



090773 3.11.12

RESTRICTED - Not to be released outside the GAO.  
Accounting Office except on the basis of specific approval  
by the Office of Congressional Relations, a record of which  
is kept by the Distribution Section, Publications Branch, OAS

43-0180

RELEASED

11  
13



LM090773

Program Administration  
At The Atterbury Job Corps Center  
In Indiana B-130515

Department of Labor

BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL  
OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH -1, 1973

~~701446~~

090773



COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

B-130515

The Honorable Birch Bayh  
United States Senate

Dear Senator Bayh:

This is our second report on program administration at the Department of Labor's Atterbury Job Corps Center near Edinburg, Indiana, which is operated by Westinghouse Learning Corporation (Indiana). This review was made at your request of December 8, 1971, and this report summarizes the results of our review. We previously discussed the details of the review with your office in Indianapolis, Indiana. 9  
J. S. [unclear]

We have discussed our findings with Department of Labor and Westinghouse officials and have considered their comments in preparing the report. However, as your office requested, agency officials, the contractor, and other affected parties were not given an opportunity to formally examine and comment on this report. This fact should be considered in any use made of the information presented.

We do not plan to distribute this report further unless you approve or publicly announce its contents.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "James B. Pritz".

Comptroller General  
of the United States

C o n t e n t s

		<u>Page</u>
DIGEST		1
CHAPTER		
1	INTRODUCTION	5
	Atterbury Job Corps Center	5
	Scope of review	5
2	RECRUITING AND ORIENTATION	8
	Recruiting	8
	Orientation	8
3	TREATMENT OF CORPSMEN	11
	Discipline	11
	Emergency graduations	14
	Reporting crimes	15
	Termination of two corpsmen	16
4	HEALTH SERVICES AND COUNSELING	18
	Health services	18
	Counseling	20
5	PLACEMENT	23
6	SCHEDULING AND SUPERVISING RECREATION	25
7	TEACHER EVALUATION AND GENERAL EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT TEST RESULTS	27

ABBREVIATIONS

a.w.o.l.	absent without official leave
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
GAO	General Accounting Office
GED	General Educational Development
OEO	Office of Economic Opportunity
OJT	on-the-job training
VD	venereal disease

D I G E S T

WHY THE REVIEW WAS MADE

At Senator Birch Bayh's request, the General Accounting Office (GAO) reviewed selected aspects of program administration at the Atterbury Job Corps Center. Westinghouse Learning Corporation (Indiana) operates the Center for the Department of Labor under a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract. The program is designed to provide comprehensive residential training to prepare 16- to 21-year-old men for employment and for the responsibilities of citizenship.

As agreed with the Senator's office, GAO reviewed recruiting and orientation procedures, treatment of corpsmen, health services and counseling programs, reporting of placement of corpsmen, scheduling and supervision of recreation, and teacher evaluation and General Educational Development test results.

GAO discussed its findings with Labor officials and the contractor. However, as the Senator's office requested, these officials and other affected parties have not been given an opportunity to formally examine and comment on this report.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Recruiting

Center officials advised GAO that

some corpsmen had complained that recruiters had given them false information about the Center's training programs and conditions. The number of complaints, however, had decreased to the extent that these officials did not believe recruiters were currently misleading applicants.

GAO believes the literature furnished recruiters adequately describes the Center's facilities, programs, and activities. (See p. 8.)

Orientation

GAO reviewed orientation procedures because of allegations that corpsmen were being intimidated on arrival by being

--required to get a short ("GI") haircut and

--falsely advised that they were legally committed to remain at least 90 days.

GAO believes the Center orientation program was satisfactory. With respect to the specific allegations, GAO found that:

--Center policy required that new enrollees receive a GI haircut. Center medical personnel fully supported this policy as necessary to detect highly contagious scalp conditions affecting some new enrollees. (See p. 9.)

MARCH -1, 1973

--There was no evidence that corpsmen were being advised that they had to remain at the Center for 90 days, although a Center employee had issued a memorandum in June 1971 instructing counselors to inform corpsmen they must remain at the Center 60 days before they could terminate. His supervisor had the memorandum rescinded within a month because it was contrary to Labor and Center policy. (See p. 9.)

#### Treatment of corpsmen

GAO reviewed the treatment of corpsmen to evaluate allegations that

- corpsmen were detained for long periods in inadequate facilities for minor rule infractions,
- some corpsmen were given emergency graduations without meeting graduation requirements in lieu of disciplinary discharges for criminal offenses,
- criminal offenses were not reported to law enforcement officials, and
- two corpsmen were improperly terminated for spending a weekend with a former Center employee and his family.

GAO found that:

- For 1 month, there were 69 confinements for various periods ranging from less than 1 day to 6 days, for behavior deemed to constitute an immediate threat to the corpsmen, other persons, or property. In some cases, the Center records did not show either the length of confinement or the specific reason a corpsman was confined. The Director stated that the Center

would keep complete records in the future. (See p. 12.)

- One corpsman included in GAO's test who was terminated for possessing a weapon was erroneously classified as a graduate without meeting the graduation criteria. (See p. 15.)
- The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) was concerned that incidents had occurred at the Center which should have been reported, but had not been. Subsequently, Labor, FBI, and Center officials agreed on incidents to be reported, and FBI officials informed GAO that they were satisfied with the Center's reporting practices. (See p. 16.)
- Two corpsmen were terminated after spending the weekend with a former Center employee who had filed charges of unfair labor practices against Westinghouse. Center officials stated the corpsmen were terminated for other reasons. Center records indicated that one corpsman was permitted to voluntarily resign from the program and the other was given an emergency graduation. (See p. 16.)

#### Health services

Because of allegations concerning the number of cases of venereal disease (VD) and undetected infections from tattoos, GAO reviewed the Center's health services program. GAO found that it needed improvement and that there appeared to be a serious VD problem among corpsmen.

A prior review by Labor had indicated that, for at least the past 3 years, the Center had not had a

permanent medical director and that the physician acting in this capacity did not supply sufficient leadership to fulfill this role. Labor also identified other problems. (See p. 18.)

The current Labor contract required the contractor to hire a physician acceptable to Labor as a medical director on or before February 8, 1972. As of October 1972 the Center had not hired a medical director, but Labor was satisfied with the efforts to do so and contemplated no action except to continue to help the Center locate an acceptable medical director. (See p. 18.)

#### Counseling

GAO reviewed the counseling program to evaluate an allegation that corpsmen were receiving inadequate counseling. Center records showed that corpsmen received individual and group counseling, but the information in the counseling files was insufficient to permit evaluation of the quality of the counseling.

The counseling program was reorganized in April 1971. Implementation was delayed because of problems between Center management and counselors, which deteriorated to the point that all counselors were terminated in July 1971. Not all counselor positions had been re-filled at the time of GAO's fieldwork.

The Director advised us the program was still being developed and revised. He predicted any subsequent review would disclose many improvements. (See p. 22.)

#### Placement

As requested, GAO reviewed the re-

liability of reports of corpsmen placed. There is no practical means to ascertain the number of terminees who have been placed during a given period, because the placement reports included placement data for corpsmen who terminated during periods other than those covered by the reports and did not account for all terminees during such periods. (See p. 23.)

#### Recreation

In addition to recreation available at the Center, the Center maintains a facility in Indianapolis to provide corpsmen opportunities to participate in community activities.

GAO reviewed the supervision of corpsmen at the Indianapolis facility because of complaints of corpsmen misconduct. Police officials advised GAO that supervision was adequate. The problems arose when corpsmen left the facility and direct supervision was not practicable.

It was alleged that corpsmen's presence had an adverse effect on the economy of the neighborhood surrounding the community center, but GAO found that local businessmen and city officials differed in this regard.

Center and Labor officials were fully aware of the problems involving the Indianapolis facility and had met with concerned citizens and city officials to find a solution and to improve relationships with the community. They plan to continue these efforts. (See p. 26.)

#### Teacher evaluation and General Educational Development test results

GAO ascertained the methods used to

evaluate teachers because of reports that teachers were rated on the number of corpsmen promoted instead of on their teaching ability.

GAO found that all teachers were evaluated by their immediate supervisors on such matters as

ingenuity, alertness to problem situations, and professionalism. There was no evidence that teachers were evaluated on any basis not set forth in the established criteria.

GAO found that the number of General Educational Development graduates was increasing. (See pp. 27 and 28.)

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

Title I, Part A, of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2701) established a Job Corps for low-income, disadvantaged young men and women. It authorized establishing residential and/or nonresidential centers in which enrollees would participate in intensive education, vocational training, work experience, counseling, and other programs. The Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) initially administered the Job Corps program, but in July 1969, it delegated this responsibility to the Department of Labor. Labor's Manpower Administration is responsible for administering the program and the Director, Job Corps, is the responsible administrative official.

### ATTERBURY JOB CORPS CENTER

The Atterbury Job Corps Center is on a former Army base, Camp Atterbury, about 25 miles south of Indianapolis near Edinburg, Indiana. The Center opened in April 1965 and Westinghouse Learning Corporation (Indiana) has operated it for the Government under cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts since June 1966. The current contract is for December 1, 1971, through February 28, 1973. Its estimated cost is \$11,479,923, plus a fixed fee of \$486,327.

The program is designed to provide comprehensive residential training to 1,800 men 16 to 21 years old, to prepare them for employment and for the responsibilities of citizenship. Westinghouse is required to furnish quality personnel, services, and materials under the supervision of a full-time Center Director.

### SCOPE OF REVIEW

Pursuant to Senator Birch Bayh's request dated December 8, 1971, and subsequent discussions with the Senator and his Indianapolis office, we reviewed selected aspects of program administration at the Center. Our review covered

--recruiting and orientation procedures,

- treatment of corpsmen,
- health services and counseling programs,
- placement of corpsmen,
- scheduling and supervision of recreational activities,  
and
- teacher evaluation and General Educational Development (GED) test results.

Our review was limited, pursuant to previous understandings with the Senator's office, to:

- Ascertaining the Center's involvement in the recruiting program and obtaining Center officials' opinions on recruiting problems.
- Evaluating the Center's orientation program.
- Observing the Center's detention facilities and ascertaining the prescribed punishment for various offenses.
- Evaluating the Center's medical program. (Work here was curtailed because Labor was attempting to solve longstanding problems in the medical program.)
- Updating information on counseling problems at Atterbury.
- Ascertaining the criteria for reporting placements.
- Obtaining information on supervising those using the recreation facilities.
- Ascertaining the basis for evaluating teachers and the results of efforts to increase the number of graduates with GED certificates.

We did not evaluate the effectiveness of Westinghouse's program.

We obtained our information from (1) applicable Labor regulations, contracts for operating the Center, reports of Labor's annual reviews, and contractor records, (2) discussions with responsible Labor and contractor representatives, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) agents, Indianapolis police officials, former Center employees, and other concerned citizens, and (3) inspection of the Center's detention facilities.

## CHAPTER 2

### RECRUITING AND ORIENTATION

We inquired into the Center's responsibility for recruiting in view of reports that recruiters were giving Job Corps applicants false impressions of opportunities and conditions at the Center. We reviewed the Center's orientation procedures because of allegations that corpsmen were being intimidated on arrival by being required to get a "GI" haircut and being falsely advised that they were legally committed to remain at least 90 days.

#### RECRUITING

We were advised that, pursuant to a specific recruiting contract, Westinghouse recruited about 12 percent of the corpsmen entering the Center during the 18 months ended June 30, 1970. Since that contract expired, Labor has been responsible for all recruiting. Labor, in turn, has contracted with and furnished guidance to public and private organizations to recruit and screen applicants. The State employment services recruit about 60 percent of the applicants, and private agencies--such as the Chicago Federation of Settlement Houses--recruit the rest.

Center officials advised us that in the past some corpsmen stated that recruiters gave them false information about the Center's training programs and conditions. However, in 1971 the Center instituted a program of scheduled visits to the Center to better acquaint recruiters with the Center and its programs. The number of complaints has decreased to the extent that these officials do not believe recruiters are currently misleading applicants.

We found that the literature concerning the Center being furnished to recruiters adequately described the Center's facilities, programs, and activities.

Center officials informed us that the corpsmen recruited since these visits began appear to have a more realistic view of Center life, facilities, and vocational offerings.

#### ORIENTATION

In 1971 a Labor review reported that the Center's orientation was inadequate. It stated that there was no

separate dormitory for the 5-day orientation; new enrollees were separated and assigned permanently to a regular dormitory. In addition, according to the report the initial reception was a cold mechanical affair which tended to set the tone of corpsmen life at the Center. As a result of this criticism, the Center restructured the orientation and extended it 1 week.

The 1972 Labor annual review reported the restructured orientation was satisfactory. It had an adequate staff, facilities had been improved and were well furnished, and reading material was available in lounges, quiet rooms, and dormitory areas.

Our observations of the orientation program and the new orientation dormitory indicate that Labor's most recent evaluation appears reasonable.

#### GI haircuts

In April 1971 the Center Director required new enrollees to receive a GI haircut. After the initial haircut, the student government's dress code requires that hair be neatly trimmed without extending over ears, neck, or collar, and that sideburns must not be below the ear lobes. Medical personnel at the Center advised us that some new enrollees come to the Center suffering from highly contagious scalp conditions which need treatment and which can only be detected and treated when the hair is closely cut. Therefore, they fully support the policy regarding initial haircuts.

#### Legal commitment to remain 90 days

Our review disclosed no evidence that corpsmen were being advised that they had to remain at the Center 90 days. However, on June 15, 1971, a Center official issued a memorandum instructing his counselors to inform corpsmen that they must reside at the Center 60 days before terminating. The official who issued the memorandum said that he had hoped to defer decisions on termination until corpsmen got over their homesickness and had adjusted to dormitory living. He stated further that his supervisor had required him to rescind the memorandum within a month after it was issued because it was contrary to Labor and Center policy.

Center officials and employees informed us that new enrollees are not advised they are legally committed to remain for any specific period. Our review of records for one group of 47 new enrollees arriving in October 1971 showed that 22 had terminated within 90 days, 19 enrollees had terminated within 60 days, and 10 of these enrollees had terminated within the first 30 days.

## CHAPTER 3

### TREATMENT OF CORPSMEN

We reviewed the treatment of corpsmen to evaluate allegations that (1) corpsmen were detained for long periods in inadequate facilities as punishment for minor rule infractions, (2) some corpsmen were given emergency graduations without meeting the graduation requirements instead of disciplinary discharges for criminal offenses, (3) criminal offenses were not reported to law enforcement officials, and (4) two corpsmen were improperly terminated for spending a weekend with a former Center employee and his family. Our review showed that the allegations were valid, in part, and that some improvements were made, particularly in reporting offenses to law enforcement officials.

#### DISCIPLINE

Job Corps regulations assign Center directors responsibility for developing reasonable rules of conduct which can be consistently enforced and obeyed. Further, each Center must develop and obtain Labor approval of a handbook fully describing the disciplinary system, procedures, and penalties for infraction of the rules. It then must issue this handbook to each corpsman. Center directors are also authorized to temporarily detain corpsmen whose behavior constitute an immediate threat to themselves, other persons, or property.

The Center had developed such a handbook, which Labor approved, and distributed it to corpsmen. The penalties described range from verbal reprimands to termination from the Job Corps.

#### Offenses resulting in confinement

We reviewed the disposition of 50 offenses committed from June 1971 through January 1972 and found that penalties for those offenses not resulting in confinement were generally within the specific limits established and in no case exceeded the maximum.

The Center Director is responsible for maintaining complete records of offenses resulting in confinement, showing the length of, and the reason for, detention.

The security department records for December 1971 showed 69 confinements of 66 corpsmen for various periods ranging from less than 1 day to 6 days for the following reasons:

Assault	27
A.w.o.l. (note a)	15
Violent misconduct	3
Possessing a weapon	3
Theft	3
Drug abuse	2
Other (arson, breaking and entering, fighting, etc.)	<u>16</u>
	<u>69</u>

<sup>a</sup>Absent without official leave.

In most instances we believe the reason cited for confinement sufficiently showed that such behavior represented a threat to the corpsmen, other persons, or property. We questioned, however, whether being a.w.o.l. from a voluntary program constituted sufficient reason for confinement.

The Center Director advised that the a.w.o.l. corpsmen had been found hitchhiking. He said that he believes that the corpsmen were exposing themselves to potential dangers, that he was responsible for their safety as long as they were members of the Job Corps and that if, upon return to the Center, corpsmen refused to remain for the normal termination processing, they were confined for their own protection.

As for the length of confinement, Job Corps regulations state that a corpsman should be released as soon as his behavior is no longer dangerous. Further, a corpsman may not be confined for more than 12 hours without a written reason and recommendation from the Center Director, which authorize the security department to confine a corpsman and which become part of his personnel file.

During our review of security department records, we could not determine the length of seven confinements because the time of entry or release was omitted. From the dates shown in the records and data from other Center records, we established that the maximum confinement for these corpsmen

would not have exceeded 48 hours. Our analysis of the records for the other 62 confinements is shown below.

<u>Number of confinements</u>	<u>Hours confined</u>
13	Under 12
19	12 to 24
16	24 to 48
3	48 to 72
0	72 to 96
<u>11</u>	96 to 144
 <u>62</u>	

The 11 confinements longer than 96 hours were based on a written request from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) to hold certain corpsmen suspected of committing a crime (assault) on a Federal reservation. The records did not specifically state the reason for confining the others for more than 12 hours; nor was there the required recommendation/authorization by the Center Director.

Security department officials advised us the above analysis might not be accurate because, in some instances, the time of release shown in the records may represent the time a terminated corpsman left for home instead of the actual time he was released. Although we could not verify these officials' contention, our review of the Center's log books showed that 33 of the 66 corpsmen involved in our test either resigned from the Job Corps program or were terminated as a result of action by the Center Review Board on the same date that their confinement ended; 22 of the 33 had been confined more than 1 day.

We discussed the failure to maintain complete records showing the length of confinement and the specific reason a corpsman was confined with the Center Director and Labor officials. The Center Director stated that the Center would keep complete records in the future.

#### Detention facilities

Job Corps regulations authorize Center directors to provide facilities for temporary confinement but they do not prescribe minimum standards for them.

The Center maintained two detention rooms, each about 9 feet by 12 feet, near the main desk in the security and discipline building. Each room was secured by a locked wooden door and had a window covered by heavy wire mesh. The rooms had four beds with mattresses, sheets, blankets, and pillows. Toilet and lavatory facilities were across the hall.

We also inspected two isolation rooms in the infirmary which were used, according to medical personnel, to restrain corpsmen with psychiatric problems or those experiencing withdrawal symptoms from drugs or alcohol. The rooms, about 5 feet by 15 feet, were on the second floor off a stairwell at the end of an unoccupied ward. Each room was secured by a locked metal door and had a window covered by a heavy wire mesh. Each room had only a mattress and blankets on the floor. Hospital personnel informed us that the absence of furniture was to prevent corpsmen from injuring themselves. The walls were not padded, but we were advised padding would be installed soon. Toilet and lavatory facilities were about 60 feet away.

Lacking any standards with which to compare the Center's detention facilities, we did not conclude whether they were adequate. We believe, however, that if corpsmen are to be detained, the Department should establish standards for detention facilities.

#### EMERGENCY GRADUATIONS

To be classified as a graduate, a corpsman must demonstrate that he possesses the minimum skills necessary to become employable at an entry level in an occupation and then satisfactorily complete an on-the-job training (OJT) program. The Center, however, may waive the OJT requirement if it cannot be completed due to an emergency. The Center then considers the corpsman an emergency graduate.

Center records showed that the OJT requirement was waived for 96 corpsmen during 1971. We reviewed the circumstances surrounding the termination of 16 of these corpsmen selected at random and found that only four had a disciplinary problem when OJT was waived and they were allowed to graduate. Of these four, two had been charged with possessing weapons, one with violating probation imposed by the Center for gambling, and one with threatening another corpsman.

One of the four corpsmen did not possess the minimum skills required for graduation. Center officials advised us this corpsman, who was terminated for possessing a weapon, should not have been classified as a graduate.

### REPORTING CRIMES

Labor regulations require Center directors to confer with appropriate law enforcement officials to develop an arrangement to provide, in part, the criteria for identifying crimes that must be reported to Federal or local officials.

The Center Director informed us that such an arrangement had been established; however, these arrangements had not been put in writing, as he did not feel he was in a position to request local law enforcement officials to do this. He stated that the Director of Security was responsible for reporting crimes.

The Director of Security informed us that he was unaware of any such reporting arrangements and that he had never received written criteria on what specific incidents should be reported. Therefore, he used his own discretion in determining which incidents to report.

To identify specific crimes that might not have been reported, we reviewed the 352 incidents which, according to Center records, occurred from May 1 through December 31, 1971. We selected 25 of these incidents which we thought should have been reported to the FBI and submitted the list to that agency to ascertain which incidents had been reported and which had not but should have been. Center records showed that eight of the 25 incidents had been reported to the FBI.

The special agent in charge of the Indianapolis FBI office confirmed that the eight incidents had been reported and that only four or five of the remaining 17 incidents should have been reported. He could not say positively that these cases had not been reported. To do so would require a search through closed files. The special agent advised us also that his office had received numerous reports from the Center of incidents not among those we had selected.

During our review, contractor, Labor, and FBI officials met several times to agree on incidents to be reported. According to Labor officials, the FBI was concerned that incidents had occurred at the Center which should have been reported but had not been. The FBI requested all incidents be reported that (1) involved personnel injury, loss or damage of Government property, or adverse public reaction, or (2) necessitated apprehension or detention. Center officials agreed to comply with this request and FBI officials informed us they were satisfied with the Center's reporting.

#### TERMINATION OF TWO CORPSMEN

Two corpsmen allegedly were terminated in October 1971 for spending the weekend with the family of a former Center employee who had filed charges of unfair labor practices against Westinghouse. Center officials stated the corpsmen were terminated for other reasons; one resigned as dissatisfied with the program and the other was given an emergency graduation.

According to Center records and our discussions with Center officials, the two corpsmen were called before the area disciplinary officer to discuss their records on Monday, October 25, 1971, following the weekend in question and after a review of their records. One corpsman, who had excessive disciplinary incidents, was given the choice of voluntarily terminating or going before the Center Review Board and possibly being involuntarily terminated. We were advised this corpsman chose to resign as dissatisfied with the Center.

The other corpsman, according to Center records, had requested a Columbus, Indiana, businessman's assistance in soliciting funds from local corporation officials to enhance the corpsman's musical career. He had advised the businessman that Center officials had sanctioned his request. Contractor officials stated such conduct could seriously impair the Center's community image and was detrimental to the cooperative programs at the Center. As the corpsman had almost completed his training program, he was given the choice of an emergency graduation or going before the Center Review Board and possibly being involuntarily terminated. We were advised this corpsman chose to terminate as an emergency graduate. According to Center records, however, he

had completed all requirements for graduation including OJT but had chosen to defer graduation to complete his GED.

The first corpsman had been involved in 18 disciplinary incidents in about 16 months at the Center. He also appeared before the Center Review Board in August 1970 charged with assault and had been given 30 days' restriction and 30 days' probation. No attempt, however, had been made to terminate him until he had spent the weekend with the former employee's family.

The basis for terminating the second corpsman was somewhat questionable. The Columbus, Indiana, businessman advised us this corpsman had never attempted to solicit funds; rather he had only requested an introduction to local entertainment personalities in an effort to enhance his musical career. He further stated that approximately 1 month before this incident, another corpsman had approached him soliciting funds for a personal project and he believed Center officials had confused his reports of the two separate incidents.

When advised of this, Center officials would not acknowledge that they had confused the two incidents, but stated that, if they had done the corpsman an injustice, they were sorry.

## CHAPTER 4

### HEALTH SERVICES AND COUNSELING

We reviewed the administration of the Center's health services and counseling programs to corpsmen because of reports of (1) undetected infections from tattoos and rampant venereal disease (VD) among the corpsmen and (2) inadequate counseling.

#### HEALTH SERVICES

From February 28 to March 3, 1972, Labor conducted its annual Center review. The review team concluded that the overall Center management, with the exception of health services, basically conformed to the contract. The review team reported that for at least the past 3 years the Center had not had a permanent medical director and the acting medical director did not supply sufficient leadership (in terms of training and supervising paramedical personnel) to fulfill this role. The review team thought the lack of direction led to low staff morale and corpsmen dissatisfaction with health services. The review team also concluded that (1) one physician could not provide adequate medical services to the 1,800 corpsmen at the Center, training and supervision for medical technicians and other personnel, and emergency services, (2) the delivery system did not insure timely, responsive, or complete treatment, and (3) impersonal, production-line medical services were often rendered.

Prior reports and correspondence revealed that the basic deficiencies cited by the 1972 annual review team had existed since at least 1968.

According to a November 1, 1971, Labor memorandum, these deficiencies remained the major problem to be resolved during the then-current contract negotiations for Center operation. Before the negotiations, Labor located an organization willing to provide partial health services. Labor decided that, if the contractor did not wish to subcontract with this organization, the contractor must provide an alternative. Because the contractor was unwilling to subcontract for health services, Labor required the contractor to (1) hire on or before February 8, 1972, a physician acceptable to Labor as a medical director responsible for the entire health services program and (2) make a complete study before March 3, 1972,

of the health services program to be submitted with recommendations for Labor approval before its implementation.

The contractor submitted the required study, dated March 3, 1972, to Labor and the Center attempted to hire the acting medical director on a permanent basis, but the individual who had been acting medical director was not acceptable to Labor. On June 27, 1972, Labor offered to help the Center Director find a physician who could meet Center needs identified in the 1972 annual review and asked the Center to make every effort to hire a medical director by September 15, 1972. Labor advised that this date was over 7 months past the date specified in the contract and "appropriate action may be taken" if a director was not hired by this revised date. On October 4, 1972, Labor officials advised us that the Center still had not hired a medical director but that Labor was satisfied with the attempts to do so and no action was contemplated, except to continue to help the Center locate an acceptable medical director.

With respect to the other deficiencies cited by the 1972 annual review team, the Center Director advised Labor that the health services had been reorganized and were now more efficient. Additional personnel--two registered nurses, two licensed practical nurses, and a licensed X-ray technician--were hired. Labor advised us the Center was granted permission to hire another physician and, as an interim measure, had arranged with the Army's Fort Benjamin Harrison in Indianapolis to provide additional physician coverage and hospital services.

Because our review of numerous reports and correspondence on the Center's health service program showed that the major deficiencies were attributed to the absence of a permanent medical director, we doubt that the action taken to date will resolve all the problems identified.

#### VD and tattoos

Since we did not have access to individual medical records because of the confidentiality of the relationship between patient and doctor, our inquiry into the reports regarding VD and tattoos was generally limited to reviewing other reports and interviewing current and former Center medical personnel.

Our review indicated a serious VD problem among corpsmen. For example, from June 1971 when the Center began compiling statistics, until March 15, 1972, there was an average of 16 VD cases per month among corpsmen. For the last 7 months of 1971, 125 VD cases were detected. This equals 80 percent of the cases reported in 1971 for Johnson County, Indiana, and over 1 percent of the cases reported for the State. Both current and former medical personnel informed us that generally corpsmen do not have the disease when they arrive at the Center but contact it while on pass in Indianapolis. They believed that after the disease was detected the corpsmen received prompt and adequate medical treatment. We were also informed that infections from tattoos were infrequent and did not pose a major medical problem among corpsmen.

### COUNSELING

Before the Center Director reorganized the counseling program in April 1971, all 12 authorized professional counselors were assigned to a counseling department directed by a counseling manager. When fully staffed there was an educational liaison counselor, a counseling coordinator, and one counselor for the corpsmen in each dormitory. The counselors worked 5 days a week and were available until 9 p.m. three nights a week. During the day the counselors saw corpsmen in their offices on a demand, crisis, or referral basis. During the evening they were generally in the dormitories for group counseling.

The Center Director abolished the counseling department during the reorganization and assigned all professional counselors to departments responsible for various program areas, such as general education and residential living. This action was reported to be in partial response to a Labor recommendation that the Center (1) clearly define the counseling department's role, (2) improve the formal counseling relationship in education, vocational training, and placement, and (3) establish procedures for periodic and comprehensive reviews of each corpsman's progress.

A June 1971 Labor review team noted that the counseling manager's position was eliminated in the reorganization and each counselor reported to the department manager to which he was assigned. The report stated that it appeared the counselors as a group thought the change represented, among other

things, a lack of sensitivity and concern. The report indicated the counselors' morale was low and that it appeared the Center administration perceived the lowered morale as working against the achievement of the Center's program goals. The report went on to say that feelings were polarized, communications had more or less broken down, and the Center's effectiveness was impaired.

Relations between the Center administration and counselors finally deteriorated to the point that all the counselors were terminated in July 1971.

Under these conditions the reorganization was delayed. For example, the counselors handbook setting forth the counseling philosophy, goals and objectives, and methodology was not issued until October 1971 and, as of February 28, 1972, three of the 12 authorized counseling positions had not been filled. Further, staff training did not begin until April 1972.

The counseling program is designed to continue from the time the corpsman enters orientation until he completes his training. The program provides for individual and group counseling by professional counselors and other staff members. Professional counselors must provide individual counseling during orientation. After orientation, the staff member working closest with the corpsman, is to provide individual counseling. Staff members are expected to refer problem cases to the professional counselors.

Counseling files for 50 corpsmen showed that corpsmen generally received professional individual counseling once a month. We also noted evidence of scheduled group counseling on social skills. We were advised that the Center did not maintain records of nonscheduled group counseling.

The information in the files was generally insufficient for us to evaluate the quality of counseling received. For example, the files for one corpsman contained a record for five individual counseling sessions. One, which was undated and unsigned, simply stated that the corpsman was pleasant, outgoing, was on the boxing team, and resided in the honor wing. Another was undated, unsigned, and contained no comments. A signed record dated February 28, 1972, contained no comments. One signed record dated March 21, 1972, was

checked to show the discipline record was discussed and commented that the corpsman had been counseled about his conduct in his shop and general educational classes. A similar record dated April 26, 1972, stated the corpsman had been counseled about horseplay in the dormitory and his involvement with the boxing team. We also found that no central counseling file was maintained which made it necessary to contact each counselor to obtain a complete counseling record for a corpsman.

We advised the Center Director of our observations and stated that, in view of the meager information in the counseling records and the relatively short duration of the current counseling program, we were unable to make a meaningful evaluation. The Center Director generally agreed with our observations and advised the program was still being developed and revised. He stated the opinion that any subsequent reviews would disclose many improvements.

## CHAPTER 5

### PLACEMENT

The reliability of reports of corpsmen placed was questioned, primarily because the reported placements for the quarter ended September 30, 1971, accounted for only a portion of the total number of corpsmen who had left the Center during the quarter. Our review confirmed that the reports involved were of questionable value for ascertaining the status of a group of terminees for a specific period of time.

The Job Corps Placement Manual states that a male corpsman is considered as placed when he has (1) obtained regular employment or entered an on-the-job wage training program, (2) been accepted into the Armed Forces, (3) entered into an academic or institutional training program, or (4) been accepted into a voluntary community service program.

Job Corps placement procedures require that a placement form be prepared for all corpsmen terminating the program. If a center places the corpsman, the form is completed after the center has verified the placement and is then sent to the Labor regional office with jurisdiction over the State in which the corpsman is placed or is residing. If a center does not place the corpsman, the center partially completes the form and forwards it to the Labor regional office with jurisdiction over the State in which the corpsman desires placement. The cognizant regional office is responsible for seeing that the various placement agencies within the region complete the form.

The placement form is to be completed either immediately upon placement or on the 90th day after the corpsman's termination date, if the corpsman has not been placed. The completed form is then forwarded to the Labor Job Corps Placement Division at Job Corps headquarters.

The Placement Division prepares, by center, two quarterly reports on the placement status of corpsmen. One lists in detail the completed placement forms received during the quarter, and the other summarizes this list.

The reporting system, as described above, does not provide for a reconciliation of the placement status of corpsmen who have left a center within a given time or on any other basis. The reports simply list and summarize the information contained on the placement forms received within the quarter. Further, Labor officials advised that the 90-day limit is not observed and that a placement will be recorded whenever the form is received. The ultimate effect of this practice is that there is no actual cutoff date for reconciliation purposes. Therefore, there is no practical means to ascertain the number of terminees who have been placed for a given period.

## CHAPTER 6

### SCHEDULING AND SUPERVISING RECREATION

We reviewed the scheduling and supervision of recreation because of complaints concerning corpsmen's misconduct while visiting the Center's Indianapolis facility. The complainants believed that the corpsmen were not adequately supervised and that the use of recreational facilities was not properly scheduled in Indianapolis or at the Center.

The Center offers corpsmen numerous recreational activities, ranging from quiet games and clubs to intramural and varsity sports. Recreational facilities are open according to corpsmen demand. Further, corpsmen are always free to check out recreational equipment kept in each dormitory.

Weekly recreational activities schedules are widely distributed. Attendance records reflect a high participation rate in structured and free time events. Center employees supervise these activities.

The Center also maintains a community center in Indianapolis to allow corpsmen to participate in community social, cultural, and recreational activities. The community center is contiguous to the central business district and is open on weekends when corpsmen may be absent from the Center on pass. Passes granted are limited by the number of corpsmen the community center can accommodate and the number of corpsmen that could reasonably be expected to find entertainment and recreation in Indianapolis--a maximum of about 350 a weekend. Since passes are limited, a rotation system is used to determine when a corpsman is eligible for a pass. In addition, a corpsman must pass a dress inspection, be clean shaven, have a haircut, and not be on restriction.

Corpsmen transported to the Indianapolis community center are briefed on weekend activities and how to conduct themselves. At the center, corpsmen may dance, play games, use an amateur radio station, participate in group discussions, watch television, read, or utilize a snack bar. Corpsmen are also taken to activities away from the community center. Center personnel supervise all planned activities. Corpsmen can leave the community center at any time. In such situations, direct supervision of corpsmen is not practicable.

Local businessmen and city officials differed as to the impact of corpsmen on the economy and as to attitudes of the neighborhood surrounding the community center. Police officials and four businessmen informed us the corpsmen's presence and behavior, in terms of dress, attitude, congregating, milling around, and use of vulgar language disturbs people who frequent the neighborhood. Two businessmen stated the corpsmen's presence intimidated their customers and thus, adversely affected business. Two businessmen, criticized corpsmen conduct but did not think it affected their business.

Police officials informed us that they believed the supervision at the community center was adequate but that the problem arises when corpsmen leave the community center. They stated that many corpsmen, have no social training, have poor manners and education. Thus, according to these officials, behavior which is found distasteful to most people is a way of life to corpsmen.

Center and Labor officials advised us they were fully aware of the problems involving the community center and had met with concerned citizens and city officials to find a solution and to improve the Center's relationship with the community. They plan to continue these efforts.

## CHAPTER 7

### TEACHER EVALUATION AND GENERAL

#### EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT TEST RESULTS

We ascertained the methods used to evaluate teachers because of reports that teachers were rated on the number of corpsmen promoted rather than on their teaching ability. We were also requested to determine the results of efforts to increase the number of GED graduates.

The contractor requires that each employee be evaluated annually to furnish information to efficiently use employees and to justify merit salary increases. Each report provides a subjective evaluation of employee performance, personal qualities, professional qualifications, and potential. Employees may appeal adverse ratings to the Center Director.

Eighty-two teachers were assigned to the Center's general, vocational, and avocational programs. Each teacher who had been an employee at least 1 year had been evaluated at least once in accordance with established procedures. None of the ratings were appealed. In all cases the teacher's immediate supervisor evaluated the teacher on such matters as ingenuity, alertness to problem situations, and professionalism. We found no evidence that teachers were evaluated on any basis contrary to the established criteria.

A Center official advised that, since the Indiana Department of Public Instruction certified the General Education Department, teachers at the Center are paid under the State's schedule and receive predetermined annual raises. The officials stated that an outstanding teacher could receive a promotion or merit increase on the basis of his performance rating.

In July 1969 we reported to the Congress<sup>1</sup> that, although many corpsmen had a chance to earn a GED certificate, they

---

<sup>1</sup>Report to the Congress entitled "Effectiveness and Administration of the Atterbury Job Corps Center For Men Under The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964" (B-130515, July 23, 1969).

did not take the test, primarily because testing facilities at Indiana University could not accommodate all qualified corpsmen. During calendar year 1967, 232 corpsmen, or essentially all that could be accommodated, took the test. Center officials informed us corpsmen may not have taken the GED test because corpsmen had to request to take the test and some may not have done so.

The Center became a GED testing site in 1969. Tests are currently administered on 2 days each month with two testing sessions each day. The test is composed of five parts taken at three separate sittings 2 weeks apart. The Center can accommodate 125 corpsmen each session. Center officials informed us that these facilities accommodate all corpsmen eligible to take examinations and that corpsmen are automatically scheduled to take the tests when they are qualified.

Since our last review at the Center, more corpsmen have completed and passed the GED test.

<u>Calendar year</u>	<u>Corpsmen completing GED test</u>	<u>Corpsmen passing GED test</u>	
		<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent of base year</u>
1968	316	263	Base year
1969	490	363	138
1970	522	450	171
1971	660	554	211

In 1972 more corpsmen will take and pass the GED test. During the first quarter of 1972, 329 corpsmen completed the test, or more than in all of 1968. Of the 329 corpsmen completing the test, 250 passed, or 95 percent of the number who passed the test in 1968.