

July 1986

TRAINING BUDGETS

Agency Budget Reductions in Response to the Balanced Budget Act



RESTRICTED—Not to be released outside the General Accounting Office except on the basis of specific approval by the Office of Congressional Relations.

536046



United States
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548

General Government Division

B-223316

July 16, 1986

The Honorable William D. Ford
Chairman, Committee on Post Office
and Civil Service
House of Representatives

The Honorable Patricia Schroeder
Chairwoman, Subcommittee on Civil Service
Committee on Post Office and Civil Service
House of Representatives

As requested by the the Chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service we examined training and executive development programs in the public and private sectors. In January 1986, we agreed with a Subcommittee representative to first gather information on the impact of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 on agencies' budgets for civilian employee training. We asked for the information directly from members of the Committee on Development and Training--an interagency group of federal training managers. This report summarizes the results of the agency responses to our inquiry.

We received responses from 66 executive branch departments, major components of the Department of Defense, and independent agencies during March, April, and May 1986. The first three sections of this briefing report summarize the responses based on each agency's relative employment size. We further categorized the agencies into civilian and defense in recognition of the differing fiscal year 1986 budget reduction requirements that were imposed in response to the balanced budget act--4.3 percent for civilian agency programs and 4.9 percent for defense programs. Section four provides details on the objective, scope, methodology, and data limitations of our work.

There are no general requirements currently in effect which require that agencies' budgets separately identify proposed expenditures for training and developmental activities for civilian employees. As a result, many agency training managers noted they could not acquire precise budget data for the whole agency and either provided no data or that which was readily available. Nonetheless, the data reported to us shows that widespread and uneven reductions have occurred in

funding for training and development of civilian employees in response to the balanced budget act. Specifically, for the 66 agencies which responded to our inquiry, we found the following:

- Fifteen of the 19 large agencies (14 civilian and 5 defense) reported training reductions. One reported no reductions, and three indicated they did not have readily available the necessary budget data to identify specific reductions. Of the 12 large civilian agencies reporting reductions, all indicated one or more training components were reduced by 4.3 percent or greater; 10 reported reductions of 10 percent or greater; and 3 reported reductions of 50 percent or greater. On the other hand, of the three large defense agencies reporting reductions, only one reported a reduction greater than 4.9 percent (11.5 percent) for one of its training components. (See sec. 1.)
- Twelve of the 20 mid-size agencies (17 civilian and 3 defense) reported training reductions. Four reported no reductions, and four indicated they did not have readily available the necessary budget data to identify specific reductions. Of the 10 mid-size civilian agencies reporting reductions, 9 reported reductions over 4.3 percent; 6 reported reductions over 10 percent; and 2 reported reductions over 50 percent. Two mid-size defense agencies reported reductions over 4.9 percent (24.1 percent and 16 percent). (See sec. 2.)
- Fifteen of the 27 small agencies (26 civilian and 1 defense) reported training reductions. Seven reported no reductions, and five indicated they did not have readily available the necessary budget data to identify specific reductions. All of the 15 small agencies reporting reductions were civilian agencies, and they all reported reductions over 4.3 percent; 14 reported reductions over 10 percent; and 7 reported reductions of 50 percent or greater. (See sec. 3.)

Given the reported widespread and uneven reductions in agency training programs, the Committee might wish to explore further the issue of whether the reductions are significant enough to warrant additional guidance by the agencies responsible for central oversight of training and budgetary matters--the Office of Personnel Management and the Office of Management and Budget. As your office directed, we did not obtain agency comments on this report.

We did not verify the information obtained from the agencies. We also did not determine whether the reductions reported were in compliance with the balanced budget act. For information on agency compliance with the act, see Budget Reductions for FY 1986

(GAO/OCG-86-1, Jan. 21, 1986), and Compliance Report for FY 1986(GAO/OCG-86-2, March 31, 1986). Other limitations of our work, which may have the effect of understating the extent of governmentwide training reductions, are discussed in section 4. As arranged unless you publicly announce its contents earlier, we plan no further distribution of this report until 5 days from its date. At that time, we will provide copies of this report to the Director, Office of Management and Budget, the Director, Office of Personnel Management, and other interested parties. If we can be of further assistance on this issue, please contact me on (202) 275-6204.


Rosilyn S. Kleeman
Senior Associate Director

C O N T E N T S

SECTION		<u>Page</u>
1	LARGE AGENCY RESPONSES	5
	Table 1. Summary of large agency responses	6
2	MID-SIZE AGENCY RESPONSES	11
	Table 2. Summary of mid-size agency responses	12
3	SMALL AGENCY RESPONSES	16
	Table 3. Summary of small agency responses	17
4	OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY	20
	Table 4.1: Summary of executive agencies responding to GAO's request	20
	Table 4.2: Summary of agencies reporting fiscal year 1986 training reductions	21
	Table 4.3: Summary of kinds of response documentation for agencies reporting training reductions	22
	Table 4.4: Summary of agencywide applicability of responses	23

ABBREVIATIONS

DOD	Department of Defense
GAO	General Accounting Office
DOL	Department of Labor
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
HUD	Housing and Urban Development
NASA	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
OPM	Office of Personnel Management
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
USIA	U.S. Information Agency
VA	Veterans Administration
VOA	Voice of America

Section 1
LARGE AGENCY RESPONSES

This section summarizes the responses provided by agencies with civilian employment over 10,000.

Table 1
Summary of Large Agency Responses

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Civilian employment (Sept. 1985)</u>	<u>Provided GAO training budget data</u>	<u>FY 1986 reductions in training budget</u>
<u>Defense agencies</u>			
Army	394,600	Yes	Yes
Navy	347,731	No	None identified
Air Force	253,333	Yes	Yes
Defense Logistics Agency	51,926	No	No
National Guard Bureau	48,165	Yes	Yes
<u>Civilian agencies</u>			
Veterans Administration	247,156	Partial	Yes
Health and Human Services	140,151	No	None identified
Treasury	130,084	Partial	Yes
Agriculture	117,750	Yes	Yes
Interior	77,485	Partial	Yes
Justice	64,433	a	a
Transportation	62,227	Partial	Yes
Commerce	35,150	Yes	Yes
General Services Administration	25,782	No	None identified
State	25,254	Partial	Yes
NASA	22,562	Yes	Yes
Labor	18,260	Partial	Yes
Energy	16,749	Partial	Yes
Environmental Protection Agency	13,788	Partial	Yes
Housing and Urban Development	12,289	Yes	Yes

aDid not respond in time to be included in our analysis.

DEFENSE AGENCIES

As shown in Table 1, of the five large defense agencies responding to our inquiry, the Army, Air Force, and National Guard Bureau provided budget information on their training and development activities for civilian personnel. They also reported that reductions have occurred in fiscal year 1986 training funds in response to the balanced budget act. While the other two agencies did not provide any budget data, only the Defense Logistics Agency indicated it did not expect any training reductions during 1986. The Navy responded that total budget figures for civilian training and development were unavailable. The Navy said its central budget includes only long-term training and civilian career programs in personnel/equal employment opportunity management, financial management, contracting, and logistics. Remaining civilian training and development activities, according to the Navy response, are budgeted by each local Navy activity as operating and/or overhead expenses.

The following summarizes the extent of fiscal year 1986 civilian training reductions reported by the Army, Air Force, and National Guard Bureau.

- The Army reported a reduction of about 3.3 percent in its civilian training, education, and development program (\$109,803,000 to \$106,140,000).
- The Air Force reported a reduction of 4.9 percent in civilian training and development programs (\$26.5 million to \$25.2 million).
- The National Guard Bureau reported a reduction of about 11.5 percent in Army National Guard technician training funding (\$6,920,000 to \$6,126,000) and 4.9 percent in Air National Guard technician training funding (\$2,908,000 to \$2,765,000). The response stated that certain types of training not to be funded in fiscal year 1986 will negatively impact on its readiness capability.

CIVILIAN AGENCIES

As shown in Table 1, of the 14 large civilian agencies responding to our inquiry, 12 provided some budget information on their training and development activities. All 12 reported reductions in fiscal year 1986 training funds in response to the balanced budget act. Two large civilian agencies (Health and Human Services and General Services Administration) told us that, because training is not separately identified in their budgets, they did not have information on the training-related impact of the balanced budget act.

In order of descending employment size, the following summarizes the extent of fiscal year 1986 training reductions from those 12 large civilian agencies reporting reductions in one or more of their organizational components.

- The Veterans Administration (VA) reported a funding reduction of about 53.5 percent (\$413,000 to \$192,000) and staff cuts (15 to 7 staff) for its central training office, the Executive Development and Training Service. VA stated funding cuts were made by canceling scheduled programs, and staff cuts were made by detailing six employees to another office and not filling two positions when they became vacant. (The response noted that similar information for VA's over 200 field stations was not collected because it would require a large-scale, time consuming survey.)

- The Department of the Treasury stated that the training budgets of 2 of its 11 bureaus with training functions (Customs Service and Secret Service) "...have been cut substantially..." due to the balanced budget act, and the Internal Revenue Service will "...have a substantial cut..." if a supplemental budget request is not approved by the Congress. Treasury also stated that discretionary training for fiscal year 1986 was eliminated in most bureaus, with priority placed on training necessary to complete the bureaus' missions. Although Treasury did not specify the dollar amounts of any reductions, it provided three examples of specific training reductions: 50 percent by the Savings Bond Division, 33 percent by the U.S. Customs Service, and 20 percent by the Comptroller of the Currency.

- The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) reported that the effect of the balanced budget act "...ranges from zero impact to significant reductions" for the 17 USDA agencies and offices covered by the response. At the departmental level, USDA stated that its Office of Personnel (1) canceled its first 11 training courses due to low registration of agency employees and (2) asked the Office of Personnel Management for an initial repayment of \$22,450 for training commitments made before the act. The Food Safety and Inspection Service reported the largest proportional reduction, 92.5 percent (\$4 million to \$300,000), followed by the Food and Nutrition Service, 70.1 percent (\$55,600 to \$16,600), and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, 50 percent (\$430,000 to \$215,000). Other USDA agencies or offices reporting reductions of 10 percent or more were the Human Resources Division of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (21.7 percent), the Foreign Agricultural Service (16.7 percent), the Office of International Cooperation (10 percent), and the Soil Conservation Service (28.2 percent).

- The Department of the Interior reported that, of the five bureaus which budget part of their training, the Minerals Management Service absorbed the largest proportional reduction, 21 percent (\$708,000 to \$559,000), followed by the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement at 13.4 percent (\$744,150 to \$644,600), and the National Park Service at 4.5 percent (\$2,664,500 to \$2,544,500). The Bureau of Indian Affairs reported a 4.3 percent reduction but did not specify dollar amounts, and the Bureau of Land Management reported no specific reductions in training.

- The Department of Transportation reported training reductions in 9 of 10 organizational elements. The Office of the Inspector General reported the largest proportional reduction, 40 percent (\$250,000 to \$150,000), followed by the Office of the Secretary at 37.5 percent (\$200,000 to \$125,000), and 23.3 percent (\$150,000 to \$115,000) for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. According to the Chief of Executive Personnel and Training at Transportation, the Federal Aviation Administration reduced centralized training by 4.9 percent (\$99,478,000 to \$94,616,000) but this reduction did not affect training for air traffic controllers or air safety training. Four Transportation components reported reductions of 10 percent or less.

- The Department of Commerce reported an overall reduction of about 10.3 percent (\$8,117,000 to \$7,282,000) in 10 departmental bureaus and in a separate training account in general administration. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration accounted for over one-half of Commerce's initial overall training budget and was reduced by about 10 percent (\$4,449,000 to \$4,006,000). Commerce estimated reductions of over 10 percent for four other bureaus (National Telecommunications and Information Administration (17.9 percent), National Bureau of Standards (16.7 percent), International Trade Administration (15.9 percent), and Economic and Statistical Analysis (16.5 percent).)

- The Department of State reported a reduction of about 46.3 percent (\$493,948 to \$265,454) in its budget for training courses. This budget is prepared by the Foreign Service Institute and covers the 4,800 civil service employees in the department. (State noted that the majority of its employees are in the Foreign Service or are foreign nationals.)

- The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) reported a 10-percent reduction (\$10 million to about \$9 million) in its approved training plan for fiscal year 1986. NASA said it anticipates that this reduction will be restored to meet the training requirements expected to be generated from recommendations of the President's Shuttle Investigation Commission.
- The Department of Labor (DOL) reported a 17.4-percent reduction (\$778,480 in 1985 to \$643,000 in 1986) in its centrally offered, departmentwide training programs. These funds are provided by the individual DOL agencies for common training needs. The response also noted that there were "...substantial reductions..." in outside training, such as Office of Personnel Management seminars, but did not specify the dollar amounts. The response further noted that most DOL agencies were reluctant to spend money on training activities because of possible employee furloughs and were not authorizing attendance at internal departmental courses requiring travel/per diem expenses.
- The Department of Energy reported that no cuts would be made in its \$1.37 million headquarters training budget because of the direct relationship between planned training activities and its mission, but added that a survey of its field installations indicated that some cuts were being made at that level. Also, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, a major component of the Department of Energy, told us in a separate response that it anticipated up to a 5-percent reduction in its \$500,000 fiscal year 1986 training budget.
- The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) reported a 4.5-percent cut (\$475,000 to \$453,500) in a central training account administered by the Office of Administration and Resources Management. Except for this account, EPA said it does not routinely identify training and development activities in its budget.
- The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) reported a 24.1-percent reduction (\$3,545,000 to \$2,691,000) in its training-related budget. HUD's training budget is centrally managed and allocations to various programs are made by its Headquarters Training Division. HUD's training-related budget consists of separate sub-object classifications for travel, enrollment, contracts, supplies, and equipment.

Section 2
MID-SIZE AGENCY RESPONSES

This section summarizes the responses provided by agencies with civilian employment between 1,500 and 10,000.

Table 2
Summary of Mid-Size Agency Responses

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Civilian employment (Sept. 1985)</u>	<u>Provided GAO training budget data</u>	<u>FY 1986 reduction in training budget</u>
<u>Defense agencies</u>			
Defense Mapping Agency	9,196	Yes	Yes
Defense Contract Audit Agency	4,695	Yes	Yes
Office of Secretary of Defense	3,861	Yes	No
Defense Communications Agency	1,908	a	a
<u>Civilian agencies</u>			
U.S. Information Agency	8,851	Yes	Yes
Panama Canal Commission	8,481	Yes	No
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	6,502	No	No
Office of Personnel Management	6,353	Partial	None identified
Small Business Administration	4,960	No	Yes
Agency for International Development	4,890	Yes	No
Department of Education	4,889	Yes	Yes
Smithsonian Institution	4,757	No	None identified
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	3,605	Yes	Yes
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	3,222	Yes	Yes
Federal Emergency Management Agency	3,133	Yes	Yes
National Labor Relations Board	2,557	Yes	Yes
National Archives	2,168	No	None identified
Federal Communications Commission	1,908	Yes	Yes
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,898	Yes	Yes
Railroad Retirement Board	1,681	Yes	Yes
Executive Office of the President	1,526	No	None identified
Federal Reserve Board	1,520	No response	No response

^aDid not respond in time to be included in our analysis.

DEFENSE AGENCIES

As shown in Table 2, of the three mid-size defense agencies responding to our inquiry, each provided budget information on its training and development activities. Two of the three reported reductions in fiscal year 1986 training funds resulting from the balanced budget act. No training reductions were reported by the Directorate of Personnel and Security, Washington Headquarters Services, which covered the Office of Secretary of Defense, the Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other DOD headquarters components.

The following summarizes the extent of fiscal year 1986 civilian training reductions reported by the Defense Mapping Agency and the Defense Contract Audit Agency.

--The Defense Mapping Agency, in an oral response, reported a reduction of 16 percent in its training budget (\$3,021,000 to \$2,539,000).

--The Defense Contract Audit Agency reported a 24.1-percent reduction in its training budget (\$4,530,900 to \$3,437,000). The agency's response noted that 33 of 165 scheduled classes were canceled and its tuition budget was reduced by 35 percent. The response also noted that further reductions were under consideration in order to provide more mission funds.

CIVILIAN AGENCIES

As shown in Table 2, of the 17 mid-size civilian agencies responding to our inquiry, 12 provided some budget information on their training and development activities. Ten agencies reported reductions in fiscal year 1986 training funds resulting from the balanced budget act. Three agencies (Panama Canal Commission, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Agency for International Development) reported that no training reductions had been made. Four agencies did not identify any specific training reductions, because they either have decentralized budgets and/or do not budget training as a separate item.

In order of descending employment size, the following summarizes the extent of fiscal year 1986 training reductions in the 10 agencies reporting reductions.

--Within the U.S. Information Agency (USIA), the Voice of America (VOA) reported a "severe" cut of 33.3 percent in its original allocation for training and development (\$997,126 to \$665,126). The response noted that because VOA's primary purpose is broadcasting, support functions

such as training had to bear much of the budget reduction burden. Training in the other components of USIA had been reduced by 2.4 percent (\$607,478 to \$593,056) according to a separate USIA response.

- The Small Business Administration reported a postponement, effective December 30, 1985, of all centralized training but did not report specific dollar amounts of reductions.
- The Department of Education reported that its actual training budget is expected to be about 71.3 percent less than its proposed budget (\$975,000 to \$280,000). The response stated that not all of the reduction can be attributed to the balanced budget act and that it would be difficult to determine the actual level.
- The Nuclear Regulatory Commission reported an 8.2-percent reduction (\$1.7 million to \$1.56 million) in its base training budget. The response noted that the training budget does not include travel and per diem associated with the training function, personnel, or the programmatic reactor technology training of agency inspectors and other technical professionals.
- The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission reported a 39.6-percent cut in its original training budget (\$841,550 to \$507,882).
- The Federal Emergency Management Agency reported a 4.3-percent cut in its allocation for training and development (\$300,000 to \$287,000), but noted that a larger reduction is expected to be shown in its next operating plan and that only 12 percent of the allocation had been expended as of April 16, 1986--more than half the fiscal year.
- The National Labor Relations Board reported a 14.7-percent reduction in its training budget (\$443,000 to \$378,000), but stated it did not reduce contractual training or unit training that was negotiated with various bargaining units. The response stated that training was reduced in those areas where training needs can be met through self-learning audio and audiovisual programs.
- The Federal Communications Commission reported a 57-percent cut in its training budget (\$128,000 to \$55,000).

- The Securities and Exchange Commission reported a 24.8 percent reduction in its training budget (\$302,000 to (\$227,000).
- The Railroad Retirement Board reported an 8.5-percent cut in its initial training allocation (\$319,000 to \$292,000).

Section 3
SMALL AGENCY RESPONSES

This section summarizes the responses provided by agencies with civilian employment under 1,500.

Table 3
Summary of Small Agency Responses

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Civilian employment (Sept. 1985)</u>	<u>Provided GAO training budget data</u>	<u>FY 1986 reduction in training budget</u>
<u>Defense agencies</u>			
Defense Nuclear Agency	748	Yes	No
<u>Civilian agencies</u>			
Federal Trade Commission	1,215	Yes	Yes
National Science Foundation	1,215	No	No
U.S. Soldiers' and Airmen's Home	1,093	Yes	Yes
Peace Corps	1,063	Yes	No
Interstate Commerce Commission	866	No response	No response
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	657	Yes	No
National Credit Union Administration	598	Yes	No
Consumer Product Safety Commission	591	Yes	Yes
Action	509	Yes	Yes
International Trade Commission	503	Yes	Yes
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation	502	Yes	Yes
Commodity Futures Trading Commission	492	Yes	No
Merit Systems Protection Board	430	Yes	Yes
Export-Import Bank	356	Yes	Yes
National Transportation Safety Board	343	Yes	Yes
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	336	Yes	Yes
Farm Credit Administration	315	No	None identified
Selective Service System	301	No	None identified
National Endowment for the Arts	295	Yes	Yes
Federal Labor Relations Authority	292	Yes	Yes
National Endowment for the Humanities	255	No	None identified
Commission on Civil Rights	230	No	None identified
Federal Maritime Commission	220	Yes	Yes
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	201	No	No
Overseas Private Investment Corporation	150	Yes	Yes
Occupational Safety and Health Review Comm.	78	No response	No response
National Mediation Board	56	Yes	Yes
Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System	10	No	None identified

As shown in Table 3, of the 27 small agencies responding to our inquiry, 20 provided budget information on their training and development activities. Fifteen reported reductions in fiscal year 1986 training funds resulting from the balanced budget act. Seven small agencies, including one defense agency, reported that no training reductions had been made. (The Federal Home Loan Bank Board response, however, stated some reduction is likely upon completion of a review to determine how cuts will be made agencywide, and the National Credit Union Administration response stated cuts were not necessary since the agency delayed starting the training program 5 months and the delay is expected to produce more than a 4.3-percent "savings".) The other five responding agencies did not identify any specific training reductions, although the Farm Credit Administration stated it expected some reductions but did not identify any specific dollar amounts.

In order of descending employment size, the following summarizes the extent of fiscal year 1986 training reductions in the 15 agencies reporting reductions.

- The Federal Trade Commission reported a 31.9-percent reduction in its training plan (\$113,000 to \$77,000).
- The United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home estimated that its training budget was reduced by about 80 percent (\$49,000 to \$9,800). The response stated that the Home's 1986 training budget was eliminated in January 1986 in an effort to reduce the number of expected furlough days. All previously approved, but unattended courses were canceled, according to the response.
- The Consumer Product Safety Commission reported a 7.7-percent reduction in its training budget (\$65,000 to \$60,000).
- Action, in an oral response, reported a cut of about 42.7 percent in its training budget (\$58,500 to \$33,500).
- The International Trade Commission projected a 26.7-percent reduction in its training allocation (\$307,000 to \$225,000).
- The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation reported an 18.9-percent reduction in its training budget (\$221,705 to \$179,755).
- While the Merit Systems Protection Board did not identify any reductions in its \$150,000 training budget, the Office of the Special Counsel projected a cut of 65 percent in its training budget (\$20,000 to \$7,000).

- The Export-Import Bank reported a 33.2-percent reduction in its training budget (\$104,800 to \$70,000).
- The National Transportation Safety Board reported that an 11-percent reduction in its budgeted training funds will be required (\$387,000 to \$344,430).
- The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service reported that, with about 62.5 percent of its \$20,000 training budget unspent, all tuition funds were frozen upon implementation of the balanced budget act.
- The National Endowment for the Arts reported a 50-percent reduction in its training budget (\$10,000 to \$5,000).
- The Federal Labor Relations Authority reported a 75-percent cut in its budget for training and development activities (\$60,000 to about \$15,000).
- The Federal Maritime Commission reported a 25-percent reduction in its training budget (\$40,000 to \$30,000).
- The Overseas Private Investment Corporation reported a 50.3-percent reduction in its training budget (\$114,600 to \$57,000).
- The National Mediation Board reported a 60-percent reduction in its training budget (\$10,000 to \$4,000).

Section 4

OBJECTIVE, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

Our objective was to provide the Committee with information on the extent of reductions in agency budgets for civilian employee training and development resulting from agency responses to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. To acquire available information in a timely fashion, we requested assistance directly from members of an interagency group of federal training managers--OPM's Interagency Advisory Group, Committee on Development and Training. Specifically, we sent a letter dated March 6, 1986, to each person listed as the principal member of the committee for an executive branch department or agency. We asked each representative to provide (1) available information on their agency's fiscal years 1986 and 1987 (proposed) budgets for training and development and (2) a description of specific reductions, if any, resulting from agency responses to the balanced budget act. We did not ask about or attempt to assess the merits of any budget reductions.

After some follow-up inquiries, we received responses from representatives of 66 executive branch departments, major components of the Department of Defense, and independent agencies. This represents 93 percent of the 71 executive agencies we queried. To facilitate analysis and simplify report presentation, we sorted the agency responses into three categories based on civilian employment size: (1) large agencies were defined as those with civilian employment over 10,000, (2) mid-size agencies with employment between 1,500 and 10,000, and (3) small agencies with employment under 1,500. We further categorized the agencies into civilian and defense in recognition of the differing overall fiscal year 1986 reductions that were imposed in response to the balanced budget act--4.3 percent for applicable civilian agency programs and 4.9 percent for applicable defense programs. Table 4.1 summarizes the responses we received by agency size and type.

Table 4.1
Summary of Executive Agencies
Responding to GAO's Request

<u>Agency size</u>	<u>Agencies requested</u>		<u>Agencies responding</u>		<u>Response percentage</u>
	<u>Civilian</u>	<u>Defense</u>	<u>Civilian</u>	<u>Defense</u>	
Large	15	5	14	5	95%
Mid-size	18	4	17	3	91%
Small	<u>28</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>1</u>	93%
Total	61	10	57	9	93%

As shown in table 4.2, 42 responses (64 percent) reported sufficient information for us to determine what percentage reduction the agency knew or anticipated would be made in one or more components of the training and development program budget for fiscal year 1986. The other 24 agencies either reported that their fiscal year 1986 training and development program budgets had not been reduced or did not identify any reductions. Fiscal year 1987 data reported by the agencies was too limited to analyze, so we excluded it from further consideration in this report.

Table 4.2
Summary of Agencies
Reporting Fiscal Year 1986 Training Reductions

<u>Agency Size</u>	<u>Number of agencies responding</u>	<u>Number reporting some training reductions</u>	<u>Number reporting no training reductions</u>	<u>Number not identifying any reductions</u>
Large	19	15	1	3
Mid-size	20	12	4	4
Small	<u>27</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	66	42	12	12

DATA LIMITATIONS

Because of certain data limitations, the agency responses received may understate the actual reductions in training budgets for civilian employees that have occurred governmentwide. First, the interagency Committee on Development and Training which is administered by OPM, does not include representatives from all agencies with civilian employees. As a result, two large organizations were not covered by our inquiry, the U.S. Postal Service and the Tennessee Valley Authority with about 750,000 and 32,000 civilian employees, respectively, as of September 1985. In addition, several executive agencies that are members of the interagency training committee either did not respond to our request or did not respond in time to be included in our analysis--the Department of Justice (64,433 employees), Defense Communications Agency (1,908 employees), Federal Reserve (1,520 employees), Interstate Commerce Commission (866 employees), and the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission (78 employees). Also, the National Security Agency and the Central Intelligence Agency are exempt from public reporting of employment and training data.

Second, the level of detail and documentation provided by the agencies varied widely as summarized in table 4.3. For example, the Army provided its internal justification for fiscal year 1986 and proposed fiscal year 1987 budgets of over \$100 million each for training and development of civilian employees. The Army noted that the budgets were part of an approved plan by the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel which provides for training professional, administrative, and technical employees in 23 career fields by occupation and grade (from entry-level intern to senior executive levels). On the other hand, the Assistant Secretary for Personnel Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, had no information to provide because the Department's "...budget formulation process makes no distinction for training-related functions."

Table 4.3
Summary of Kinds of Response Documentation For
Agencies Reporting Training Reductions

<u>Agency Size</u>	<u>Agencies reporting training reductions</u>	<u>Written statements and some budget/ planning documents</u>	<u>Written statements only</u>	<u>Oral response only</u>
Large	15	4	11	-
Mid-size	12	8	3	1
Small	<u>15</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	42	16	24	2

Moreover, some agencies, such as the Veterans Administration, provided data only for a component of the agency because they said their data systems were decentralized and providing information for the entire agency would have taken an inordinate amount of time. Table 4.4 summarizes the agencywide applicability of the responses we received.

Table 4.4
Summary of Agencywide Applicability
of Responses

<u>Agency size</u>	<u>Number of agencies responding</u>	<u>Response applicable to the entire agency</u>	<u>Response applicable to one or more components</u>
Large	19	12	7
Mid-size	20	20	-
Small	<u>27</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>-</u>
Total	66	59	7

Requests for copies of GAO reports should be sent to

U.S. General Accounting Office
Post Office Box 6015
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20877

Telephone 202-275-6241

The first five copies of each report are free. Additional copies are \$2.00 each.

There is a 25% discount on orders for 100 or more copies mailed to a single address.

Orders must be prepaid by cash or by check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents

