoughts on duplicative teacher and workforce training programs.

At a time when our nation faces a historic fiscal crisis, we must make a concerted effort to reduce federal spending. A necessary step in this process is to eliminate and streamline federal programs. Now more than ever, it is critical to ensure taxpayer dollars are spent wisely.

Thanks to the work of Senator Tom Coburn of Oklahoma and the Government Accountability Office, we have recently learned of massive amounts of waste and duplication within federal programs. According to the March 2011 report, billions of dollars are being squandered on redundant programs. As our nation continues to borrow 40 cents of every dollar spent, this misuse of taxpayer funds is unacceptable.

This committee is particularly concerned about the 82 individual teacher quality programs and the 47 separate job training programs detailed in the report. We all recognize the importance of placing more qualified and better prepared individuals in our schools and workplaces. This will help provide our children with a quality education and keep our nation competitive in the global economy. But the magnitude of duplication and overlap among the programs listed in the GAO report is counterproductive to the achievement of these fundamental goals.

Of the 82 distinct programs focused on improving teacher quality, several aren't administered by the Department of Education. Ten separate agencies are responsible for overseeing various teacher quality programs, including the Departments of Defense, Interior, State, Agriculture, and Energy. In 2009, $4 billion in taxpayer funds was dedicated to improving teacher quality. Instead of instituting a government-wide strategy to ensure these funds were being used wisely and effectively, communication between agencies was limited and programs continued to be implemented without coordination or concern about existing initiatives. As a result of this fragmented process, taxpayer dollars were wasted and student achievement saw little improvement.

Nine federal agencies, including the Departments of Labor, Education, Health and Human Services, Interior, Agriculture, Defense, Justice and Veterans Affairs, are currently responsible for implementing 47 different employment and job training programs that cost the taxpayers approximately $18 billion in 2009. Forty-four of the 47 programs overlap with at least one other program. In fact, many of the programs provide the same services to the same populations through separate administrative structures. This lack of coordination—in workforce training programs and teacher quality programs—is irresponsible, wasteful, and careless.

We must act now to return fiscal sanity to Washington, D.C. This report illustrates considerable opportunities to cut federal spending and consolidate wasteful government programs. If we allow taxpayer funds to be wasted and federal spending to continue unchecked, we are putting our children in a more precarious position and risking the future stability of our country.

We all have a responsibility to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse of taxpayer dollars and make the tough choices necessary to streamline federal programs within this committee's jurisdiction. A failure to act when confronted with such compelling evidence of waste would be indefensible.

Again, I'd like to thank Mr. Dodaro (DOE-DAR-OH) for joining us, and I will now recognize my distinguished colleague George Miller, the senior Democratic member of the committee, for his opening remarks.

---

Mr. MILLER. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this hearing.

And I want to also welcome Comptroller General Dodaro, again, to the committee.

Witnesses from the General Accountability Office aren't new to this committee. The GAO has completed some incredible work on behalf of this committee.

Your undercover investigations 2 years ago showed us the Bush administration failed to respond to serious allegations of waste and child labor violations. This investigation resulted in the hiring of 200 new investigators and ordering the retraining of current investigators.

Your work about the residential boot camps and the abuse of special needs children under the guise of discipline garnered national attention and led to legislation that passed this committee and the House with bipartisan support.

Today I am reintroducing that bill in this Congress. In the years since the bill has passed hundreds of kids have continued to be abused and we can prevent those abuses by setting minimum safety standards among the states.

Your food safety investigations identified major gaps within USDA that led to administrative changes to protect the food of our students eating the school lunch and nutrition programs. In these prior investigations GAO reports told how a great—a great deal about what the need is on the ground and where the avenues for action might be.

The report before us today seems to be of a different nature. There is absolutely a need to identify, reduce, and eliminate government waste. It is clear from reading the testimony and related reports that when it comes to the issues within the jurisdiction of this committee, the relevant agencies recognize the need to address many of the issues identified by the GAO over the years.

On the education side, the Department of Education has taken proactive action to better align programs and consolidate where possible. They have established a working group across the agencies to better collaborate and propose to consolidate programming in a number of areas, including consolidating 38 teacher training programs into 11.

With Secretary Duncan at the helm, the department has identified areas where the consolidation makes both—makes sense both for the taxpayer and the students, teachers, and schools. But as the GAO noticed in the past, Congress must take action to address program realignment, which I hope we will have a chance to do so with the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act this year.

In regards to job training, GAO found that there are 47 programs that spend $18 billion to provide training services. What I would like to hear from GAO's view on—I would like to hear GAO's views on how many individuals receive effective job training, how many individuals have been denied service, and what specific savings and

program improvements can be achieved by consolidating administrative structures.

While the report before us today has already been the subject of congressional hearings and discussion, I hope that today's hearing can somehow move us forward in the consideration of the items I have just mentioned. If Congress is to act and to address the issues of government waste then there is very specific detailed information that we need to know about the effectiveness of the programs you reviewed.

If, on the other hand, the information we hear today is limited to what has already been reported, then the hearing that the majority has called unfortunately may be redundant and, in fact, duplicative of what already has taken place in the Congress. And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

[The statement of Mr. Miller follows:]

**Prepared Statement of Hon. George Miller, Senior Democratic Member, Committee on Education and the Workforce**

Good morning and welcome Comptroller General Dodaro.

Witnesses from the Government Accountability Office aren't new to this committee.

GAO has completed some incredible work on behalf of this committee.

Your undercover investigation two years ago showed us how the Bush administration failed to respond to serious allegations of wage theft and child labor law violations.

This investigation resulted in the hiring of 200 new investigators and ordering the retraining of current investigators.

Your work about residential boot camps and abuse of special need children under the guise of discipline garnered national attention and lead to legislation that passed this Committee and the House with bipartisan support.

Today, I am reintroducing that bill in this Congress. In the year since the bill passed this House, hundreds of kids have been abused and we can prevent those abuses by setting minimum safety standards.

Your food safety investigations identified major gaps within USDA that led to administrative changes to protect the food our students eat in school.

In these prior investigations, GAO reports told us a great deal about what the need is on the ground and where the avenues for action might be.

The report before us today is of a different nature.

There is absolutely a need to identify, reduce and eliminate government waste.

It is clear from reading the testimony and related reports that when it comes to the issues within the jurisdiction of this committee, the relevant agencies recognize the need to address many of the issues identified by GAO over the years.

On the education side, the Department of Education has taken proactive action to better align programs and consolidate where possible.

They've established working groups across agencies to better collaborate and have proposed to consolidate programming in a number of areas, including consolidating 38 teacher training programs to 11.

With Secretary Duncan at the helm, the Department has identified areas where consolidations make sense both for the taxpayer and for students, teachers and schools.

But as GAO has noted in the past, Congress must take action to address program alignment which I hope we will have a chance to address through the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act this year.

In regards to job training, GAO found that there are 47 programs that spent $18 billion to provide job training services.

I'd like to hear GAOs views on how many individuals received effective job training, how many individuals have been denied services, and what specific savings and program improvements can be achieved by consolidating administrative structures.

While the report before us today has already been the subject of congressional hearings and discussions, I hope today's hearing could somehow move us forward.

If Congress is to act to address issues of government waste, there is very specific, detailed information that we need to know about the effectiveness of the programs you reviewed.

If, on the other hand, the information we hear today is limited to what has already been reported, then this hearing that the majority has called is, unfortunately, just more government waste.

---

Chairman KLINE. I thank the gentleman.

Pursuant to Committee Rule 7(c), all committee members will be permitted to submit written statements to be included in the permanent hearing record. And without objection, the hearing record will remain open for 14 days to allow statements, questions for the record, and other extraneous material referenced during the hearing to be submitted in the official hearing record.

It is now my pleasure to introduce our distinguished witness. The Honorable Gene Dodaro became the eight Comptroller General of the United States and head of the U.S. Government Accountability Office on December 22, 2010, when he was confirmed by the U.S. Senate.

As Comptroller General, Mr. Dodaro helps oversee the development and issuance of hundreds of reports and testimonies each year to various committees and individuals Members of Congress. His longstanding career at GAO dates back more than 30 years. Prior to serving as the Comptroller General, he served as the Chief Operating Officer for 9 years, assisting the Comptroller General and providing direction and vision for GAO's diverse, multidisciplinary workforce.

I now recognize the Comptroller General.

## STATEMENT OF HON. GENE DODARO, COMPTROLLER GENERAL, U.S. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

Mr. DODARO. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Miller, members of the committee. I am very pleased to be here today to discuss our recent report on opportunities to reduce potential duplication in federal programs, reduce costs, and to enhance revenues.

This report is the first of a statutorily required mandate for GAO to produce a report each year on these topics. In this first report we identified 34 areas that we believe are a subject of either program fragmentation, overlap, or potential duplication, and they range across the spectrum of the federal government's activities from defense, to energy, to economic development programs, to transportation programs, to those that you already mentioned in your opening statements, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member Miller, today on education and employment and training.

In addition to those 34 programs we identify 47 other opportunities to reduce costs and to enhance revenues, particularly to address a yawning tax gap of $290 billion, which is estimated at this point in time. So we cover the full range of the federal government's activities.

The 81 areas offer opportunities to save billions of dollars, and importantly, also, make programs more effective and efficient. And the objective of the review was to do both.

Now, of special interest today are two of the 81 areas on teacher quality and the employment and training programs. With regard to the teacher quality programs, as mentioned, we identified 82 distinct teach quality programs administered by 10 states.

Importantly, however, we found there was no government-wide strategy to reduce fragmentation and overlap and potential duplication in those programs. And this fragmentation has led to limitations on agencies' abilities to comprehensively tackle this issue, to evaluate the individual programs to determine what is working effectively and what is not working effectively in the programs, and it adds to administrative burdens not only at the federal level but at the state and local level as well.

As you mentioned, Ranking Member Miller, the Education Department has already put forth a proposal to consolidate 38 of these areas into 11 areas, and we think this is a good starting point for the discussions and that Congress should use the opportunities afforded through its legislative vehicles, Mr. Chairman, as you approach reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. And we would be happy to support the committee in that endeavor.

Now, with regard to the employment and training programs, 44 of the 47 programs overlap, at least providing the same service to the same types of populations over time. Now, importantly, in terms of the question about what do we know about the effectiveness of these programs, 23 of these programs have not been subject to any evaluation since 2004. So there is limited information and a lot of our recommendations in the past have been encouraging the Department of Labor to evaluate these programs, and we can talk more about that in the Q&A session.

We think at a minimum there are opportunities to gain administrative efficiencies in dealing with these programs, but the federal departments and agencies have to move forward with some of our recommendations about determining what is being experimented with at the state and local level, what is working well, disseminating some of these best practices, and importantly, trying to figure out what incentives there are or could be to incentivize the state and local governments to more effectively come up with pilots to administer these programs. We think this is very important, and one of the departments believes there are some legislative limitations on their abilities to work with agencies in the TANF program, and we think that is something that the Congress could remedy.

Now, there are activities that, in the short term, can be dealt with; and also in the employment training area the administration has put forth a proposal to consolidate nine of the programs into three and to shift another program from Labor to HHS, and so we think those merit congressional attention as well.

Now, while there are a lot of opportunities in the short term to deal with these two areas, in the longer term legislation the Congress passed last year in the Government Performance Results Act Modernization provides additional legislative tools to help deal with these issues.

It requires, for example, OMB to set a specific number of crosscutting goals and requiring greater coordination across agencies and areas. It requires individual agencies to identify what they are doing to collaborate and coordinate with other agencies in related program efforts. It requires quarterly reviews with performance measures to be posted on public Web sites. And importantly, it requires the executive agencies to consult with the Congress in the

development of performance measures and in determining what the priorities would be for these program areas.

So there is a heavy role contemplated and increased requirements for consultation with the Congress, which I think offer important opportunities.

I appreciate the opportunity to be here today, Mr. Chairman, to discuss these issues. GAO stands ready to help the Congress deal with the enormous fiscal pressures that are upon us right now and to help make decisions in a careful, deliberative manner, and these areas require careful consideration, and I am sure this committee will give.

And so I would be happy to answer questions at this point. Thank you very much.

[The statement of Mr. Dodaro follows:]

United States Government Accountability Office

GAO

Testimony

Before the Committee on Education and the Workforce, House of Representatives

For Release on Delivery
Expected at 10:00 a.m. EDT
Wednesday, April 6, 2011

# Opportunities to Reduce Fragmentation, Overlap, and Potential Duplication in Federal Teacher Quality and Employment and Training Programs

Statement of Gene L. Dodaro
Comptroller General of the United States

GAO-11-509T

Chairman Kline, Ranking Member Miller, and Members of the Committee:

We appreciate the opportunity to discuss GAO's recent report entitled *Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue.*[1] This report delineates dozens of areas across government where fragmentation, overlap, and potential duplication merit the attention of Congress and the Administration spanning a range of government missions: agriculture, defense, economic development, energy, general government, health, homeland security, international affairs, and social services. The report also describes other opportunities for federal departments, agencies or Congress to consider taking action on that could either reduce the cost of government operations or enhance revenue collections for the Treasury. Taking actions on these opportunities and reducing or eliminating duplication, overlap, or fragmentation could save billions of tax dollars annually and help agencies provide more efficient and effective services.

With regard to issues of specific interest to this Committee, GAO found fragmentation, overlap, and potential duplication in the areas of federal programs to improve teacher quality and employment and training. Each of these areas is characterized by a large number of programs with similar goals, beneficiaries, and allowable activities that are administered by multiple federal agencies. Fragmentation of programs exists when programs serve the same broad area of national need but are administered across different federal agencies or offices. Program overlap exists when multiple agencies or programs have similar goals, engage in similar activities or strategies to achieve them, or target similar beneficiaries. Overlap and fragmentation among government programs or activities can be harbingers of unnecessary duplication. Given the challenges associated with fragmentation, overlap, and potential duplication, careful, thoughtful actions will be needed to address these issues.

My testimony today draws upon the results of our recently issued report and will address what is known about fragmentation, overlap, and potential duplication among federal teacher quality and employment and training programs. I will also address options for Congress to help minimize fragmentation, overlap, and potential duplication and how it can

[1]See GAO, *Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue*, GAO-11-318SP (Washington, D.C.: Mar. 1, 2011). An interactive, Web-based version of the report is available at: http://www.gao.gov/ereport/gao-11-318SP.

use recent legislative tools to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of federal programs.

The key points I will make today are:

- We identified 82 distinct programs designed to help improve teacher quality administered across 10 federal agencies, many of which share similar goals. However, there is no governmentwide strategy to minimize fragmentation, overlap, or potential duplication among these many programs. The fragmentation and overlap of teacher quality programs can frustrate agency efforts to administer programs in a comprehensive manner, limit the ability to determine which programs are most cost effective, and ultimately increase program costs. Congress could address these issues through legislation, particularly through the pending reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965,[2] and the Department of Education (Education) has already proposed combining 38 programs into 11 programs in its reauthorization proposal.

- We found that 44 of the 47 employment and training programs we identified overlap with at least one other program in that they provide at least one similar service to a similar population. To facilitate further progress by states and localities in increasing administrative efficiencies, we recommended that the Secretaries of Labor and Health and Human Services (HHS) work together to develop and disseminate information that could inform such efforts. As part of its proposed changes to the Workforce Investment Act, the Administration proposes consolidating nine programs into three. In addition, the budget proposal would transfer the Senior Community Service Employment Program from Labor to HHS.

- Sustained congressional oversight is pivotal in addressing these issues. Specifically, this Committee can look for opportunities to enhance program evaluations and performance information, foster coordination and strategic planning for program areas that span multiple federal agencies, and consolidate existing programs or coordinate service delivery.

In preparing this statement in March 2011, we relied on our previous work in these areas (please see the related GAO products Appendix at the end of this statement). These products contain detailed overviews of the scope and methodology we used. The work on which this statement is based was

[2]Pub. L. No. 89-10, 79 Stat. 27, as most recently amended and reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002).

performed in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform audits to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions. We believe that the evidence obtained provided a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

## Proliferation of Programs That Support Teacher Quality Complicates Federal Efforts to Invest Dollars Effectively

In fiscal year 2009, the federal government spent over $4 billion specifically to improve the quality of our nation's 3 million teachers through numerous programs across the government. Teacher quality can be enhanced through a variety of activities, including training, recruitment, and curriculum and assessment tools. In turn, these activities can influence student learning and ultimately improve the global competitiveness of the American workforce in a knowledge-based economy. Prior GAO reports have noted that sustained coordination among key federal education programs could enhance state efforts to improve teacher quality.

Federal efforts to improve teacher quality have led to the creation and expansion of a variety of programs across the federal government. However, there is no governmentwide strategy to minimize fragmentation, overlap, or potential duplication among these many programs. Specifically, GAO identified 82 distinct programs designed to help improve teacher quality, either as a primary purpose or as an allowable activity, administered across 10 federal agencies. Many of these programs share similar goals. For example, 9 of the 82 programs support improving the quality of teaching in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM subjects) and these programs alone are administered across the Departments of Education, Defense, and Energy; the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and the National Science Foundation. Further, in fiscal year 2010, the majority (53) of the programs GAO identified supporting teacher quality improvements received $50 million or less in funding and many have their own separate administrative processes.

The proliferation of programs has resulted in fragmentation that can frustrate agency efforts to administer programs in a comprehensive manner, limit the ability to determine which programs are most cost effective, and ultimately increase program costs. For example, eight different Education offices administer over 60 of the federal programs supporting teacher quality improvements, primarily in the form of competitive grants. Education officials believe that federal programs have failed to make significant progress in helping states close achievement

gaps between schools serving students from different socioeconomic backgrounds, because, in part, federal programs that focus on teaching and learning of specific subjects are too fragmented to help state and district officials strengthen instruction and increase student achievement in a comprehensive manner. While Education officials noted, and GAO concurs, that a mixture of programs can target services to underserved populations and yield strategic innovations, the current programs are not structured in a way that enables educators and policymakers to identify the most effective practices to replicate. According to Education officials, it is typically not cost-effective to allocate the funds necessary to conduct rigorous evaluations of small programs; therefore, small programs are unlikely to be evaluated. Finally, it is more costly to administer multiple separate federal programs because each program has its own policies, applications, award competitions, reporting requirements, and, in some cases, federal evaluations.

While all of the 82 federal programs GAO identified support teacher quality improvement efforts, several overlap in that they share more than one key program characteristic. For example, teacher quality programs may overlap if they share similar objectives, serve similar target groups, or fund similar activities. GAO previously reported that 23 of the programs administered by Education in fiscal year 2009 had improving teacher quality as a specific focus, which suggested that there may be overlap among these and other programs that have teacher quality improvements as an allowable activity. When looking across a broader set of criteria, GAO found that 14 of the programs administered by Education overlapped with another program with regard to allowable activities as well as shared objectives and target groups (see figure 1). For example, the Transition to Teaching program and Teacher Quality Partnership Grant program can both be used to fund similar teacher preparation activities through institutions of higher education for the purpose of helping individuals from non-teaching fields become qualified to teach.

**Figure 1: Areas of Overlap among Selected Programs Administered by Education that Support Teacher Quality Improvement**

| | Even Start[a] | Striving Readers[a] | Mathematics and Science Partnerships[a] | Improving Teacher Quality State Grants[a] | Title I, Part A | School Improvement Grants | Transition to Teaching[a] | Advanced Certification or Advanced Credentialing[a] | Teacher Quality Partnership Grants[a] | Language Resource Centers | Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow Program: Baccalaureate[a] | Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow: Masters[a] | Foreign Language Assistance Program[a] | Teach for America[a] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Objective** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Improve Education in Specific Subjects | ● | ● | ● | | | | | | | ● | ● | ● | ● | |
| Improve Education in General | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Improve Education for Special Populations | ● | ● | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | ● | ● | | ● |
| **Target Group** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Current Teachers | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | ● | | ● | | ● | ● | |
| Prospective Teachers | | | | ● | | | ● | | ● | | ● | ● | | ● |
| Other Education Professionals | ● | ● | | ● | ● | ● | | | | ● | | | | |
| **Activity[b]** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Teacher Preparation | | | | ● | | | ● | | ● | | ● | ● | | ● |
| Professional Development | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | |
| Recruitment or Retention | | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | ● | ● | | ● |
| Certification or Licensure | | | | ● | | | ● | ● | ● | | ● | ● | | |
| Induction or Mentoring | | | | ● | | | ● | | ● | | ● | | | ● |

Source: GAO analysis of Department of Education documents and interviews.

Note: The 14 programs shown in the table are a subset of over 60 Education programs supporting teacher quality improvement either specifically or as an allowable activity. Specifically, although Title I, Part A, School Improvement Grants, and Even Start allow program funds to be used for teacher quality activities, this is not their primary focus. The 14 programs presented above overlapped with at least one other program across objective, target group, and activity.

[a]Education has proposed consolidating this program under a broader program in its proposal for the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

[b]This is not an exhaustive list of activities allowed under these programs, but rather the activities GAO determined were most relevant for the purposes of this analysis.

Although there is overlap among these programs, several factors make it difficult to determine whether there is unnecessary duplication. First, when similar teacher quality activities are funded through different programs and delivered by different entities, some overlap can occur unintentionally, but is not necessarily wasteful. For example, a local school district could use funds from the Foreign Language Assistance program to pay for professional development for a teacher who will be implementing a new foreign language course, and this teacher could also attend a summer seminar on best practices for teaching the foreign language at a Language Resource Center. Second, by design, individual teachers may benefit from federally funded training or financial support at different points in their careers. Specifically, the teacher from this example could also receive teacher certification through a program funded by the Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow program. Further, both broad and narrowly targeted programs exist simultaneously, meaning that the same teacher who receives professional development funded from any one or more of the above three programs might also receive professional development that is funded through Title I, Part A of ESEA. The actual content of these professional development activities may differ though, since the primary goal of each program is different. In this example, it would be difficult to know whether the absence of any one of these programs would make a difference in terms of the teacher's ability to teach the new language effectively.

In past work, GAO and Education's Inspector General have concluded that improved planning and coordination could help Education better leverage expertise and limited resources, and to anticipate and develop options for addressing potential problems among the multitude of programs it administers. Generally, GAO has reported that uncoordinated program efforts can waste scarce funds, confuse and frustrate program customers, and limit the overall effectiveness of the federal effort. However, given the large number of teacher quality programs and the extent of overlap, it is unlikely that improved coordination alone can fully mitigate the effects of the fragmented and overlapping federal effort.

In 2009, GAO recommended that the Secretary of Education work with other agencies as appropriate to develop a coordinated approach for routinely and systematically sharing information that can assist federal programs, states, and local providers in achieving efficient service delivery. Coordination is essential to ensure that programs do not work at cross-purposes, do not repeat mistakes, and do not engage in wasteful duplication of services. Education has established working groups to help develop more effective collaboration across Education offices, and has

reached out to other agencies to develop a framework for sharing information on some teacher quality activities, but it has noted that coordination efforts do not always prove useful and cannot fully eliminate barriers to program alignment, such as programs with differing definitions for similar populations of grantees, which create an impediment to coordination.

Congress could help eliminate some of these barriers through legislation, particularly through the pending reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and other key education bills. Specifically, to minimize any wasteful fragmentation and overlap among teacher quality programs, Congress may choose either to eliminate programs that are too small to evaluate cost-effectively or combine programs serving similar target groups into a larger program. Education has already proposed combining 38 programs into 11 programs in its reauthorization proposal, which could allow the agency to dedicate a higher portion of its administrative resources to monitoring programs for results and providing technical assistance. Congress might also include legislative provisions to help Education reduce fragmentation, such as by giving broader discretion to the agency to move resources away from certain programs. Congress could provide Education guidelines for selecting these programs. For example, Congress could allow Education discretion to consolidate programs with administrative costs exceeding a certain threshold or failing to meet performance goals, into larger or more successful programs. Finally, to the extent that overlapping programs continue to be authorized, they could be better aligned with each other in a way that allows for comparison and evaluation to ensure they are complementary rather than duplicative.

## Providing Information on Colocating Services and Consolidating Administrative Structures Could Promote Efficiencies Across Multiple Employment and Training Programs

Federally funded employment and training programs play an important role in helping job seekers obtain employment. In fiscal year 2009, 47 programs spent about $18 billion to provide services, such as job search and job counseling, to program participants. Most of these programs are administered by the Departments of Labor, Education, and HHS.

GAO has previously issued reports on the number of programs that provide employment and training services and overlap among them. In the 1990s, GAO issued a series of reports that identified program overlap and possible areas of resulting inefficiencies. In 2000 and 2003, GAO identified programs for which a key program goal was providing employment and training assistance and tracked the increasing number of programs. GAO recently updated information on these programs, found overlap among them, and examined potential duplication among three selected large programs—HHS's Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and the Department of Labor's Employment Service and Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Adult programs.

Forty-four of the 47 federal employment and training programs GAO identified, including those with broader missions such as multipurpose block grants, overlap with at least one other program in that they provide at least one similar service to a similar population. Some of these overlapping programs serve multiple population groups. Others target specific populations, most commonly Native Americans, veterans, and youth. Even when programs overlap, they may have meaningful differences in their eligibility criteria or objectives, or they may provide similar types of services in different ways.

GAO examined the TANF, Employment Service, and WIA Adult programs for potential duplication and found they provide some of the same services to the same population through separate administrative structures. Although the extent to which individuals receive the same services from these programs is unknown due to limited data, GAO found these programs maintain parallel administrative structures to provide some of the same services such as job search assistance to low-income individuals (see figure 2). It should be noted that employment is only one aspect of the TANF program, which also provides a wide range of other services, including cash assistance. At the state level, the TANF program is typically administered by the state human services or welfare agency, while the Employment Service and WIA Adult programs are typically administered by the state workforce agency and provided through one-stop centers. Agency officials acknowledged that greater efficiencies could be achieved in delivering services through these programs but said factors such as the

number of clients that any one-stop center can serve and one-stop centers' proximity to clients, particularly in rural areas, could warrant having multiple entities provide the same services.

**Figure 2: Selected Employment and Training Services Provided by the Employment Service, TANF, and WIA Adult Programs, Fiscal Year 2009**

| Program name | Employment counseling and assessment | Development of job opportunities | Job readiness skills training | Job referrals | Job search or job placement activities |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Employment Service/Wagner-Peyser Funded Activities (DOL) | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (HHS) | ○ | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| WIA Adult Program (DOL) | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |

● Primary services ○ Secondary services

Source: GAO survey of agency officials.

Colocating services and consolidating administrative structures may increase efficiencies and reduce costs, but implementation can be challenging. Some states have colocated TANF employment and training services in one-stop centers where Employment Service and WIA Adult services are provided. Three states—Florida, Texas, and Utah—have gone a step further by consolidating the agencies that administer these programs, and state officials said this reduced costs and improved services, but they could not provide a dollar figure for cost savings. States and localities may face challenges to colocating services, such as limited office space. In addition, consolidating administrative structures may be time consuming and any cost savings may not be immediately realized.

An obstacle to further progress in achieving greater administrative efficiencies is that little information is available about the strategies and results of such initiatives. In addition, little is known about the incentives that states and localities have to undertake such initiatives and whether additional incentives are needed.

To facilitate further progress by states and localities in increasing administrative efficiencies in employment and training programs, we recommended in 2011 that the Secretaries of Labor and HHS work together to develop and disseminate information that could inform such efforts. This should include information about state initiatives to consolidate program administrative structures and state and local efforts to colocate new partners, such as TANF, at one-stop centers. Information on these topics could address challenges faced, strategies employed,

results achieved, and remaining issues. As part of this effort, Labor and HHS should examine the incentives for states and localities to undertake such initiatives, and, as warranted, identify options for increasing such incentives. Labor and HHS agreed they should develop and disseminate this information. HHS noted that it lacks legal authority to mandate increased TANF-WIA coordination or create incentives for such efforts.

To the extent that colocating services and consolidating administrative structures reduce administrative costs, funds could potentially be available to serve more clients or for other purposes. For the TANF program alone, GAO estimated that states spent about $160 million to administer employment and training services in fiscal year 2009. According to a Department of Labor official, the administrative costs for the WIA Adult program were at least $56 million in program year 2009. Officials told GAO they do not collect data on the administrative costs associated with the Employment Service program, as they are not a separately identifiable cost in the legislation. Labor officials said that, on average, the agency spends about $4,000 for each WIA Adult participant who receives training services. In periods of budgetary constraints, it is all the more important that resources are used effectively. Depending on the reduction in administrative costs associated with colocation and consolidation, these funds could be used to train potentially hundreds or thousands of additional individuals.

## Options for Congress to Consider as it Addresses Fragmentation, Overlap, and Potential Duplication

This Committee has authority over a wide range of programs intended to help many of our neediest and most vulnerable citizens. With pending reauthorizations, it is an opportune time to consider options for addressing fragmentation, overlap, and potential duplication among these programs. In the past, Congress has taken a range of actions to address these issues that may help you as you seek approaches on how to proceed. Today, I would like to highlight 3 of these approaches:

1. enhancing program evaluations and performance information,
2. fostering coordination and strategic planning for program areas that span multiple federal agencies, and
3. consolidating existing programs or coordinating service delivery.

## Enhancing Program Evaluations and Performance Information

Information about the effectiveness of programs can help guide policymakers and program managers in making tough decisions about how to prioritize the use of scarce resources and improve the efficiency of existing programs. However, there can be many challenges to obtaining this information. For example, it may not be cost-effective to allocate the funds necessary to conduct rigorous evaluations of small programs and as a result these programs are unlikely to be evaluated. As we have reported, many programs, especially smaller programs, have not been evaluated, which can limit the ability of Congress to make informed decisions about which programs to continue, expand, modify, consolidate, or eliminate. For example,

- We found that of 47 employment and training programs we identified, 23 have not had a performance study of any kind completed since 2004, and only 5 have had an impact study completed since 2004.
- We recommended that Labor comply with the requirement in the Workforce Investment Act of 1998[3] to conduct an impact evaluation of WIA services to better understand what services are most effective for improving outcomes. However, Labor has been slow to implement this requirement, and does not expect to complete the study until June 2015.
- In 2009, GAO reported that while evaluations have been done, or are under way, for about two-fifths of 23 programs we identified as being focused on teacher quality, little is known about the extent to which most programs are achieving their desired results.
- In 2010, GAO reported that there were 151 different federal K-12 and early education programs,[4] but that more than half of these programs have not been evaluated, including 8 of the 20 largest programs which together accounted for about 90 percent of total funding for these programs.

There are also other governmentwide strategies that may play an important role. Specifically, in January 2011, the President signed the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010 (GPRAMA),[5] updating the almost two-

[3]Pub. L. No. 105-220, 112 Stat. 936 (1998).

[4]See GAO, *Federal Education Funding: Overview of K-12 and Early Childhood Education Programs*, GAO-10-51 (Washington, D.C.: Jan. 27, 2010).

[5]Pub. L. No. 111-352, 124 Stat. 3866 (2011).

decades-old Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA).[6] Implementing provisions of the new act—such as its emphasis on establishing outcome-oriented goals covering a limited number of crosscutting policy areas—could play an important role in clarifying desired outcomes and addressing program performance spanning multiple organizations. Specifically, GPRAMA requires agencies to (1) disclose information about the accuracy and reliability of performance information (2) identify crosscutting management challenges, and (3) report quarterly on priority goals on a publicly available Web site. Additionally, GPRAMA significantly enhances requirements for agencies to consult with Congress when establishing or adjusting governmentwide and agency goals. OMB and agencies are to consult with relevant committees, obtaining majority and minority views, about proposed goals at least once every 2 years. This information can inform deliberations on spending priorities and help re-examine the fundamental structure, operation, funding, and performance of a number of federal education programs. However, to be successful, it will be important for agencies to build the analytical capacity to both use the performance information, and to ensure its quality—both in terms of staff trained to do the analysis and availability of research and evaluation resources.[7]

## Fostering Coordination and Strategic Planning for Program Areas that Span Multiple Federal Agencies

Where programs cross federal agencies, Congress can establish requirements to ensure federal agencies are working together on common goals. For example, Congress mandated—through the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010—that the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), develop and maintain an inventory of STEM education programs, including documentation of the effectiveness of these programs, assess the potential overlap and potential duplication of these programs, and develop a 5-year strategic plan for STEM education, among other things.[8] In establishing these requirements, Congress put in place a set of requirements to provide information it can use to inform decisions about strategic priorities.

[6]Pub. L. No. 103-62, 107 Stat. 285 (1993).

[7]See GAO, *Government Performance: GPRA Modernization Act Provides Opportunities to Help Address Fiscal, Performance, and Management Challenges*, GAO-11-466T. (Washington, DC: Mar. 16, 2011).

[8]Pub. L. No. 111-358, § 101(b), 124 Stat. 3982 (2011).

## Consolidating Existing Programs or Coordinating Service Delivery

Consolidating existing programs or coordinating service delivery are other options for Congress to address fragmentation, overlap, and duplication. In the education area, Congress consolidated several bilingual education programs into the English Language Acquisition State Grant Program as part of the 2001 ESEA reauthorization. As we reported prior to the consolidation, existing bilingual programs shared the same goals, targeted the same types of children, and provided similar services. In consolidating these programs, Congress gave state and local educational agencies greater flexibility in the design and administration of language instructional programs. Congress has another opportunity to address these issues through the pending reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Specifically, to minimize any wasteful fragmentation and overlap among teacher quality programs, Congress may choose either to eliminate programs that are too small to evaluate cost effectively or to combine programs serving similar target groups into a larger program. In the employment and training area, Congress took steps to better coordinate service delivery for many employment and training programs when it enacted the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (WIA). Specifically, WIA established one-stop centers in all states and mandated that numerous programs provide their services through the centers. In doing so, WIA sought to unify a fragmented employment and training system and create a single, universal system—a one-stop system that could serve the needs of all job seekers and employers.

In conclusion, removing and preventing unnecessary duplication, overlap, and fragmentation among federal teacher quality and employment and training programs is clearly challenging. These are difficult issues to address because they may require agencies and Congress to re-examine within and across various mission areas the fundamental structure, operation, funding, and performance of a number of long-standing federal programs or activities. Implementing provisions of GPRAMA—such as its emphasis on establishing priority outcome-oriented goals, including those covering crosscutting policy areas—could play an important role in clarifying desired outcomes, addressing program performance spanning multiple organizations, and facilitating future actions to reduce unnecessary duplication, overlap, and fragmentation. Sustained attention and oversight by Congress will be critical also. As the nation rises to meet its current fiscal challenges, GAO will continue to assist Congress and federal agencies in identifying actions needed to address these issues. Likewise, we will continue to monitor developments in the areas we have already identified.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Miller, and Members of the Committee. This concludes my prepared statement. I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

## GAO Contact

For further information on this testimony please contact Barbara Bovbjerg, Managing Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security, who may be reached at (202) 512-7215, or BovbjergB@gao.gov. Contact points for our Congressional Relations and Public Affairs offices may be found on the last page of this statement.

# Related GAO Products

## Education Programs

*Federal Education Funding: Overview of K-12 and Early Childhood Education Programs.* GAO-10-51. Washington, D.C.: January 27, 2010.

*English Language Learning: Diverse Federal and State Efforts to Support Adult English Language Learning Could Benefit from More Coordination.* GAO-09-575. Washington: D.C.: July 29, 2009.

*Teacher Preparation: Multiple Federal Education Offices Support Teacher Preparation for Instructing Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners, but Systematic Departmentwide Coordination Could Enhance This Assistance.* GAO-09-573. Washington, D.C.: July 20, 2009.

*Teacher Quality: Sustained Coordination among Key Federal Education Programs Could Enhance State Efforts to Improve Teacher Quality.* GAO-09-593. Washington, D.C.: July 6, 2009.

*Teacher Quality: Approaches, Implementation, and Evaluation of Key Federal Efforts.* GAO-07-861T. Washington, D.C.: May 17, 2007.

*Higher Education: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics Trends and the Role of Federal Programs.* GAO-06-702T. Washington, D.C.: May 3, 2006.

*Higher Education: Federal Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics Programs and Related Trends.* GAO-06-114. Washington, D.C.: October 12, 2005.

*Special Education: Additional Assistance and Better Coordination Needed among Education Offices to Help States Meet the NCLBA Teacher Requirements.* GAO-04-659. Washington, D.C.: July 15, 2004.

*Special Education: Grant Programs Designed to Serve Children Ages 0-5.* GAO-02-394. Washington, D.C.: April 25, 2002.

*Head Start and Even Start: Greater Collaboration Needed on Measures of Adult Education and Literacy.* GAO-02-348. Washington, D.C.: March 29, 2002.

*Bilingual Education: Four Overlapping Programs Could Be Consolidated.* GAO-01-657. Washington, D.C.: May 14, 2001.

*Early Education and Care: Overlap Indicates Need to Assess Crosscutting Programs.* GAO/HEHS-00-78. Washington, D.C.: April 28, 2000.

*Education and Care: Early Childhood Programs and Services for Low-Income Families.* GAO/HEHS-00-11. Washington: D.C.: November 15, 1999.

*Federal Education Funding: Multiple Programs and Lack of Data Raise Efficiency and Effectiveness Concerns.* GAO/T-HEHS-98-46. Washington, D.C.: November 6, 1997.

*Department of Education: Information on Consolidation Opportunities and Student Aid.* GAO/T-HEHS-95-130. Washington, D.C.: April 6, 1995.

*Multiple Teacher Training Programs: Information on Budgets, Services, and Target Groups.* GAO/HEHS-95-71FS. Washington, D.C.: February 22, 1995.

*Department of Education: Opportunities to Realize Savings.* GAO/T-HEHS-95-56. Washington, D.C.: January 18, 1995.

*Early Childhood Programs: Multiple Programs and Overlapping Target Groups.* GAO/HEHS-95-4FS. Washington, D.C.: October 31, 1994.

## Employment and Training Programs

*Multiple Employment and Training Programs: Providing Information on Colocating Services and Consolidating Administrative Structures Could Promote Efficiencies.* GAO-11-92. Washington, D.C.: January 13, 2011.

*Multiple Employment and Training Programs: Funding and Performance Measures for Major Programs.* GAO-03-589. Washington, D.C.: April 18, 2003.

*Multiple Employment and Training Programs: Overlapping Programs Indicate Need for Closer Examination of Structure.* GAO-01-71. Washington, D.C.: October 13, 2000.

*Department of Labor: Rethinking the Federal Role in Worker Protection and Workforce Development.* GAO/T-HEHS-95-125. Washington, D.C.: April 4, 1995.

*Multiple Employment Training Programs: Information Crosswalk on 163 Employment and Training Programs.* GAO/HEHS-95-85FS. Washington, D.C.: February 14, 1995.

*Multiple Employment Training Programs: Major Overhaul Needed to Create a More Efficient, Customer-Driven System.* GAO/T-HEHS-95-70. Washington, D.C.: February 6, 1995.

*Multiple Employment Training Programs: Major Overhaul Needed to Reduce Costs, Streamline the Bureaucracy, and Improve Results.* GAO/T-HEHS-95-53. Washington, D.C.: January 10, 1995.

*Multiple Employment Training Programs: Basic Program Data Often Missing.* GAO/HEHS-94-239. Washington, D.C.: September 28, 1994.

*Multiple Employment Training Programs: How Legislative Proposals Address Concerns.* GAO/T-HEHS-94-221. Washington, D.C.: August 4, 1994.

*Multiple Employment Training Programs: Overlap Among Programs Raises Questions About Efficiency.* GAO/HEHS-94-193. Washington, D.C.: July 11, 1994.

*Multiple Employment Training Programs: Major Overhaul Is Needed.* GAO/T-HEHS-94-109. Washington, D.C.: March 3, 1994.

*Multiple Employment Training Programs: Conflicting Requirements Underscore Need for Change.* GAO/T-HEHS-94-120. Washington, D.C.: March 2, 1994.

*Multiple Employment Training Programs: Most Federal Agencies Do Not Know If Their Programs Are Working Effectively.* GAO/HEHS-94-88. Washington, D.C.: March 2, 1994.

*Multiple Employment Training Programs: Overlapping Programs Can Add Unnecessary Administrative Costs.* GAO/HEHS-94-80. Washington, D.C.: January 28, 1994.

*Multiple Employment Training Programs: Conflicting Requirements Hamper Delivery of Services.* GAO/HEHS-94-78. Washington, D.C.: January 28, 1994.

*Multiple Employment Programs: National Employment Training Strategy Needed.* GAO/T-HRD-93-27. Washington, D.C.: June 18, 1993.



---

Chairman KLINE. Thank you, sir. Again, thank you for being here and for your time and the hard work that the GAO does.

And I am keenly mindful of the ranking member's comments about we don't want this hearing to be either redundant or duplicative. We have actions that we need to take. We have been discussing here, in fact, for some years whether—whichever side was occupying this chair—that we need to address some of this duplication, some of the problems, some of the shortfalls in WIA and other areas.

Your report just sort of put a double underscore over the scale of the problem that has been sitting out there. And as you know, we have some—it is not only a question of nine or 10 agencies; it

is also a question of, sometimes, nine or 10 committees here in Congress, and we have to work that out. And I am hoping that some of the questions and discussion that we go through here today can kind of help us sort that out, and I think it is part of my job to work with the leadership and other chairmen to see if we can sort out some of these jurisdictional challenges here in Congress.

You mentioned some of the things that the administration is doing; Mr. Miller mentioned some of the things that Secretary Duncan is doing. But you also said, or I certainly inferred from your testimony, that there are some legislative actions that should be taken.

Can you expand that a little bit? What are the things that you are thinking about, looking at, that the Congress should be taking up?

Mr. DODARO. First, there are reauthorizations that are upon you in both of these programs in the education area as well as employment training activities, and the reauthorization of Workforce Investment Act. So I do think those reauthorizations provide really pivotal, timely opportunities to reassess what the federal role should be.

A lot of these programs have developed over a period of time, and it is a good opportunity to take a step back to try to determine what is working well, what isn't, to set priorities, and for the Congress to be clear on what the desired outcomes it would like to achieve in these programs, and to also potentially use legislative vehicles to require coordination across federal government's programs and activities.

The Congress did that recently with the Competes America Act in the areas dealing with the scientific technical engineering and math programs requiring a strategic plan, requiring a role of OMB and the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy. So I think the Congress can use its legislative platform to make sure that there is more coordination across the executive branch and to get clearer reports from the executive branch activities.

The other legislative change that we would suggest the Congress consider is in the employment and training area. The Department of Health and Human Services has indicated that there are legislative barriers to them in the TANF program, the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families program, in order to allow them to deal properly with incentives to work with other program activities. So we think that makes sense.

Also, I think this is also a very important opportunity for the Congress to get input from the state and local level as well as it considers legislation. Most of these programs are administered at the state and local level. They are under enormous fiscal pressures as well.

We have done long-range simulations of the collective fiscal path of the state and local sector and it is on the same difficult long-range unsustainable path that the federal government is on. And so trying to work with them to give them incentives to streamline administrative operations to provide more efficient delivery services I think would be enormously helpful at all levels of government.

Chairman KLINE. Thank you.

Mr. Miller?

Mr. MILLER. Thank you.

In the media advisory—the majority media advisory for today's hearing—it says that the GAO has identified a number of programs aimed at improving teacher quality and it says that GAO has identified a number of employment and training programs in the same vein. And I think that is accurate.

However, the advisory asserts that GAO has found, and I quote—"Many of these programs are managed by multiple agencies and aimed at the same beneficiaries, causing unnecessary duplication and wasted tax dollars." I don't see that in your report, and I do not see in the evidence of your testimony that that is the case of showing unnecessary duplication or identifying specific tax dollars wasted.

In fact, where you discuss the teacher quality programs at the top of page 6 you actually say, "Several factors make it difficult to determine whether there is unnecessary duplication in these programs," and you go on to say that, "when similar teacher quality activities are funded through different programs and delivered by different entities, some overlap"—the word you use, overlap can be unintentional but it is not necessarily wasteful. And I think that is a difference from the cast of the advisory on this hearing.

Later in your testimony, with regard to job training and employment programs, you say on page 8 that the extent to which individuals receive the same services from job training programs is unknown. More than 15 times throughout your testimony you include the title and the use of phrase "potential duplication," but you don't find the massive duplication. I recognize, and we have been very concerned on this committee, about who is offering—in the Competes Act we try to get rid of some of the duplication and let the National Science Foundation deal with science and STEM.

But let me ask you in the time remaining, as quickly as I can, did you—in this GAO report did you identify specific examples of programmatic duplication—not administrative duplication, but specific examples of programmatic duplication?

Mr. DODARO. What we did identify were fragmentation and overlap, which we believe can be harbingers of potential duplication——

Mr. MILLER. Okay. I understand. But——

Mr. DODARO [continuing]. But for these two program areas we did not identify any examples of duplication.

Mr. MILLER. Right. And I think that your response comports with what is on page 6, where you talk about the overlap, and some overlap can occur unintentionally, but again, it is not necessarily wasteful——

Mr. DODARO. Right.

Mr. MILLER [continuing]. In terms of tax dollars.

Did you identify and calculate specific cost savings to be achieved by consolidating administrative structure?

Mr. DODARO. We believe that it is Congress's prerogative to decide the priorities on these programs, so we did not provide specific recommendations on how to address this area. What our main recommendation was is that to get ahead of this, to make sure there isn't——

Mr. MILLER. No, I understand that. But in your report where you find overlap and whatever you have not assigned a cost or concern about what that would be——

Mr. DODARO. No. We have pointed out some limitations in the ability to be able to do that because——

Mr. MILLER. You also mentioned that some states have done this and you say they said they saved a lot of money, and yet—but they couldn't provide you any dollar amounts.

Mr. DODARO. Not at this time. And this is why we think the federal agencies should have a stronger role in developing that information.

Mr. MILLER. So we don't know whether they saved or didn't save. They said they saved, and I appreciate that, but—okay.

Mr. DODARO. And I think given their situation, I mean they are looking for ways to reduce costs.

Mr. MILLER. I understand.

Did you assess the effectiveness of the programs identified in the report?

Mr. DODARO. We had not been asked to assess the effectiveness, and we think this is an important area where the agencies have not stepped up to fulfill their responsibilities to evaluate the effectiveness of the programs.

Mr. MILLER. Are you planning on doing effectiveness—looking at these teacher programs or the training programs?

Mr. DODARO. Well, I think first and foremost our effort is making sure that the agencies fulfill their responsibilities to do these effectiveness studies. Like, for example, in the workforce investment area the 1998 legislation mandated that they do an impact study and that study is way late and it is not due to be completed until 2015, almost 17 years after. So——

Mr. MILLER. I guess my concern is here is if the recommendation is—and the department, at least in education, is heading toward consolidation and made these recommendations, when you are doing consolidation I assume what you would take would be the most effective programs and try to provide for that consolidation. And therefore, you would somehow wring the savings out of here. But we really don't have those recommendations from this report.

Mr. DODARO. Yes. There are some programs—and I would be happy to provide for the record—that have had evaluations, that have shown positive results that could be built off of, and so we will provide that for the record.

But in the other—many other areas' programs aren't evaluated so it is really hard to determine at this point. You know, that is why we think this Government Performance and Modernization Act requires agencies to do more rigorous evaluations, to discuss the quality of the data, to provide publicly available results to help not only the Congress but the public understand what is effective in these programs——

Mr. MILLER. That would be a methodical——

Mr. DODARO. Right.

Mr. MILLER [continuing]. Reevaluation or periodic effectiveness evaluation of the programs that would be required by the act?

Mr. DODARO. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Okay. Thank you.

Chairman KLINE. Thank the gentleman.

Dr. Foxx, you are recognized.

Mrs. FOXX. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you for being here, Mr. Dodaro. I appreciate it.

I am very interested in the comments that you made about—particularly, it has been 17 years since the law was passed to create evaluation and some effectiveness. I think the American public would find that absolutely appalling that here we justify paying high wages to the people who work in the federal government based on the fact that they have degrees and should be very highly skilled, and yet they can't come across with an evaluation program in 17 years. I think something is really lacking.

I am really curious, also, about some of the things that you have talked about. I wonder if we could focus a little bit more on the evaluation aspect. I think there is a great irony here that we are debating No Child Left Behind or the ESEA reauthorization and the concerns that local school systems have on how they have been evaluated.

And I think perhaps we ought to bring in a group of teachers and principals and let them set up the evaluation programs for the Department of Education. Since the Department of Education has been able, it seems, to design extraordinarily intricate evaluation programs for the school systems and yet have failed completely to set up evaluation programs for themselves.

I noted in the information we were given that in 2003 Congress attempted to streamline federal literacy efforts by establishing a commission to look at how to eliminate areas of overlap, and that commission found absolutely no areas of overlap. So it looks like we can't do evaluation from within.

Did you come across, in your work, any evaluative systems that you thought were really good and that should—or people from outside or inside who could then establish models for evaluations? Did you find any of those?

Mr. DODARO. Yes. There have been some evaluations that have been done in the teacher quality area and in the employment and training area, and I would be happy to provide, you know, that for the record.

You know, one of the challenges here is that of the 82 programs, 53 of them are relatively small programs, making it difficult to evaluate it. And I think that is part of the rationale for the Education Department's consolidation efforts, to be able to have programs large enough, you know, particularly given the fact that the federal government's efforts are supplemental to what is already being spent at the state and local level, and that is another complicating factor in the evaluations.

I think the Congress' oversight activities could be enhanced in these areas to make sure that the agencies do do the evaluations that are scheduled to be done and that are critically important to make sure that the Congress gets good information to make informed decisions.

Mrs. FOXX. I was also curious about the comment you made about the 38 programs being collapsed into 11 programs. When we heard from Secretary Duncan he talked about that also, but I asked him the question, because we have been informed by staff

that there will be no savings as a result of consolidating those programs, and I think there has to be some emphasis placed on savings.

You didn't mention that in your comments, but did you find that we could have some savings as a result of that? You mentioned administratively, but how about in other areas?

Mr. DODARO. Right. Well, first of all, I would point out that two teacher quality programs of the ones we have mentioned Congress has already eliminated in these continuing resolutions that it has passed to date, so there have been two programs that have been eliminated. Obviously savings attended with those.

We haven't formally evaluated the department's consolidation effort and what is to be gained from savings. We would be happy to look at that and provide our thoughts to the committee.

Then there are 20 remaining programs within the department, which I think in the reauthorization program and the teacher quality area questions could be put forward to the department to determine why those programs weren't consolidated, as well and what the opportunities are there and whether there are evaluations there.

So I think there is a systematic way to look at the 60 of the 82 programs that are within the Department of Education's purview, and then there are questions of the other programs outside the department that could then be pursued as a line of questioning that would be, I think, very informative to the reauthorization deliberations.

Mrs. FOXX. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KLINE. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Kildee, you are recognized.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Dodaro, you mentioned there were 82 teacher quality programs. Is the problem the number of the substantive redundancy in many of these programs?

Mr. DODARO. I think the issue is both, in terms of the number and the size of some of these programs, as I mentioned, are relatively small. In some programs, Congressman, what we found was that it is an allowable activity among many activities, and then there are specific smaller targeted programs intended to get at different particular issues.

So because of that, it is hard to plan, you know, sort of a comprehensive approach to the program, both at the federal level and at the state and local level. So it is both the number, I think, the size of the programs, and the specific areas that involve some degree of overlap that need to be rationalized.

And I think they are all well-intended. The question is, what is the most efficient way to do it? And because there aren't evaluations it is difficult to provide information from the Education Department to the state and local level of what techniques have worked well, what should be replicated. And so I think that is limiting the—ultimately achieving the goals of all these programs.

Mr. KILDEE. If they are allowable the agency or the state could do away with those programs themselves; if they are mandated then we would have to take action on that.

Mr. DODARO. Yes. Well, a lot of them are competitive grants too. Where people apply for education determines that. So there is a cost associated with filling out the applications, reviewing them, that needs to be taken into account as well.

Mr. KILDEE. So these 82 are spread through various levels of government, various states——

Mr. DODARO. Yes.

Mr. KILDEE [continuing]. So the entire——

Mr. DODARO. Yes.

Mr. KILDEE [continuing]. Country then.

You said that some of these programs could be shifted from Labor to HHS. How would that help? Are some of the programs that similar that they could carry out their—both their missions?

Mr. DODARO. Yes. The administration's proposal in the employment and training area is to shift one program dealing with senior services to the Department of HHS, which has other related programs dealing with that population. So it would allow them to try to provide a more, you know, comprehensive approach in dealing with that part of our population.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you very much. Thank you for your good work.

Mr. DODARO. Thank you.

Chairman KLINE. Thank the gentelman.

Dr. Roe, you are recognized.

Mr. ROE. Thank you.

I want to thank you for this report. I had a chance to read in detail and you all did a great job of really clarifying for me where all these programs were. And your staff and you are to be commended for that. It is very enlightening for me to see what this bowl of spaghetti looked like.

And obviously it is complicated when you have this many programs. And just to bring up a couple here, both in workforce and in education: In 2010 the GAO reported there were 151 different federal K through 12 programs in early educational programs. More than half of these programs have not been evaluated, including eight of the 20 largest programs, which together accounted for about 90 percent of the total funding of these programs.

I can't believe that, that we haven't looked at it in some detail to find out if they work. There is no business in the world that would spend the kind of money we are spending and not find out if it is effective.

And I think your points you just made were the number of programs, the size, and then to evaluate the effectiveness of it—I mean, that is our fiduciary responsibility. And to have those tools we have to have the—we have to have the information about whether they are working or not.

Mr. DODARO. That is exactly right. I mean, one of the laws that was passed in 1993 was the original Government Performance and Results Act, which was—required agencies to set goals, to provide measurements on that. And that has produced some additional impetus but it really hasn't produced systematic program evaluations of what has worked.

That is why I mentioned this Modernization Act that was passed last year. And, you know, my belief is it won't work effectively

without the Congress' oversight role and participation as a stakeholder.

So I think it is a great opportunity that Congress should seize. Hold the agencies accountable. It fixes more accountability with a performance officer in the agencies, and I think it is a—it could be a sort of a game changing paradigm.

Mr. ROE. I don't think you all looked at this specifically, but how much—when you have this many duplicative programs how much cost is there in just the administration and how much of it actually gets to the classroom, or to the teacher, or whatever? I wonder if there is any way to know how much we are spending, because we know how much charitable organizations—and I don't donate to them when 50 percent of their money goes to administration, and I don't think taxpayers ought to be donating to something where it's not going to the classroom and being effective.

Mr. DODARO. It is very difficult to obtain that information both at the federal level and at the state and local level. I think the only two areas in our report where we identify clearly administrative costs associated with the employment and training programs are in the employment services area and the Workforce Investment Act Adult services, and I think we—those administrative costs are between—I think they are over $150 million just for those two programs.

Mr. ROE. That is a lot. And the other one—another point here in workforce, and you mentioned it before, but 47 employment and training programs, 23 have not have a performance study of any kind completed since 2004 and only five have had an impact study since 2004, so we don't know what they are doing. We don't know whether they are effective. And as you pointed out, when you have got—in addition to the states administer a lot of these are overlapping, we are singing to the same people with both administrations.

The other thing you pointed out, which I thought was excellent, was the fact that if your program was small enough it never got evaluated. And I think you mentioned 53.

And the Secretary is to be commended for trying to shrink these down; I give him credit for that and that is a very good start, I think. But he can't know what to shrink if he doesn't know—having the accountability either. He can't know whether he is making any forward progress or not.

So I think that those 53 programs—I want to be in one of those where I never get looked at.

Mr. DODARO. I think it is very important to make sure that everything that is done is evaluated. I mean, I think that, you know, there is a presumption that things continue to get funded unless there is a proven problem as opposed to making sure things work and are evaluated properly before they get additional funding.

Mr. ROE. What kind of timeline do you think is reasonable to get this done so that we—it is a huge task, but what kind of timeline do you think we should be on?

Mr. DODARO. Well, I think there are things that could be tackled relatively short-term. I think it is clear the way to do that would be to set priorities with the administration and build off of some of the work that they have already done. That would be my recommendation. And then set priorities for where there are gaps in

evaluation and requiring them to begin to close those gaps as soon as possible on a sort of a set schedule.

Mr. ROE. Okay. Again, thank you very much.

And I yield back.

Mr. DODARO. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, if I might——

Chairman KLINE. You may.

Mr. DODARO [continuing]. For a second, one thing I forgot to do is introduce our program experts that are with me here today. We have our managing director for employment and workforce and income security programs, Barbara Bovbjerg. George Scott and Andy Sherrill are experts in these areas, too. And if I might, I might ask them to help to answer some of the more detailed questions.

Chairman KLINE. You certainly may. When I saw you look over your shoulder, I suspected that that indeed might be the case.

So we welcome all of you here, and we welcome any input that you have got.

Mr. Payne, you are recognized.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you very much.

It is good to see you, and I thought that you just had it all in your head since you are one of the first presenters that I have seen that have not used a prepared text. Let me commend you for knowing your information so well that you don't need any notes. I have some, so you are ahead of me. [Laughter.]

Let me just ask a question. In your testimony you said that the GAO found that many federal programs to improve teacher quality and employment and training had similar goals, beneficiaries, and allowable activities. Did the GAO report take into consideration the effectiveness of these programs or capacity for each program to meet the demand for the provided services? I mean, in light of the fact that you said there are duplicates, what were the results?

Mr. DODARO. Yes. We tried to find out whether or not there had been evaluations done on these programs and in these areas. And as I mentioned earlier, in many areas there really wasn't a lot of information about program evaluations that were available.

So those that we did have available we were able to use, but there were a lot of gaps. So you weren't able to systematically look at all the 82 programs and determine, of the 82, which one's program evaluation showed the most promising results, and I think for the reasons that I mentioned earlier, some of them were too small, some of them are part of a broader program. And so there are a lot of difficulties in gaining that picture that you are seeking.

Mr. PAYNE. In your testimony you said that, you know, as you have just mentioned, that even when programs overlap they may have meaningful differences in their eligibility criteria or objectives, or they may provide similar types of services in different ways. Are there any examples of that that you can cite where that would occur?

Mr. DODARO. In the teacher quality area?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

Mr. DODARO. Yes. I don't have notes but I do have people, and I would like to ask George Scott to come up as our expert in that area. He can enlighten you on that——

Mr. PAYNE. Great.

Mr. DODARO [continuing]. If I will.

George, please?

Mr. SCOTT. Good morning, Congressman Payne.

Mr. PAYNE. How are you?

Mr. SCOTT. So again, what was your specific question?

Mr. PAYNE. That in the testimony it said that even when programs overlap they may have meaningful differences in their eligibility criteria or objectives or they may provide similar types of services in different ways. And I just wondered if there were any examples of how this might occur.

Mr. SCOTT. Well, there are examples across some of the teacher quality programs where either, you know, through comparative grants or through allowable activities you may see very similar activities but, you know, they could be targeted to very similar populations. That is why we were very careful to distinguish between fragmentation, overlap, and duplication.

And what we say clearly in our work is that, you know, we have found evidence of fragmentation, where you have a lot of activity spread across several agencies or departments. We also have some indication of overlap, at least for a small number of programs under the Department of Education.

But we talk about potential duplication but we did not actually find examples of duplication in the teacher quality programs.

Mr. PAYNE. Okay. Thank you very much.

Just a final question: This is probably for the future, but as, you know, in H.R. 1 they are regarding—in the program there will be an effort to close 3,000 one-stop career centers, eliminate summer youth employment programs, which provide access to job training and education to up to 7,000 disadvantaged students, and then the workforce development support provided to more than 1 million dislocated workers. Is this effort in line with the recommendations submitted in the report or have you dealt on what the potential would be if these cuts went into effect?

Mr. DODARO. I don't think we have evaluated that, so I will go back and we will take a look at it and if we have evaluated that, Congressman, we will provide it for the record, get it to you.

Mr. PAYNE. Great. Thank you very much.

Yield back.

Chairman KLINE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Thompson?

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General, thanks for being here, for your testimony. Your report—I was going through the report—specifically identified 47 separate employment training programs across nine agencies. The programs spent $18 billion.

And certainly, you know, workforce development, I think, is the key to America's competitiveness, but in your findings only five of those 47 programs had self-evaluations outcomes or impact studies of really outcomes. And as a former workforce investment board member I certainly have seen the value of workforce development programs in my local areas.

And everyone—everyone—is concerned about jobs. What are some immediate actions the committee can take to assure that

value and outcomes for employment training are delivered with the investment that we are making with taxpayer dollars?

Mr. DODARO. I think the best way to go about it is to hold the department accountable for producing the evaluations that they were supposed to produce, and they are behind. Labor Department has been slow to produce the evaluations. We have made many recommendations over the years to try to get them to improve the performance measures.

So, you know, I believe that you really have to, you know, put the responsibilities with them and try to get them to give you what they have. Now, they do have some of the evaluations and some show positive results, so I think it is important to understand that. But I think in these other areas you have to really, you know, basically hold them accountable for providing the type of evaluations that you are looking for.

Mr. THOMPSON. So I am sure we will do oversight hearings on this. I think that is kind of what I am taking from your recommendations.

But there will be some program areas where there is—based on your department's analysis there really isn't good data or tracking of outcomes with some programs?

Mr. DODARO. Right. In fact, let me ask Andy Sherrill, who is our expert in the employment and training area, to come up and give you sort of a rundown on what is available and what isn't.

Mr. SHERRILL. Okay. With regard to the tracking of outcomes, we found that most all of the 47 employment and training programs do track certain outcomes, most frequently things like entered employment, or retention of a job, or wages, that kind of thing.

But we also found that, with regard to the evaluations, as we have said, you know, programs typically track outcomes but not a lot is known about sort of the effectiveness—to what extent do the programs contribute to the achieving the outcomes? What would have happened in the absence of the programs?

And so that is sort of historically—in the work we have done on the Workforce Investment Act programs, sort of a repeated theme of our work has been the need for more information about what works and what doesn't.

Mr. THOMPSON. Very good. Well, thank you.

I want to change gears just a little bit. The report states that in April 2010 the GAO recommended to the Department of Agriculture—I sit on the Agriculture Committee as well—that it identify and develop methods for addressing potential inefficiencies and reduce unnecessary overlap in smaller food assistance programs, including convening a group of experts to examine the issue. To date, however, the USDA has not implemented any of the recommendations.

Were you able to determine why the USDA ignored this proposal?

Mr. DODARO. Yes. My understanding is the reason that they gave our team was that they didn't have funding in order to implement the recommendation. But I think this is something that the Congress should expect. It is part of normal management activity; it should be budgeted for and it should be done.

Now, in this particular area we found 18 food assistance programs, 11 of which there weren't a lot of evaluations done. There was a lot known about the seven larger ones but these other 11 there really weren't, and so we were trying to encourage them to close that gap.

And I think this, you know, it is something that should be—Congress should expect the agencies putting the money out to be able to tell you what we received for the money and whether it is working effectively or not. And so we will keep pressing our recommendations but I would encourage the Congress to follow up.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you, General.

I yield back, Chairman.

Chairman KLINE. Thank the gentleman.

Mr. Tierney?

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Dodaro, for your testimony, and the others as well.

I am interested in what you said about the—and what your associates said about measuring the outcomes on the Workforce Investment programs. Last time we reauthorized that bill it was a big conversation about the fact that we had been measuring the data in terms of the number of people it served, the number of dollars allocated to those people, but not enough on the outcomes.

Now, if I am hearing right, what you are saying is we have information about the outcomes of those programs—how many people now have jobs, and how many people have increased wages—and you think that there is a need to measure, somehow, how it is that the program got those outcomes. How would you go about measuring that?

Mr. SHERRILL. Well, for example, the WIA Adult and Dislocated Worker programs track outcomes with regard to, you know, how—and have performance goals with regard to the percentage of people that they want to have enter employment, have certain wage levels, and retain jobs. And, for example, for the program year 2009, if you look at to what extent were those goals achieved, in many cases they weren't achieved, in part—you know, obviously the economy has a key effect. But any time, you know, you have outcome measures you also want to get some sense of whether the programs meet them or not, to what extent are sort of funding for the program responsible for those?

Mr. TIERNEY. So if I am hearing you, what you are saying is they had the outcomes but they didn't match them up with the expectations, so they didn't have the goals as they relate to the outcomes?

Mr. SHERRILL. Well, they had the performance goals, performance—things that they wanted to achieve, but we don't have a good enough sense of to what extent are the things that the programs are doing, and sort of the one-stop center approach, actually making a difference. In other words——

Mr. TIERNEY. Yes, and I guess my question to you is, how do you do that, all right? If you have the goals and then you have the outcomes you can match those up and see whether or not it is working, or to what extent. But how do you determine whether or not the action you took is the action that got it to that point or some abstract thing that—I don't know how you measure——

Mr. SHERRILL. Well, there are two kinds of key ways. One is to do an impact study that relies on random assignment, so you have a control group of people who don't go through the program, and so you compare what effects the program has versus those for the control group.

There has also been other kinds of studies that use administrative data to do sort of comparisons, where there isn't a control group, but to look at other people who are similar to the people going through the program and try to assess the outcomes. Are there differences in outcomes of the program versus the comparison group?

And so there have been studies in some of the WIA programs to assess, is the program, as far as we can tell, having an impact on results?

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Now, General Dodaro, you did say in your report that you don't question the fact that the job training programs play an important role in helping job seekers obtain employment. Is that accurate?

Mr. DODARO. Yes. That is correct.

Mr. TIERNEY. But that there are some overlap you think. But I don't think you made a judgment as to whether or not all of the overlap was, in fact, problematical. And I draw that to a distinction on some veterans programs.

I know in many districts on that—there is a veterans program that serves the veterans homeless; there is another veterans program that might target, you know, disable veterans, for instance. Really, that is two different challenges that might be required of them.

So you are not making an evaluative judgment on whether those should be allowed together or anything. You are saying that they exist and they are separate?

Mr. SHERRILL. That is right. I mean, when we say that there was overlap and that they provide at least one similar service to a similar population we are not saying that that in itself is a problem, but that might warrant a deeper look, just as you are saying, because there are several programs that serve youth, for example, but as a target population, you know Job Corps provides services to—in a residential setting, other programs, you know, provide different—so we think that overlap provides an opportunity to look deeper at some of these programs to see the extent they are coordinated, the extent they might potentially be duplicating services.

Mr. TIERNEY. No, in the context of trying to reauthorize this bill over the last several years have you made any evaluation—I know that we have made efforts, the different groups on both sides, of trying to consolidate some of these programs and make the kinds of adjustments you are talking about, as has the administration.

Have you taken that work to date and seen how it measures up to your suggestions, whether or not what you are suggesting is, in fact, being addressed at all in that process?

Mr. SHERRILL. We haven't made any evaluations of the consolidation proposals there. The focus of our recommendation on the employment training front was really to foster more innovation at the state and local area, and for the federal agencies to disseminate in-

formation about what is working there and what might be replicated in terms of achieving greater cost efficiencies.

Mr. TIERNEY. Now, there is an effort going on, but I know—just because I happen to be fortunate enough to have a workforce investment board that is one of the national models so I brag a little bit about that—but I know that those types of studies are going on, and in fact, work is being done within that network of workforce investment boards on monitoring each other, mentoring each other, and trying to bring best practices around. Was that evaluated at all—that effort?

Mr. SHERRILL. Well, we think that is a—we didn't evaluate that effort but we think that is a good avenue for looking for cost efficiencies and mining what states are doing.

Mr. TIERNEY. But you didn't take any measure of how that is doing——

Chairman KLINE. The gentleman's time has expired.

Dr. Bucshon?

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you for cutting me off, Mr. Chairman. Very polite.

Mr. BUCSHON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This is just the type of report I think the American people just hate to hear out of Washington, D.C. I mean, I think it confirms their impression of what we do here with their money.

I am also continued to be amazed at the resistance by some in Congress to tackling this problem, especially, in fact, that we continue to find excuses of why we can't consolidate programs and make things more efficient here in Washington, D.C., including some comments that have been recently made right here in this hearing.

In my view, it is not good enough to consolidate programs but actually not decrease the size and scope of government. Putting the same number of Washington bureaucrats under different titles without actually eliminating those with duplicative roles doesn't accomplish anything. And in that vein, I look forward to the specifics from the administration in regards to this process within the Department of Education.

The question I have is, could you discuss briefly how inclusive the research was? Did it include all federal departments and programs? What were the limitations and why did you choose to limit the limitations that you chose?

Mr. DODARO. Basically, the statute requires us to produce an annual report every year, and we don't have the resources to cover the entire federal government every year. And so what we decided our plan was is we started with discretionary programs and work that GAO had already done over the years that we could build upon for this first report, which was done.

And so we included defense and civilian agencies. We are going to be looking, in the next 2 years, in entitlement areas and also tax expenditures.

You know, at any one time every year there is as much revenue foregone through tax expenditures as there is outlaid in discretionary programs, and some tax expenditures, particularly, like, in the student loan area, overlap some of the lending programs. So we

are going to be looking at lending programs as well as tax expenditures, discretionary and mandatory programs, as well.

And so we hope over the next 2 years we will cover the entire federal government in these first three reports. That is our goal and we are aiming toward that.

Now, we also included in the report additional recommendations on cost savings that did not involve overlap, duplication, or fragmentation, that GAO had identified in its work, and also ways to enhance revenue coming into the government. And so we plan to continue to do that, Congressman.

Mr. BUCSHON. Thank you.

And also, you did comment some about the states, and did you look at state-funded programs around the country and crosscheck those with some of these federal programs within the departments? And would that likely have even led to a higher number of redundant programs within the federal government?

Mr. DODARO. You know, I have had that similar question myself, and our mandate goes to federal programs, so federal programs that are administered through the state and local level we are including in our review. But I do believe one of the next things we need to do once we get through the federal government is look at that very issue, because I think the intergovernmental delivery system that we have is rather fragmented as a whole, and I think there are opportunities there as well.

And if we did look at that, you know, I think we would come up with some potential recommendations. But that is down the road.

Mr. BUCSHON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Chairman KLINE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Scott, you are recognized.

Mr. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

One of the challenges we have is trying to figure out an idea that we want to have here in Washington and then you—by the time the idea gets down to our local districts, as you have suggested, the money gets caught up in bureaucracy and red tape. And another consideration we have is a teenager, even if there is overlap, if you have got a job—a summer job program a teenager is only going to get one job so the fact that there may be overlap in programs isn't much of a problem.

Can you tell us what we can do with the money we are spending to enhance the number of young people who have summer jobs?

Mr. DODARO. Let me ask Andy to come to the table and talk about that, Congressman.

Mr. SHERRILL. One of the areas we looked at under our Recovery Act work was the WIA Summer Youth Employment program, and what we found there was that states really—well, states had a very short time to gear up because Congress did emphasize the importance of providing summer youth employment. It was, in general, a success story. Most of the states we visited and analyzed were able—and some states hadn't previously had summer youth programs—most were able to quickly ramp up and serve a lot of additional youth with their summer youth programs.

Mr. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA. So with the money that we provided an appropriate number of youth actually got jobs?

Mr. SHERRILL. In some cases they weren't able to meet the entire demand at some places. In other places they had trouble finding enough youth to sort of—that they wanted to serve. But what we heard sort of in most places was that people thought that was a very useful program for serving youth.

Mr. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA. Was there any overlap or any bureaucratic red tape between Washington and the youth actually getting a job?

Mr. SHERRILL. I mean, part of one of the issues we found was that Department of Labor—in fact, we recommended—needed to provide more guidance in terms of the outcomes expected for the youth program, in terms of sort of the guidance, because we found that what states were measuring in terms of skill attainment for the youth, the way they were measuring it kind of across the board didn't easily allow you to tell—sort of to assess the gains across localities and states. So we recommended that Department of Labor provide more guidance in this area and pay attention to that issue.

Mr. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA. Okay. I noticed that you have a lot of overlap in programs to enhance teacher quality. Again, even though they may overlap, each teacher will presumably only get one program. Can you tell us how we are doing on teacher quality?

Mr. DODARO. I will ask George Scott to come up and elaborate, but we do have an example in our testimony about how one individual teacher could get several different assistance over a period of their career. So it is possible for one teacher to get aid under multiple programs that may or may not be duplicative. It might be quite appropriate in some circumstances.

Mr. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA. But that could be a good thing, that they would learn a lot of different things.

Mr. DODARO. Right. But again, it will only be known if there is evaluation done of these programs, which, in many cases, is not happening. But let me ask George to elaborate.

Mr. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA. And is the answer to the problem evaluation or is the problem red tape getting the program from idea in Washington to on the ground in our districts?

Mr. SCOTT. The issue we have highlighted is the lack of rigorous evaluation of many of these programs. As the Comptroller General mentioned, there are instances where teachers, under either the Elementary and Secondary Education Act or under the Higher Education Act, can qualify for various teacher quality programs throughout their career. That is not where the problem is.

From our perspective, one of the key issues is it is not clear based on the limited number of evaluations that the Department of Education has conducted, you know, to what extent are those programs achieving their stated objective? And so from our perspective, that is really why it is really important to hold the department accountable for ensuring that in addition to rolling out these programs that there is some evaluation component built in so that at the end of the day we have a clear picture of whether these programs are achieving their intended objective.

Mr. DODARO. I think basically, Congressman, also, in the department's justification for consolidating the 38 programs into 11 they point out that, I think, they think the problem is both, that there is a lot of effort and time that goes into evaluating these competi-

tive grant programs that could be better spent focusing on programs that have a proven track record, and that is part of their justification for the consolidation.

Chairman KLINE. Thank you.

Mrs. Roby, you are recognized.

Mrs. ROBY. Thank you, Mr. Dodaro, for being here. I appreciate your testimony and your willingness to answer our questions.

On page 141 of the report it mentioned that some states have colocated the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, employment, and training services in one-stop centers where employment services and the Workforce Investment Act Adult Services are provided. Additionally, three states, as stated in the report—Florida, Texas, and Utah—have consolidated the agencies that administer these programs, and state officials said that this reduced cost and improved services.

Could you just expand further on how either colocating services or consolidating agencies can improve the services and what kind of improvements we might expect to see?

Mr. DODARO. Yes. That is a very good question. I will let Andy explain the details.

Mr. SHERRILL. On the colocation theme, part of what we found in our work—previous work on WIA—is that provides an opportunities for different program partners to do things like cross-training staff, have common intake processes, share computer systems, sort of provide services more efficiently and sort of have a more common face for the people coming through, a single plan for the person, that kind of thing. So it provides opportunities for better serving customers.

On the three states that we—Utah, Texas, and Florida—that had consolidated their state welfare and workforce agencies, they basically told us that this had—in their view, has allowed them to save some administrative costs and better serve people, as well. But as we have said here, there is not a lot known about this.

You know, what were the challenges? What were the results? What were the approaches that they used? What are the remaining issues to doing those kinds of initiatives?

So that is where we think there can be more focus.

Mrs. ROBY. Right. And I guess, to add on to that, I mean, I think you said earlier in your testimony that 23 of the—there are 44 out of 47 that have been identified, but 23 of them haven't been evaluated at all as it relates to the administrative efficiencies, but of the programs that have been evaluated, are there any performance measurements to show that they actually result in individuals finding jobs faster or securing jobs at higher pay? Has any of this been looked at?

Mr. DODARO. Yes. There are some limited studies. I will ask Andy to elaborate on them. There are two that we know of. They are not generalizable to the entire population but they do provide some insight into people gaining employment that leads to a higher income.

Mrs. ROBY. Okay.

Mr. SHERRILL. Right. Both of these studies—one in 2008, one in 2005—were impact evaluations of the Workforce Investment Act Adult and Dislocated Worker programs that—one of them, I think,

was 12 states; another was in seven states. Both found that the program had positive impacts compared to other sort of similar populations where they did statistical data-matching.

So people coming through the WIA—these WIA programs tended to have higher getting into jobs, like one of them found receiving any WIA services in these two programs was generally—result in a 10 percent gain in sort of—10 percentage point gain in entering employment, so getting into jobs more. They also found sort of increases in people's earnings achieved as well, compared to the comparisons group they had. So some positive impacts.

Mrs. ROBY. Thank you so much.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman KLINE. Thank you.

Ms. Woolsey, you are recognized.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And my apologies for not being here during your testimony, and I may be somewhat repetitive. But I am definitely concerned that if we were to consolidate all the programs that you studied, and maybe—which is four more, you are recommending, than the department has recommended—I am really worried about how it would affect the quality of our education system.

And would there actually be a net positive in terms of bringing more efficiencies, or would it just leave teachers and students who receive federal assistance hanging because all of a sudden there are fewer programs and less funding and they are all competing for the—out of the same pot?

This is, like, three questions. Here is the third: Isn't it reasonable to believe that new programs have been added over time to cover areas not included in the existing programs, and how will we ensure that those programs don't get left out?

Mr. DODARO. I will ask George to elaborate a little bit, but it is clear that programs have been added over time to fill what is a perceived need or a gap in particular services. But what we have observed in looking at programs over time, after a period of time the original intent of the program can change over a period of time and there needs to be careful monitoring to make sure that it actually achieved what it did.

Right now one of our messages is that in many of these programs we really don't know whether they are achieving their original objectives or not in the first place. Now, there is a danger of unintended consequences. If you do change those programs or consolidate in some way it may have unintended consequences, but unless the department clearly monitors what is going on and provides feedback to the Congress we won't know whether these programs either serve their intended purpose or what the revised purpose will be that the Congress sets for itself.

There are safeguards that could be put into the programs to make sure—Congress could give the Education Department, for example, some additional flexibility if something goes wrong. There could be more flexibility given to the state and local governments as well to be able to deal with those issues.

So I think there are possibilities for consolidation while building in appropriate safeguards that guard against unintended consequences. But let me ask George to elaborate.

Ms. WOOLSEY. So, George, while you are elaborating, tell me what that safeguard would look like or sound like.

Mr. SCOTT. As our work has pointed out, there is a mix of programs across a range of agencies, including both specific programs as well as allowable activities, and our message here has been, you know, while clearly, you know, these programs are serving—can serve similar target populations, can provide similar types of assistance, can even have very similar objectives, but what that does is it raises a couple challenges.

One is that it really complicates efforts—and we have heard this from the Department of Education—it really complicates efforts to effectively administer these programs in the comprehensive manner across—not only within the department, but across other federal agencies. That is why it is important that to the extent that there can be a higher level of strategic planning about some of these activities—for example, as the Congress did with Competes Act, it really sort of allows agencies to look outside of themselves and look across the other—to similar activities across the federal government.

That could be, for example, one of the safeguards we can build into these other programs to ensure that their folks are ensuring that the programs are reaching the target populations.

One of the other challenges that the Department of Education has raised, and we certainly concur with, is that by having such broadly fragmented programs it makes it very difficult to understand and to evaluate which programs work and which are not. Out of the 23-plus programs that we looked at back in 2009 only about six of them have completed evaluations. And the bottom line from those evaluations was little is known about how effective these programs are.

So clearly, you know, it creates problems or challenges for the Department of Education as well as for the grantees, in terms of having to apply for these grants.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Well, were there any programs that you thought had legitimate reason for overlap? I mean, could you——

Mr. SCOTT. Well, as we said, you know, out of the 82 programs we looked at—we looked at those specifically within the Department of Education—we found that 14 of those actually overlapped with at least one other program across a couple key areas—similar objectives, target populations, activities, and services. We did not, however, find the duplication, which is sort of doing the exact same thing for the exact same target group.

So we are very careful in terms of how we phrase what we found in terms of the teacher quality programs.

Ms. WOOLSEY. So out of 80 there was 14?

Mr. SCOTT. Fourteen of the programs within the Department of Education. There were 63 programs administered by the Department of Education, and out of those we found 14 overlapped.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Okay. Thank you very much.

Chairman KLINE. Thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. Noem, you are recognized.

Mrs. NOEM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you for coming today, Mr. Dodaro. And I appreciate your testimony and your willingness to be here, and your explanations as well.

You know, your report is very comprehensive and I appreciate that. I think it has, unfortunately, confirmed a lot of the public's sentiments, that a lot of what we do at the federal government level is fragmented and duplicative, and frankly, we can't keep track of what we do ourselves. So I thank you for that report.

I also wanted to talk to you a little bit specifically, because I represent the state of South Dakota—the entire state—which is filled with rural, small schools. And so I know that there are a lot of challenges that they face because they have very small staff, they have difficulty complying with the different requirements between different programs and keeping them straight, between agencies and departments.

And so I would like you to tell me a little bit of, do you feel that this duplication puts small schools and rural schools at a disadvantage in trying to comply and qualify for a lot of these different programs in order to receive possible funding or assistance?

Mr. DODARO. Well, what we have found over time—and George can talk specifically in the education area to your question about the small schools—but it is difficult for a lot of people to identify what federal funding is available, how to foresee—to achieve that funding, how to write a good grant application to be competitive in that area.

So it does put a burden on entities that are applying for assistance, and that was one of the things that we thought could be looked at in this particular case to streamline that. In fact, that is one of the reasons that the Education Department puts forth its consolidation proposal is to eliminate some of that competitive grant kind of process and allow its employees to focus more on improving teacher quality and outcomes——

Mrs. NOEM. But competitive grants would also create that same problem for rural schools that maybe don't have a staff that are used to writing grants, as well.

Mr. DODARO. Right. Well, but you would be able to—yes, right, you would be able to free up resources that are consumed through administrative processes competing for small amounts of money to be able to look at it in a broader standpoint and to give more flexibility to the local officials to meet their needs, which is, I think, an important tenet of the program.

But let me see if George has anything to add.

Mrs. NOEM. Okay.

Mr. SCOTT. Sure. We have not yet specifically looked at this issue of the capacity—basically it is a capacity issue—of states or LEAs. We do have a couple ongoing reviews, but I think we will touch on that issue.

We have work going on looking at both Race to the Top, the competitive large federal grant—competitive grant program, as well as state improvement grants. And so we are out in the states, and so we will be able to provide here this summer some—a better picture of some of the challenges. And the Comptroller General has already, you know, laid out what we have heard generally about the

capacity of certain states in terms of competitive grants, but we will have more specific information on that this summer.

Mrs. NOEM. Okay. I will look forward to that.

You know, Mr. Dodaro, one more question: I know that the Federal Tea Taster was abolished already, but in your view, after putting this report together, what do you feel is the most wasteful or duplicative program that you found when you were putting this together?

Mr. DODARO. Well, there are a lot to look at. I don't have any personal favorites.

There are some, though, that we were able to put some dollar savings on, which I think are really important. Like, for example, in the Social Security program state and local workers that aren't in the program, their spouses—the Social Security offsets if somebody is receiving another government pension, they don't have, really, the information from the state and local level to be able to offset those pensions. If IRS put one line on one form to be able to collect that information it is estimated by CBO the federal government could save $2.4 billion to $2.9 billion every 10 years if we collect more information.

There is also $640 billion that has been sitting for 10 years in the customs service of an additional duty that was imposed, and really, nobody has determined what the proper use of that money would be. We recommend a look at the duplication between the Ethanol Tax Credit and the Renewable Fuel Standard and basically say, "We don't believe you need both at this point in time," and if you reduced the tax credit last value was about $5.7 billion in amount of money that could be saved.

And so we also point out that there could be more competition in federal contracts. About 30 percent of those contracts aren't competed or there is only one person competing it, and where there have been competition the federal government's costs go down through that activity.

We point out the oil and gas revenue management. We just added that to our high-risk list. And we don't believe there is reasonable assurance the federal government is getting its value for oil that is produced on federally leased lands and that, you know, a lot more money could be achieved through that process.

So that is just a sampling.

Mrs. NOEM. That is a good list. Thank you. Appreciate it.

Mr. DODARO. Thank you.

Chairman KLINE. Thank you.

Dr. Heck?

Mr. HECK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, General Dodaro. I am appreciative for your thoughtful and candid comments and the very thorough and knowledgeable preparation of your staff. It is a pleasure to have you here.

In the report in March it states that overlap and fragmentation among government programs or activities can be harbingers of unnecessary duplication. Reducing or eliminating duplication, overlap, or fragmentation could potentially save billions of tax dollars annually.

And then in the March 18th letter to congressional addressees it was stated that determining whether and to what extent these programs are actually duplicative requires programmatic information that is often not readily available.

I recently introduced a resolution that would require Congress to proactively list any duplicative programs as part of the committee process prior to authorizing a new program. Would that help GAO better track and highlight duplication and overlap of programs? And what, in your opinion, could Congress do better?

We can always talk about what is out there now, but what can we do moving forward to prevent this from happening? What can we do better to avoid these pitfalls in the future?

Mr. DODARO. That is a very good issue. In fact, I was testifying before the Senate Budget Committee and they asked me the exact same question.

I think, you know, having something going forward that involves some sort of an analysis about a new program proposal to make sure it doesn't duplicate or overlap something that already exists would be a very good process for the Congress to incorporate into its deliberations and decision making. That function could be performed by OMB or CBO. Some have suggested GAO as another alternative for that.

And so I think that that is just a prudent approach to be able to do it. Like, right now there are cost estimates of CBO about what it costs to implement new legislation. I think having some safeguard in place—or at least informing the Congress—and it may decide to proceed for very valid reasons in any event, but I think having that information is better than not.

Chairman KLINE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Walberg?

Mr. Ross?

Mr. ROSS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate that.

You know, I want to focus on workforce because I think that is rather important. I mean, we have been up here talking about jobs and I think that the federal government doesn't have a responsibility for creating private sector jobs but I think it has a responsibility for creating the environment and making sure, of course, that we have programs out there that will train and provide the qualifications necessary for people to find sustainable private sector employment.

And I see in your report where three states, one of which is mine—Florida, Texas, and Utah—have gone a step further by consolidating, but you can't determine what the savings is from that. Now, the reason for consolidating—are there any federal incentives in these programs to consolidate the resources?

Mr. DODARO. Not enough. That was our recommendation. Our recommendation was that the federal agencies should provide more incentives to the states.

I think, no, the states and the locals are closer to the ground. They understand the populations they are serving. They have their own individual arrangements within each state.

And so, you know, we think there ought to be more incentives. And that was one of the concerns I had when HHS said that they can't provide it legislatively under the TANF program. I think that

they should make a proposal and Congress should give them the flexibility to be able to do that. But I——

Mr. ROSS. Any idea what incentives you would suggest to encourage them to do that?

Mr. DODARO. Yes. Well, there are pilot activities that could be made. There is some freedom from administrative requirements that could be put in place.

There are a lot of incentives, and if they consult the state and local governments I bet they will get a longer list.

Mr. ROSS. I think you are right.

With regard to the 47 programs that you identified, would it be safe to say, however, that there are other state programs, as Mr. Bucshon was talking about, that may also receive federal funding that were not included in this?

Mr. DODARO. Let me ask Andy if he knows that.

Mr. ROSS. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. SHERRILL. That is possible. I mean, we focused for this on federally funded programs, so we didn't look to see whether there are also state-funded programs that might also be providing similar services.

Mr. ROSS. What about appropriations that may go through the educational system—say, like, into community colleges for their workforce or reemployment programs? Is that included as part of the 47 or is that something different?

Mr. SHERRILL. No. Those weren't included as part of the 47. I mean, Department of Labor has done certain grant programs in the past to provide sort of high-growth job initiatives, that kind of thing.

Mr. ROSS. So in essence, there could be significantly more duplication than just what was found by the 47 if you take into account not only those 47 programs but also educational programs through the Department of Education as well as any state programs that may receive federal funding?

Mr. SHERRILL. It is possible. I mean, we did focus on federally funded programs that have a primary focus on employment and training, which we defined as enhancing the skills—the job-related skills of workers, identifying job opportunities, and helping people find a job.

Mr. ROSS. Thank you.

Mr. Dodaro, you——

Mr. DODARO. Yes. I do want to look at that down the road.

Mr. ROSS. Thank you. I appreciate that.

Mr. DODARO. We do a lot of work with the state auditors, and I think we can have a joint effort to look at that program. I think that makes a lot of sense.

Mr. ROSS. Thank you. I commend you on what you are doing, and I yield back.

Mr. MILLER. Would the gentleman from Florida just yield for 1 second?

Mr. ROSS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MILLER. Just to follow up on his questions, in the case of WIA, though, at least it appears to me at the local level that some of that money is used—he was talking about community colleges, and when employer and community colleges and people sit down

and some of that money is used to develop a program—they may have a need because of a new employer or somebody coming and talking. And so would that be duplicative or is that—you know, because the community college is now——

Mr. SHERRILL. No. I think that would be typically included in the kinds of WIA Adult and Dislocated Worker programs where, you know, they would work with contractors or community colleges to provide training for people——

Mr. MILLER. So the make-up is they might shift—it might, you know, in one case Dow Chemical is doing all of the training themselves; in another case they have outsourced that to the community colleges because they wanted a broader spectrum of training. But the introduction of different parties doesn't necessarily make that a duplicative effort?

Mr. SHERRILL. No. No.

Mr. MILLER. Okay.

Thank you. I yield back.

Mrs. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, could I make a quick comment in relation to what Mr. Miller said?

Chairman KLINE. If Dr. DesJarlais will yield to you, which I now recognize him.

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Actually, I don't really have any questions, so I would be happy to yield my time to Congresswoman Foxx.

Mrs. FOXX. Thank you.

I just wanted to tell Mr. Miller that in my experiences as a community college president we did work with folks who were running WIA programs, but in many cases there were three or four layers of administration, and it appeared as though the WIA programs were funding unnecessary and duplicative administrative structures in various committees across the district and across the state.

In many cases the community college was doing all of the work, basically, but other agencies were skimming off as much as 30 percent of the money that was being provided, and all that was doing was paying for administrators in those agencies. And I think it is a real issue that needs to be looked at.

Mr. MILLER. If the gentlewoman would yield just for a second, and that may be the case. I guess my experience, I think—I guess I would say in my area that was more likely to be the case 10 years ago.

What I find now is as they sit down on a regular basis—the education institutions and the employers and representatives of local government—they basically make a decision, how are they going to farm this project out? And then that entity, in the case of community colleges or a single employer or a group of employers who share the same need—I have a lot of heavy manufacturing in my district—they then take the responsibility for that.

One of the reasons I was kind of down on WIA as they had an opportunity to reauthorize it because I still had concerns about kind of a heavy overhead in a lot of instances.

Mr. SHERRILL. One of the ongoing studies we have in this area that we think might shed some light is to look at WIA one-stop locations that experts view as having promising practices as really bringing in multiple partners, economic development and others, and to really collaborate in new ways. So this is part of what we

are doing currently and I think this should yield some examples of ways that are doing this in promising ways.

Chairman KLINE. I forget whose time it is, but I think, Dr. DesJarlais, if you are yielding back, Mr. Barletta, you are recognized.

Mr. BARLETTA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, Mr. Dodaro, for testifying today.

Yesterday I met with two middle school principals from Northeastern Pennsylvania who suggested that teacher quality programs should consider school administrators or those individuals who actually hire and evaluate teachers. Do any of these teacher quality programs consider school administrators or educational leaders that actually do the hiring?

Mr. DODARO. We will provide you an answer for the record. I don't know offhand. It is a good question, and I will get you an answer.

Mr. BARLETTA. Just a follow up: Can you identify how the fragmentation and duplication of federal programs impacts states, school districts, and school administrators and how do they impact students?

Mr. DODARO. Yes. Our evaluation did not go down to that level of granularity. We were just looking at the federal level and coordinating it. I think ultimately if some of these consolidations go through that the department is looking at we can then do follow-up studies and to see if we can identify some additional areas.

But I can tell you from evaluating federal programs that are administered at state and local level for many years, state and local governments appreciate greater flexibility and being able to use the funds to meet what their local needs are. And that could work effectively as long as there are good accountability mechanisms in place. But we will try to focus on that in the future.

Mr. BARLETTA. Thank you. And to go back to the original question, if they do not—if these teacher quality programs do not—I believe they should. I think it makes sense to include those that are actually doing the hiring.

Mr. DODARO. And the administrators and the hiring—yes, we will get you a quick answer.

Mr. BARLETTA. Okay. Thank you.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KLINE. I thank the gentleman.

I think all Members have had an opportunity to ask a question. I obviously want to thank the Comptroller General.

I will yield to Mr. Miller for any closing remarks he has.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for having this hearing, again.

And I just wanted to follow up a little bit on what Congresswoman Noem talked about, and we have had this discussion a little bit on the—for rural areas, these small pots of money you really have to raise the question of whether or not it is worth the cost of applying for those monies.

And one of the things we are trying to look at in reauthorization is the consolidation with allowable uses, and they can make the determination how they want to use that professional development money within the guidelines, but have that kind of flexibility.

But if they got something it would be worth applying for. I guess we have kind of come to that stage for a number of different reasons.

And so we have tried to think about this in rural areas because it is starting to make less and less sense, and yet could they acquire the services, the resources to do that it would probably help improve the educational experience in that district. But a lot of times that district, you know, is not very big. There is one school and not a lot of alternatives.

So I just want to say that I think what we are looking at in reauthorization—I guess I am making a commercial for reauthorization—is this kind of—these kinds of changes that we would look to adopt in terms of both flexibility and consolidation, so it would make sense for—I think it would make—the same case can be made even for large urban districts, in terms of how we—funds are segregated back and forth.

Mr. DODARO. I agree with you. And that is one of the reasons we were raising the issues we were, to stimulate that type of discussion and debate, Congressman, so I think it makes sense.

Mr. MILLER. Let me just raise one other point: As I understand the authorization under which this report—the big report—is done, department and government report annually to the Congress the findings, including the cost of duplication and recommendations for consolidation and elimination. Is there a follow-on to this initial report where——

Mr. DODARO. There will be one—the legislation requires an annual report, so we will be doing one every year. I am hoping that we will cover—the first three reports will cover the entire federal government and then I will be able to work with the people who authorize that legislation. It was initially sponsored by Senator Coburn——

Mr. MILLER. Right.

Mr. DODARO [continuing]. And to see if it makes sense for us to do it—keep doing it in perpetuity. Right now, yes, there will be a report every year.

Mr. MILLER. But in this report—I am sort of suggesting two things. One is, you didn't find duplication, but yet if you had found outright duplication as opposed to overlap or shared missions or whatever they call it, would you then be making—in the future would you be making a recommendation with—for consolidation and elimination?

Mr. DODARO. We could. If we have the necessary work done we would present some options to the Congress, yes.

And one of the things I would suggest for this committee, if there are areas that you would like us to look at and incorporate into our future work in this area we would be more than happy to do so. Actually, the 81 areas that I mentioned in this first report were really done as part of work for well over a third of the committees in both the House and the Senate over a period of time, and so we just built off of that work, created some new work. But we would, and some areas where we are doing that.

We were also trying to get ahead of—you know, not waiting for duplication to occur——

Mr. MILLER. No, I understand.

Mr. DODARO. Yes, and so, but we would be happy to entertain areas that this committee thinks are important to look at and incorporate into our work.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KLINE. I thank the gentleman.

And this is one of those committees, and sometimes we agree on other sides of the aisle, and occasionally Mr. Miller and I exactly agree. And it happens rarely, and so we try to make note of it.

But I identify with his comments about the difficulties that, again, Mrs. Noem raised of rural schools, and these programs that are very small, and you indicated that some of them haven't been even evaluated; they are too small and people don't bother with it.

And the small schools don't have the—maybe some of these school districts are one school, and they simply can't. They simply can't find people to put in grant applications and so forth. So we are looking for much more flexibility and consolidation.

And I appreciate the plea or advertisement for reauthorization. We are moving on reauthorization on a number of fronts, and one of them—obviously ESEA is in front of us, but WIA is in front of us.

And again, I want to thank you very much for coming in, for the really terrific work that you do. And I know it is a lot of work and there is a temptation, which we apparently can't resist, to keep tasking you to do more working. And I heard you volunteering to do more work, so probably more will be coming your way.

So again, thank you very much to our guests and to our witnesses and to my colleagues. There being no further business, the committee stands adjourned.

[The statement of Mr. Rokita follows:]

**Prepared Statement of Hon. Todd Rokita, a Representative in Congress From the State of Indiana**

Thank you Mr. Chairman. We are here today to address a very important issue—the continued spending of money that our Country does not have. As a member of the House Budget Committee, I have spent the past few months working with our colleagues on ways to rein in Washington's out of control spending problem. The issue we have before seems to me to be a very strong step forward—eliminate those programs our government is spending money on that are duplicative, wasteful, and ineffective.

As a new Member of Congress, I have already learned that the rules in Washington are stacked in favor of people who want to spend more money. I come from the great state of Indiana—we have a balanced budget, triple-A bond rating, and we have not raised taxes because we know taxes are not the problem. The problem is our colleagues who continue to push for more government spending knowing that our debt is over $14 trillion and climbing.

The U.S. borrows 42 cents of every dollar it spends. When the Federal government borrows money, we are passing along a tax increase to our children and grandchildren. In fact, I call it a "birth tax" because every baby born today owes $45,000 as his share of the public's debt. Moreover, every taxpayer alone owes $127,000 of the debt.

Recently, the Government Accountability Office released a report entitled "Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue." We have always known that waste exists, this report quantifies it. According to the report, billions of dollars are being squandered on redundant programs and many of these programs are managed by multiple agencies only adding to the confusion and waste. In our current economic situation, how can we ignore this data?

I appreciate the first steps the Administration took by identifying 13 programs to eliminate and 38 more for consolidation. However, this does not come close to what

needs to be done. In the GAO report alone, 82 programs are identified as being focused on teacher quality. Can anyone honestly tell me that all 82 are necessary and have been proven effective? It is time for us to rein in our spending problem, put taxpayer dollars to work where they can be most effective, and reduce the regulatory burden imposed on states and school districts.

I refuse to leave the next generation less freedom and a lower standard of living—and that is what we continue to do by keeping the status quo.

---

[Additional submissions from the GAO follow:]

**Employment and Training Programs That Have Shown Positive Results**

As part of GAO's recent study of multiple employment and training programs, we conducted a survey of federal agency officials and asked them to identify impact studies that had been completed since 2004 to assess program performance with respect to employment and training activities.[1] An impact study assesses the net effect of a program by comparing program outcomes with an estimate of what would have happened in the absence of the program. This type of study is conducted when external factors are known to influence the program outcomes, in order to isolate the program's contribution to the achievement of its objectives. Of the 8 studies cited by survey respondents, we determined that 5 can accurately be described as completed impact studies. These studies found that 4 programs had positive impacts on participant outcomes.

*1. Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Adult (Labor)*

Study citation: Carolyn J. Heinrich, Peter R. Mueser, and Kenneth R. Troske, Workforce Investment Act Nonexperimental Net Impact Evaluation, Final Report, a report prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor (December 2008).

Study design and scope: Quasi-experimental design (used a closely matched comparison group rather than a randomly assigned control group). Examined outcomes for 95,580 WIA Adult participants and compared them to outcomes for matched comparison group members selected from a pool of nearly 3 million individuals who had similar demographic characteristics but either did not receive WIA Adult services or did not receive WIA Adult training. Examined the impact of the programs on average earnings and employment using 16 quarters (4 years) of wage record data from 12 states, starting with the quarter in which the participant entered the program (between July 2003 and June 2005). Findings are not generalizable.

Findings: The program had positive impacts on average earnings and employment up to 4 years after participant entry. Longer term impacts for participants receiving training were greater than for those receiving core and intensive services. Impacts were generally larger for women than for men. The authors caution that the impact estimates are averages, and differences across states were substantial.

*2. WIA Dislocated Worker (Labor)*

Study citation: Carolyn J. Heinrich, Peter R. Mueser, and Kenneth R. Troske, Workforce Investment Act Nonexperimental Net Impact Evaluation, Final Report, a report prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor (December 2008).

Study design and scope: Quasi-experimental design (used a closely matched comparison group rather than a randomly assigned control group). Examined outcomes for 63,515 WIA Dislocated Worker participants and compared them to outcomes for matched comparison group members selected from a pool of nearly 3 million individuals who had similar demographic characteristics but either did not receive WIA Dislocated Worker services or did not receive WIA Dislocated Worker training. Examined the impact of the programs on average earnings and employment using 16 quarters (4 years) of wage record data from 12 states, starting with the quarter in which the participant entered the program (between July 2003 and June 2005). Findings are not generalizable.

Findings: For participants receiving core and intensive services, the program had positive impacts on their average earnings and employment, although these impacts were smaller than the impacts for WIA Adult participants and took several quarters to materialize. Impacts were generally more positive for employment than for earnings. The authors caution that there was uncertainty about the causes for the impacts that they found. They also caution that the impact estimates are averages, and differences across states were substantial.

---

[1] GAO, Multiple Employment and Training Programs: Providing Information on Colocating Services and Consolidating Administrative Structures Could Promote Efficiencies, GAO-11-92 (Washington, D.C.: January 13, 2011).

*3. National Guard Youth Challenge Program (Defense)*

Study citation: Dan Bloom, Alissa Gardenhire-Crooks and Conrad Mandsager, Reengaging High School Dropouts—Early Results of the National Guard Youth ChalleNGe Program Evaluation (MDRC, 2009).

Study design and scope: Experimental design (used a randomly assigned control group). Examined outcomes for program participants in 10 states and compared them to outcomes for youth who applied and were eligible to participate in the program but were not invited to participate because there were too few slots available. About 3,000 youth were assigned to either the experimental or the control group in 2005-2006. About 1,000 youth in each group completed a brief survey approximately 9 months after they entered the study (the survey did not target all study participants; the response rate among those targeted was 85 percent).

Findings: The program had short-term positive impacts on participants' education (high school diploma/GED receipt), employment, mental health, and criminal activity (lower arrest rates) in the first year of participation. However, since participants had not yet completed the program, it is too early to say whether the program will have positive, long-term impacts such as increased earnings.

*4. Reintegration of Ex-Offenders (Labor)*

Study citation: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, In Search of Evidence-Based Practice in Juvenile Corrections: An Evaluation of Florida's Avon Park Youth Academy and STREET Smart Program, a report prepared for the U.S. Department of Justice and the U.S Department of Labor (September 2009).

Study design and scope: Experimental design (used a randomly assigned control group). Examined outcomes for 369 program participants and compared them to outcomes for 345 youth assigned to the control group. Youth in both groups had similar characteristics including criminal history and demographics. Youth were randomly assigned to one of these groups between June 2002 and February 2003, and then participated in residential programs between June 2002 and May 2005. After these youth were released to the community, about 67 percent of them participated in a series of post-release interviews over a period of several years.

Findings: The program had short-term positive impacts on participants' employment, earnings, and recidivism in the first year after release from a juvenile corrections facility, but these impacts were not sustained for all participants during the second and third years after release. Positive impacts on employment and recidivism were sustained for Hispanic youth in the second and third years after release.

---

**Teacher Quality Programs That Have Shown Positive Results**

Based on our review of outcome and impact evaluations of teacher quality programs administered by the Department of Education (Education), GAO identified two studies that found positive results for two programs: Early Reading First Program and Teacher Quality Partnership Grants Program.[1]

*1. Early Reading First Program (Education)*

Study citation: National Evaluation of Early Reading First: Final Report to Congress, a report prepared by U.S. Department of Education, Decision Information Resources, Inc., Mathematica Policy Research, and Center for Improving the Readiness of Children for Learning and Education (May 2007).

Study design and scope: The purpose of this national impact evaluation of the Early Reading First (ERF) program to assess the impact of ERF funding and program support for preschools on the language and literacy preparedness of preschool children. In particular, it was designed to measure the effects on children's language development and emergent literacy when preschools receive funding to adopt scientifically based methods and materials and teachers are provided with focused professional development that supports the use of these materials and methods. The evaluation sample was composed of a treatment group, which consisted of 4-year-olds attending preschool in 28 of 30 ERF grantee sites, whereas the comparison group consisted of children attending preschool in 37 of the 67 unfunded applicant sites that had the highest application scores and that agreed to participate in the study. The study team randomly selected approximately 11 4-year-old students per classroom whose parents had provided written consent for participation in the

[1] Outcome evaluations assess the extent to which a program achieves its outcome-oriented objectives, but may also assess program processes to understand how outcomes are produced. Impact evaluations use scientific research methods to assess the net effect of a program by comparing program outcomes with an estimate of what would have happened in the absence of the program.

study. ERF participants appeared to be more disadvantaged than the national average according to a number of demographic factors, including family income level, single-parent household status, among other factors. They also scored lower than national norms on three standardized assessments.

Findings: The evaluation found that the program had positive, statistically significant impacts on several classroom and teacher outcomes and one of four child outcomes measured, including the following areas:

- Classroom environments and teacher practices: classroom language environment; book-reading practices; materials and teaching practices to support print and letter knowledge and writing, among other areas.
- Teacher outcomes: number of hours of professional development that teachers received and on the use of mentoring as a mode of training.
- Classroom quality: quality of teacher-child interactions; classroom organization; activity planning.
- Child outcomes: Children's print and letter knowledge.

Limitations: The design of this study was based on the assumption that the grant application score fully reflects the selection rule Education used to award ERF grants. Furthermore, the authors of the report noted several limitations of their sub-group analysis that meant that they could not draw conclusions about the program's effectiveness for the groups considered.[2]

*2. Teacher Quality Partnership Grants (Education)*

Study citation: Partnerships for Reform: Changing Teacher Preparation Through the Title II HEA Partnership Program (Final Report), a report prepared by American Institutes for Research and SRI International for U.S. Department of Education (May 2006).

Study design and scope: The purpose of this outcome evaluation was to identify and describe the collaborative activities taking place in partnerships under the Title II Partnership Grants Program. It was also designed to examine approaches to preparing new and veteran teachers and to assess the sustainability of project activities after the grant ends. Specifically, the evaluation surveyed nearly 300 representatives from 25 grantees of the 1999 cohort of the partnership grants, including at least 66 colleges and universities, 28 community colleges, 179 school districts, and 821 elementary schools in more than 25 different states. More than 500 principals were surveyed once, during the 2002—03 school year. The study also included secondary data analyses using publicly available data on school characteristics, school-level achievement data, and pass rates on teacher assessments reported as part of the Title II HEA reporting requirements. Five diverse projects were the subject of case studies that included repeated week-long visits.

Findings: The evaluation found that the program had certain positive outcomes, such as enhanced collaboration between colleges/universities and schools around teacher preparation; a shared focus on the accountability concerns of the HEA Title II; and increased requirements for teachers entering and exiting teacher preparation programs.

Limitations: The analytic sample for this study had several sources for potential bias, including survey- and item-level nonresponse (across and within partnerships). Nonresponse bias, which includes issues of missing data, nonrespondent bias and the potential for selection bias must be considered when interpreting the survey results presented in this study. Furthermore, this evaluation could not determine with precision the extent to which the partnership program alone was responsible for any of the measured outcomes. For example, the report authors indicated that some partners had multiple grants and projects operating simultaneously, sometimes with shared goals, making it difficult to separate the effects of these efforts from those of the teacher quality partnerships.

---

[2] Examples of sub-groups they analyzed included teachers with and without a bachelor's degree; teachers with five or more years of teaching experience and teachers with fewer years of experience; whether the preschool received Head Start funding; and whether the preschool offered full-time or part-time classes.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS THAT SUPPORT TEACHER QUALITY AND ALLOW FUNDS TO BE USED FOR ACTIVITIES AIMED AT IMPROVING THE PERFORMANCE OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

| CFDA No. | Program |
|---|---|
| 84.010 | Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies |
| 84.048 | Career and Technical Education—Basic Grants to States |
| 84.083 | Women's Educational Equity Act Program |
| 84.101 | Career and Technical Education—Grants to Native Americans and Alaska Natives |
| 84.165 | Magnet Schools Assistance |
| 84.206 | Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education Grant Program |
| 84.256 | Freely Associated States—Education Grant Program |
| 84.283 | Comprehensive Centers |
| 84.299B | Indian Education Professional Development Grants |
| 84.336B | Teacher Quality Partnership Grants |
| 84.363 | School Leadership |
| 84.367 | Improving Teacher Quality State Grants |
| 84.374 | Teacher Incentive Fund |
| 84.377 | School Improvement Grants |

Note: This is a preliminary list based on a review of information provided in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) and the Department of Education documents. We interpreted the authority for these purposes broadly, but did not verify our interpretation with the Department of Education. Therefore, the list may be incomplete and some of the programs may not be targeted to providing services to school administrators or principals.

---

[Letter, dated April 22, 2011, from Secretary Solis follows:]

**SECRETARY OF LABOR**
**WASHINGTON**

APR 22 2011

The Honorable John Kline
Chairman
Committee on Education and the Workforce
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-6100

Re: DOL *Letter for the Record* of the April 6, 2011, hearing of the House Education and the Workforce Committee on *Streamlining Federal Education and Workforce Programs.*

Dear Chairman Kline:

We have reviewed the Government Accountability Office's (GAO) testimony entitled "*Opportunities to Reduce Fragmentation, Overlap, and Potential Duplication in Federal Teacher Quality and Employment and Training Programs,*" presented before your Committee on April 6, 2011, in which GAO highlighted three options for Congressional consideration. We appreciate the opportunity to provide a formal response for the record to explain the Department of Labor's (DOL) efforts to ensure effectiveness of our employment and training programs by responding to each of GAO's proposed options.

Before we respond to the GAO, however, we want to shed light on the important role the public workforce investment system serves in workforce development. Even at a time of slow private sector job growth, over 7.2 million program exiters[1] entered employment upon the completion of Wagner Peyser (employment service) and/or Workforce Investment Act (WIA) funded employment and training services.

Performance data for the programs suggest that training can help get participants back to work. For the 12-month period ending June 30, 2010, the entered employment rate for WIA Adult program exiters who received training was 69.3 percent compared to 52.8 percent for those who received core and intensive services only. For WIA Dislocated Worker program exiters who received training, the entered employment rate was 76.2 percent, compared to 46.9 percent for those who received core and intensive services only.

We agree with GAO that there are opportunities to improve the current system and are committed to doing so. In the current constrained fiscal environment, there is an even greater need to innovate and look for better, more cost-effective ways to deliver services in a way that does not leave disadvantaged populations behind. We will continue to work with Congress on a WIA reauthorization bill that streamlines service delivery, better meets the needs of employers and regional economies, improves accountability, and

[1] State Workforce Investment Act Annual Report for Program Year 2009 (July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010) and State Wagner-Peyser Quarterly Report for the quarter ending June 30, 2010

promotes innovation. As part of this, we have proposed to create a new authority for cross-program waivers that would supplement current WIA waiver authorities. Enhanced waiver authority would provide a way for states to experiment with bolder options to streamline service delivery and improve outcomes for individuals and employers and evaluate their effectiveness. These experiments would inform future reauthorizations and administrative changes, by building knowledge about which models or approaches produce the best outcomes.

The new Workforce Innovation Fund, first funded in the 2011 appropriations bill, will support States and regional partnerships to work across program silos to test new and better ways of generating better employment and education outcomes at a lower cost per outcome. And, consistent with the Presidential Memorandum on Administrative Flexibility, the Administration is seeking input from State and local partners to identify and reduce unnecessary regulatory and administrative requirements that hamper effective and efficient service delivery.

Please find below some additional information we believe is relevant to GAO's recommendations:

1. Enhancing Program Evaluations and Performance Information

At DOL, we strongly believe in the importance of Federal fiscal responsibility and that part of this responsibility is identifying which programs and strategies efficiently provide the greatest benefit to participants. To acquire this knowledge, DOL continues to work within its budget to enhance performance information and support rigorous evaluations. An overview of these activities is discussed below.

All of DOL's employment and training programs either include or are developing strong accountability features and performance metrics. We are further strengthening our focus on performance based management, as discussed in DOL's strategic plan.[2] In addition to our efforts to reassess performance measures to promote better outcomes for individuals of all skill and need levels, we believe that workers and employers should have easy access to information about program outcomes for past participants, so they can make informed decisions about which programs are most likely to meet their needs.

In addition to conducting annual employment and training performance reviews at the Federal, state, and local levels, DOL has worked diligently over the past two years to increase the rigor of its evaluations. Last year, DOL created the Chief Evaluation Office (CEO). This office coordinates the Department's research and evaluation agenda in order to increase its capacity to conduct high quality, rigorous evaluations. The CEO is working closely with all Departmental agencies, including the Employment and Training Administration, to ensure that DOL evaluations are appropriately rigorous and designed to yield clear and actionable information for policymaking purposes.

[2] Available at: http://www.dol.gov/_sec/stratplan/StrategicPlan.pdf

Since 2009, about half the evaluations the Department's Employment and Training Administration (ETA) has funded have been rigorous, random assignment impact evaluations. These include the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) Gold Standard Evaluation of the Adult and Dislocated Worker Programs (WGSE); the YouthBuild Impact Evaluation; the Reintegration of Ex-Offenders Random Assignment Evaluation; the Impact Evaluation of Green Jobs, Health Care and High Growth Training Grants; and the Transitional Jobs Demonstration Impact Evaluation -- all of which are examining net impacts on employment, retention and earnings, and include benefit-cost analyses. ETA was able to fund these evaluations through an increase in fiscal year 2010 appropriations for evaluations and the funds made available to DOL by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

While rigorous random assignment evaluations, such as the WGSE, provide the most credible information on program effectiveness, they are highly resource intensive and typically take a range of three to seven years to implement and complete. Mindful of the statutory responsibility and to address the knowledge gap until the WGSE results are available, in 2009 ETA released the results of a non-experimental net impact evaluation of the WIA Adult and Dislocated Worker programs.[3] This study uses the next-best methodology when random assignment is not available and has found positive long-term earnings impacts for both programs, though the impacts are more significant for Adults than for Dislocated Workers. ETA plans to publish interim findings of the more definitive WGSE when they are available in 2013, and the final report will be available in June 2015, although this schedule is dependent upon continued appropriations for the evaluation of WIA programs.

Random assignment evaluations of our programs may not always be possible when the law requires that people receive services, as is the case in many entitlement programs, such as the Unemployment Insurance (UI) program. However, other approaches may be helpful in these situations. In November 2010, ETA released a study which used nationally representative tax and benefit data in a prominent macroeconomic model. The study provided new evidence reaffirming the value of UI as an automatic economic stabilizer during the latest recession.[4]

2. Fostering Coordination and Strategic Planning for Program Areas that Span Multiple Federal Agencies

In the past two years, the Department has developed effective partnerships with other Federal agencies that encourage state and local synergies to improve models for delivering quality services across programs. For example, a partnership between the Departments of Health and Human Services (HHS) and DOL promoted leveraging of Federal resources to expand summer youth employment opportunities for more than 138,000 youth in 2010. The partnership encouraged workforce and human service

---

[3] The *Workforce Investment Act Non-Experimental Net Impact Evaluation: Final Report* may be found at ETA's Research Publication Database Web site.
[4] *The Role of Unemployment Insurance As an Automatic Stabilizer During a Recession* may be found at ETA's Research Publication Database Web site.

agencies to co-enroll youth in WIA and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) programs and leverage TANF funds to help support subsidized wages for youth.

The Department is also working in partnership with HHS' Administration for Families and Children and the Office of Vocational and Adult Education at the Department of Education on strategic planning and systems change in the area of career pathways for adult learners. The Department provided grants to nine states and two tribal entities to bring together the key state and local workforce, education and human services partners to develop and implement strategic plans around career pathways. The three Federal agencies worked together to plan and conduct a training institute in November 2010 with the second institute scheduled for April 26-28, 2011.

In addition, the Department is in discussions with HHS and other agencies to coordinate and streamline Federal grants planning requirements in order to facilitate and encourage participation in joint strategic planning among partner agencies. The Departments undertook these efforts to improve strategy-focused planning and promote improved alignment and integration of WIA, TANF and other relevant programs to support more seamless delivery of a broader set of services for participants. Guidance is expected to be published following public comment and further feedback from stakeholders and Federal partners. DOL believes that use of strategic planning across programs involved in the public workforce system could be further advanced as part of the reauthorization of WIA.

3. Consolidating Existing Programs or Coordinating Service Delivery

The Department is committed to bringing about better alignment of Federal investments in job training, improving models to deliver quality services across programs at lower cost and providing relevant information to the workforce, employers, and others. While we agree that it is important to minimize duplication and maximize efficiency, we believe that a coherent public workforce system does not necessarily mean a single program, supplier or agency. Our goal should be a rational system whose elements fit together logically, with minimal duplication, and provide ready and seamless access to services for jobseekers and other workers looking for good jobs and to employers looking for job-ready skilled workers.

The new Workforce Innovation Fund, included in the recently enacted 2011 appropriations bill, will encourage States and regional partnerships to work across program silos for more seamless service delivery. The Fund will award grants to incentivize systemic change designed to improve education and employment outcomes for program participants, including those with barriers to employment, while reducing administrative redundancy. DOL will ensure that grants are paired with high-quality evaluation, so that effective approaches can be adopted more broadly.

The reauthorization of WIA presents another opportunity to promote innovation and further enhance service delivery. In particular, the Administration's goals for WIA reauthorization emphasize streamlining service delivery, providing one-stop shopping for high-quality services, engaging with employers on a regional and sectoral basis,

improving accountability, promoting innovation, and identifying and replicating best practices. To that end, the Department has provided extensive technical assistance to the bipartisan staff of the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, in support of WIA reauthorization efforts. The Department also has provided technical assistance to staff in the House of Representatives, as requested. Proposals include authorization of a Workforce Innovation Fund jointly administered by DOL and the Department of Education, and recommendations to standardize performance measures and data definitions to facilitate collaboration between programs and have more transparent system-wide reporting on participant outcomes. We would like to continue to work with both Houses of Congress to support the WIA reauthorization process.

We would be pleased to meet with you to discuss ways to strengthen and improve federally funded employment and training programs. If you have additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact Brian V. Kennedy, Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs, at (202) 693-4600. I look forward to continuing this important work with you.

Sincerely,

Hilda L. Solis

HILDA L. SOLIS
Secretary of Labor

Cc: The Honorable George Miller
Senior Democratic Member, Committee on Education and the Workforce



---

[Whereupon, at 11:34 a.m., the Committee was adjourned.]