094981

B-165430
6-18-75
094981

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

B-165430 JUN 18 1975

The Honorable John Brademas
Chairman, Select Education Subcommittee
Education and Labor Committee
House of Representatives

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In accordance with the September 30, 1974, request made by you and the Chairmen, Senate Special Committee on Aging; and the Subcommittee on Aging, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and agreements with your office, we have studied the implementation of the Older Americans Comprehensive Services Amendments of 1973 (Public Law 93-29).

We interviewed officials of the 28 area agencies on aging, 17 State agencies on aging, and 9 Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regional offices listed in enclosure I. During these interviews we filled out questionnaires developed in cooperation with your office. We interviewed also representatives of selected area agency grantees, local governments, councils of government, and review agencies established in accordance with Office of Management and Budget Circular A-95. Our study emphasized (1) identification of problems experienced by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Office of Human Development Regional Program Directors on Aging and State and local officials in implementing the Comprehensive Service Amendments and (2) obtaining their assessments of the programs established under the amendments.

Although we have not fully evaluated all the data, this is a brief interim report responding to your office's information needs during consideration of amendments to the Older Americans Act. We will continue to evaluate and summarize the responses to our questionnaires and will provide you with a final report. In addition, only 15 of the 17 States we visited are discussed in this report because the information concerning 2 States' programs has just been obtained and not yet evaluated. However, we will discuss their programs in our final report.

BACKGROUND

The Older Americans Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-73) provided services and programs for older persons through three

grant programs for (1) community planning and services, (2) research and demonstration, and (3) personnel training in the field of aging. This act also established the Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Older Americans Act Amendments of 1967 (Public Law 90-42) extended each of these provisions. The Older Americans Act Amendments of 1969 (Public Law 91-69) also extended these provisions and added a program of grants for model projects and a new volunteer program under which the Foster Grandparent and Retired Senior Volunteer programs were authorized. The 1972 amendments to the act (Public Law 92-258) authorized a National Nutrition Program for the Elderly.

The Comprehensive Service Amendments of 1973 established the "area agency concept" under title III of the act to develop at the substate level a system of comprehensive and coordinated services for older persons. Before the 1973 amendments, title III moneys were allotted to the States for allocation to local agencies which provided specific social programs.

Title III, as amended, authorized formula grants to the States for developing comprehensive and coordinated systems for delivery of social services to the elderly and for model projects. To participate in the title III formula grant program, a State must designate a sole State agency to

--develop a State plan to be submitted to the Commissioner on Aging for approval,

--be primarily responsible for coordinating all State activities related to the purposes of the Older Americans Act, and

--divide the entire State into planning and service areas.

In dividing a State into planning and service areas, the State agency must consider the geographical distribution of individuals aged 60 and older, the need for social services (including the numbers of older persons with low incomes residing in the area), the distribution of resources available to provide these services, the location of units of local government and any other relevant factors. Any local government which has a population within its jurisdiction aged 60 or over of 50,000 or more, or which contains 15 percent or more of the State's population aged 60 or over, is to be designated as a planning and service area. However, the State may designate as a planning and service area any region within the

State which includes one or more local government units when the State determines that the designation is necessary for effective administration.

After making these designations, the State agency determines the planning and service areas for which an area plan will be developed and names (after considering the views of local government units in the area) a single public or nonprofit private agency or organization as the area agency. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regulations require each area agency to annually submit to the State agency for approval, its area plan for developing comprehensive and coordinated systems for delivery of social services to the elderly throughout the area.

In order for the award of funds to be approved by the State agency, the area plan must provide for a continuous area agency process of planning, including defining and redefining objectives and establishing priorities; and creating or strengthening action programs within the area for coordinating delivery of existing services for older persons, and pooling of untapped resources. Title III funds awarded to a State for area planning and social service programs may be used to fund up to 75 percent of the cost of administering an area plan and up to 90 percent of social services provided under the plan. Individual social services may be funded for no longer than 3 years unless the Commissioner, after obtaining State agency's views, approves further funding.

Since 1965 virtually all the States and territories have created State agencies on aging. According to officials of the Administration on Aging, 412 local area agencies on aging had been funded under title III of the Older Americans Act by January 1, 1975. Most of these had been designated between January and June 1974. Eventually, the States plan to establish 586 area agencies.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regulations require also that, whenever possible, Indian reservations be designated as planning and service areas, and that the tribal organization of reservations be designated as the area agency. Eight States in our sample had Indian reservations which were not designated as planning and service areas. Officials in five States said the small number of elderly Indians living on the reservations was a primary reason for not making the designation. Officials of the other three States said that the planning and service area boundaries followed existing substate boundaries which did not make allowances for Indian reservations.

ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES

After the State agency approves an area plan, it may allocate funds to an area agency to support

--planning, pooling, and coordination;

--outreach, information, and referral services designed to assist older persons to become aware of social services available in the area;

--transportation and escort services; and

--other social services needed by older persons but which no public or private agencies of the area can or will provide (commonly referred to as gap-filling services).

We obtained budgetary data to determine how the area agencies allocated their resources to (1) program planning, (2) coordination of the delivery of existing services, (3) pooling of existing but untapped resources, (4) information and referral, (5) outreach, (6) transportation, (7) escort, and (8) gap-filling services. Enclosure II presents a summary of the allocation of resources by the area agencies.

Generally, the area agencies did not feel they were receiving sufficient funds for obtaining necessary staff to administer the program. Officials at most area agencies said that, because of insufficient resources at the local level, they probably would not be able to continue providing social services after the 3-year limit for Federal support expires.

Pooling of untapped resources focuses upon "potential" rather than actual resources. Potential refers to resources which are not being used for the benefit of older persons, regardless of whether they are being used for some population other than the elderly.

Of the 28 area agencies sampled, 24 had pooled funds from local government revenues, 20 from other public revenues, 18 from revenue sharing funds, and 11 from State general revenues.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regulations state that, for fiscal year 1975 and each fiscal year thereafter, not less than 25 percent of the non-Federal share of the total expenditures under the State plan shall be met with

funds from State or local public sources. In most instances the area agencies received the bulk of their non-Federal matching funds from local governments or private sources. Twenty area agencies received no non-Federal matching funds from State governments. Enclosure III presents a summary of sources for non-Federal matching funds.

Use of title III funds as a catalyst

During consideration of the 1973 amendments to the Older Americans Act, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare indicated that title III funds were to be used as a catalyst to attract increasing commitments of public and private resources. Similarly, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regulations provide that area agencies must each year acquire and spend non-Federal resources in an amount not less than that of the previous year. This has been commonly referred to as the local maintenance of effort rule. According to the Commissioner of the Administration on Aging, this provision is to insure that non-Federal resources already committed to aging programs are not withdrawn as a result of increases in title III funds. There was no consensus among area agency officials as to whether this maintenance of effort requirement increased the catalytic effect of title III funds. Those officials in favor of the requirement believe that it insures the continued funding of programs and forces grantees to work toward total independence. Others said that as a result of this requirement potential funding sources hesitate to support the programs.

On April 9, 1975, the Commissioner announced that after closely reviewing the local maintenance of effort rule governing title III grantees, the Administration on Aging had decided to repeal this provision by deleting it from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's regulations. According to the Commissioner, this action is being taken because the rule has been troublesome in many respects--from a conceptual, as well as a practical standpoint.

ABILITY TO FULFILL BASIC RESPONSIBILITIES AND COORDINATE EXISTING SERVICES

The area agencies are the principal focus of activity under the Older Americans Act and, accordingly, function largely to (1) close the gaps between the needs of older persons and the services available to meet their needs, (2) improve the linkage of services into a comprehensive, coordinated system, and (3) advocate the needs of the elderly within local areas. The area agencies are also responsible for

--providing leadership and advocacy on behalf of older persons,

--determining the need for social services,

--inventorying local resources,

--establishing program objectives and priorities,

--planning with planning agencies and local providers of services,

--coordinating the delivery of services,

--pooling available untapped resources,

--periodically evaluating and monitoring the performance of contractors and grantees,

--conducting public hearings concerning the needs of the elderly,

--collecting and disseminating information concerning the needs of the elderly,

--providing technical assistance to service providers,

--arranging for legal services for older persons,

--arranging for older persons to aid in day care centers,

--establishing an advisory council, and

--considering the views of recipients of services under the area plan.

Except for arranging legal services for older persons and arranging for older persons to aid in day care centers, the majority of area agencies were performing the above functions either directly or under contract or grant. Enclosure IV shows the number of area agencies performing these functions and the approximate amount of time devoted to each.

As shown in enclosure IV, more than half of the area agencies are arranging for neither legal services nor for older persons to aid in day care centers. Many of the officials at area agencies, as well as State agencies and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regional offices, stated that the area agencies should not be responsible for

performing these functions because they (1) did not have available staff to assign to them, (2) had assigned higher priorities to other functions, and (3) believed that other organizations were capable of providing them. Some officials told us they viewed these as services rather than functions and believed they should be treated as such.

In contrast, many officials at the area agencies said they should be given additional responsibility for coordinating their existing functions with the Older Americans Act title VII nutrition programs. As shown in enclosure V, most of the area agencies shared facilities, outreach services, and volunteers with the local title VII projects; 11 used the same paid staff as the title VII project in their areas; and most provided information and referral services, health and welfare counseling, recreation activities, and transportation services to the local title VII projects.

Regional officials stated that area agencies varied in their ability to perform both the coordination and pooling function. The principal reasons given for these variances were

--capability of the area agency director,
--length of time the area agency had been in existence,
--attitudes and capability of area agency staff, and
--attitudes of and support from local organizations.

Although the extent of activities varied, area agencies had pooled from revenue sharing funds, State general funds, local government funds, and other public funds. Local government and other public funds were the most frequent sources from which the area agencies pooled funds. Revenue sharing and State general funds were sought to a lesser degree.

Most of the area agencies believed that their ability to pool funds would be enhanced if the States provided additional guidance and support. Officials at some of the area agencies commented that the State did not tell them how to obtain funds from other sources. They also believed the State should negotiate more agreements at the State and Federal levels which could benefit the area agencies at the local levels.

Some area agencies have occasionaly experienced difficulty in obtaining revenue sharing funds because these moneys were earmarked for capital expenditures. Other area agencies found that these funds were scarce and the competition was strong for those that were available.

Advisory councils

The Older Americans Act and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regulations require each area agency to establish an advisory council, composed of representatives of program participants and the general public, to advise the area agency on all matters relating to the development and administration of the area plan and operations conducted thereunder. The act also contains a similar requirement for a State advisory committee.

Most of the States felt that the area agency advisory councils and State advisory committees had made significant contributions to the program. However, two States believed that the contributions of State advisory committees were not as important as those of the area agency advisory councils. One State official said that the advisory groups were too large to be effective. Twenty-six of the area agencies we visited had advisory councils, and their membership ranged from 11 to 92 people. Officials of three Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regional offices believed advisory councils and committees had not made significant contributions to the aging programs. Enclosure VI is a summary of State and area agency responses concerning the effectiveness of advisory committees and councils.

Serving the poor and minorities

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regulations require that, to the extent feasible, considering available resources, low income and minority individuals should be served at least in proportion to their relative numbers in the planning and service area.

Only a small number of the area agencies we visited have been unable to comply with this regulation. In several instances, the area agencies were serving the low income and minority far in excess of their relative numbers in the planning and service area.

Even with these successes, the area agency officials interviewed cited several problems associated with serving poor and minority individuals. The most frequently stated problems were (1) language barriers, (2) cultural differences, (3) identification of individuals belonging to these groups, and (4) the reluctance of some elderly to participate in what they consider a "welfare" or "hand-out" program.

To overcome these problems, area agencies were including representatives from minority groups on advisory councils, employing bilingual individuals, using outreach workers, and using news media to inform poor and minority elderly about the availability of the program and to overcome the image of being a "hand-out" program.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regulations also require that the area plan provide for contracts or grants to be awarded to minority individuals at least in proportion to their relative numbers in the planning and service area. Officials of 10 State agencies and 4 Department regional offices told us that the area agencies in their States and regions had not complied with this regulation. The primary reasons given by them for non-compliance were that (1) this requirement was not stressed until after the area plans had been developed, (2) there is a scarcity of experienced, competent minority contractors and difficulties in determining what constituted a minority contractor, and (3) the existing minority contractors are often not financially competitive.

STAFF SIZE AND ABILITY TO MEET WORKLOAD

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regulations require that the single organizational unit on aging in each State be headed by an individual possessing education and experience necessary to assume leadership, and that this individual's time be devoted solely to that activity. In addition, this individual is to be assisted by adequate qualified staff to assure the effective conduct of the State agency's responsibilities. Enclosure VII presents the positions occupied in State agencies and the educational backgrounds of individuals responsible for the different activities at the locations we visited.

Only five of the State aging agencies indicated that they had sufficient qualified staff to properly perform their assigned responsibilities. Eight States specifically indicated that their understaffing was due to funding limitations.

Officials at two State agencies said that a substantial number of their staff members were not qualified for the positions they held. One State is seeking to reduce the impact of this situation by reassigning some employees to less demanding positions while another is stressing training under a tuition reimbursement program.

The Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regulations require that preference be given to employing persons aged 60 and over for any position in State and area agency organizations for which they qualify under the governing merit employment systems. In addition, the States and area agencies are required to develop an affirmative action plan for equal employment opportunity. All of the State agencies we visited had employees from minority groups and only one did not have any employees who were 60 or older.

All of the 28 area agencies had separately identifiable employees except for one, which was operated by the local Community Service Agency as part of its overall functions. Of the 27 area agencies which had identifiable employees, 15 did not have anyone 60 or older on their staffs. Twelve of these 27 area agencies did not have minority representation. Enclosure VIII summarizes the staffing patterns of the area agencies visited.

Most of the States said they and the area agencies were having difficulty implementing the affirmative action plans. The major problems were:

--Inability to attract qualified applicants.

--Delays in getting merit systems approved and other problems associated with not having complete control of hiring.

--Small staff size prohibiting development of meaningful affirmative action plans.

GUIDANCE RECEIVED AND RELATIONSHIPS WITH STATE AND FEDERAL AGENCIES

Operation of aging programs involves a substantial amount of communication among officials of the Federal and State governments and area agencies. The Administration on Aging is responsible for developing and issuing regulations, guidelines, and related material to State and area agencies on aging to help insure compliance with legislative requirements. Apart from these requirements, the State agencies are responsible for establishing guidelines for area agencies to implement their plans. If questions arise on interpretation of regulations, guidelines or policy, or their applicability to particular situations, the Department of Health, Education, and

Welfare's Office of Human Development Regional Program Directors on Aging are responsible for providing necessary clarification. We discussed channels of communication with officials of area agencies, State agencies, and Department regional offices to (1) determine their reactions concerning the effectiveness of policy guidance and the reasonableness of directives, (2) determine what they thought about reporting requirements, and (3) solicit their opinions concerning relationships with each other.

Effectiveness of policy guidance

Responses from officials of 9 of the 28 area agencies indicated that State policy was good; 7 believed that it was average; 11 officials said that it was poor; and 1 did not give a response. The problems most frequently mentioned were that the States' guidance was ambiguous and changed too often.

Also, we asked State officials for their opinions on the effectiveness of regional policy guidance. Of the 15 officials responding, 5 indicated that the guidance was good; 2 believed that it was poor; 7 said that it was average; and 1 rated policy guidance for fiscal management as poor and guidance for program implementation as good. The State officials made the following comments in connection with their responses:

--Washington gave the regional office little power and yet the States looked to the region for answers.

--The frequency of policy changes reflected a tendency to set overly detailed policy.

--Many new policy documents are issued which either change old policies or affect related communications without referring to them.

Reasonableness of directives

To ascertain responses about the reasonableness of State and Administration on Aging directives, we asked area agency officials whether they agreed that these directives were reasonable--offering sufficient guidance without being overly restrictive.

	State directives	Administration on Aging directives
Agree	15	16
Uncertain	3	5
Disagree	7	7
No reply	3	0

The problem with the State directives most frequently mentioned was that they did not always provide sufficient details for guidance. Area agency officials mentioned a variety of problem areas with Administration on Aging directives including, (1) untimeliness of issuance, (2) requirements for destruction of information and referral records within 30 days, and (3) requirements for granting service contracts to minorities.

We also asked officials of the 15 State agencies to give their opinions of the reasonableness of Administration on Aging directives. Officials of 12 States said that the directives were not reasonable, 1 was uncertain, and 2 believed that the directives were reasonable. The problems most frequently mentioned concerning Administration on Aging directives were that they were ambiguous, voluminous, and did not offer sufficient guidance.

Adequacy of reporting requirements

In addition to submitting annual State plans, State agencies are required to submit quarterly fiscal and program reports to the regional offices. Once area agencies are designated in the planning and service areas, they must submit their annual area plans to the States. The number of fiscal and program reports which the area agencies are required to prepare vary from State to State. For example, some States require area agencies to report monthly while other States require quarterly reports.

During our interviews, officials at 16 of the 28 area agencies said that State reporting requirements were satisfactory. Officials at 7 of the 15 States believed that the Administration on Aging's reporting requirements were satisfactory. Almost all of the area agency officials said that they received no formal feedback on or about reports submitted to the State agency. Similarly, most State officials said that they received no formal feedback on reports submitted to the regional offices.

State agency relationships with area agencies and regional offices

Most of the State officials interviewed said that their relationships with area agencies were good. However, one State official believed that his agency's relationship with its area agency was average to poor because the State agency began to administer the program at the same time the area agencies were established. Most State officials told us that they had a good working relationship with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regional offices.

Suggestions for changing the Older Americans Act

During our interviews, we asked officials of the area agencies, States, and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regional offices to recommend changes in legislation which they believed would improve the title III program. The recommendations most frequently mentioned were to require more coordination between title III and VII programs and to increase the total funding level of title III programs. A summary of the major recommendations made appears in enclosure IX.

CONCLUSIONS

Because we have not fully evaluated the responses to our questionnaires and some additional verification is still needed on certain matters, we do not have specific conclusions and recommendations at this time. However, we believe that progress has been made by the States and area agencies in implementing the Older Americans Comprehensive Services Amendments of 1973. Although the officials we interviewed identified a number of problems in implementing the 1973 amendments, most appear to be attributable to the relative newness of the area agency concept and its recent beginnings in many of the States.

- - - -

We are sending identical reports to the Chairmen, Senate Special Committee on Aging; and the Subcommittee on Aging, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Because of your urgent need for his interim report, we have not obtained HEW comments on the information presented here.

Sincerely yours,

Elmer B. Staats

Comptroller General
of the United States

Enclosures - 9

ENCLOSURE I

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE REGIONS; STATE AGING AGENCIES; AND AREA AGENCIES ON AGING VISITED DURING OUR STUDY

Region I --Boston, Massachusetts
Region II --New York, New York
Region III --Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Region IV --Atlanta, Georgia
Region V --Chicago, Illinois
Region VI --Dallas, Texas
Region VIII--Denver, Colorado
Region IX --San Francisco, California
Region X --Seattle, Washington

State aging agencies

Arizona
California
Colorado
Florida
Georgia
Idaho
Illinois
Indiana
Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota
New Jersey
New Mexico
Ohio
Pennsylvania
Rhode Island
South Carolina

Area agencies on aging located in

Tucson, Arizona
Los Angeles, California
Sacramento, California
San Diego, California
Durango, Colorado
Pueblo, Colorado
Winter Park, Florida
Miami, Florida
Atlanta, Georgia
Gainesville, Georgia
Pocatello, Idaho
Chicago, Illinois
Mt. Carmel, Illinois
Terre Haute, Indiana
Vincennes, Indiana
Escanaba, Michigan
Flint, Michigan
Duluth, Minnesota
St. Paul, Minnesota
Cleveland, Ohio
Columbus, Ohio
Albuquerque, New Mexico
Oaklyn, New Jersey
Doylestown, Pennsylvania
Honesdale, Pennsylvania
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Greenville, South Carolina
Rock Hill, South Carolina

ENCLOSURE II

SUMMARY SCHEDULE OF TITLE III AND MATCH RESOURCES ALLOCATED TO VARIOUS ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES (WITH PERCENTAGES) BY AREA AGENCIES ON AGING (note a)

Activity or service	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
Program planning	$ 80,594 12%	$ 28,524 15%	$ 8,671 5%	$189,463 12%	$ 23,517 20%	$ 0 0%	$
Coordination				263,824 16%	13,777 12%	1,624 7%	c/99,505 48%
	b/80,907 12%	b/50,369 27%	b/62,275 36%				
Pooling				102,925 6%	5,320 4%	0 0%	
Information and referral	123,839 19%	24,455 13%	13,430 8%	413,426 25%	11,200 9%	less than 60 .01%	73,518 35%
Outreach	119,817 18%	6,386 3%	21,083 12%	97,811 6%	0 0%	less than 60 .01%	0 0%
Transportation	79,858 12%	20,787 11%	28,431 16%	389,776 24%	55,607 47%	0 0%	0 0%
Escort	74,972 11%	3,085 2%	8,756 5%	107,345 7%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Gap-filling	100,136 15%	54,233 29%	32,215 18%	73,700 4%	10,000 8%	20,129 92%	34,340 17%
Total	$660,123 d/100%	$187,839 100%	$174,861 100%	$1,638,270 100%	$119,421 100%	$21,873 100%	$207,363 100%

a/One area agency was not included in this schedule because it was unable to supply complete budgetary data.

b/Figures for coordination and pooling combined. No breakouts available for area agencies I, II, and III.

c/No breakout available for funds allocated to program planning, coordination, and pooling. One block figure reported.

d/Due to rounding error, actual total is less than 100 percent.

ENCLOSURE II

SUMMARY SCHEDULE OF TITLE III AND MATCHING RESOURCES ALLOCATED TO VARIOUS ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES (WITH PERCENTAGES) BY AREA AGENCIES ON AGING

Activity or service	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	XIV
Program planning	$ 26,432 11%	$ 25,259 9%	$ 60,143 20%	$ 78,330 12%	$ 37,622 16%	$ 34,680 8%	$ 23,576 17%
Coordination	31,322 13%	25,259 9%	37,752 12%	140,119 21%	0 0%	14,986 3%	7,906 6%
Pooling	6,416 3%	12,630 4%	37,750 12%	117,920 18%	0 0%	0 0%	7,906 6%
Information and referral	19,448 8%	60,197 21%	100,000 33%	253,766 39%	53,554 23%	142,389 31%	0 0%
Outreach	35,246 14%	38,517 14%	0 0%	31,471 5%	19,131 8%	59,780 13%	2,250 2%
Transportation	49,981 21%	60,746 21%	70,222 23%	0 0%	15,416 7%	90,074 20%	77,128 56%
Escort	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	14,665 6%	37,792 8%	0 0%
Gap-filling	71,282 30%	61,366 22%	0 0%	34,569 5%	91,253 40%	82,132 17%	18,000 13%
Total	$240,127 100%	$283,974 100%	$305,867 100%	$656,175 100%	$231,641 100%	$461,833 100%	$136,766 100%

ENCLOSURE II

SUMMARY SCHEDULE OF TITLE III AND MATCHING RESOURCES ALLOCATED TO VARIOUS ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES (WITH PERCENTAGES) BY AREA AGENCIES ON AGING

Activity or service	XV	XVI	XVII	XVIII	XIX	XX	XXI
Program planning	$ 24,602 22%	$165,677 14%	$ 5,378 2%	$ 54,103 14%	$ 33,334 5%	$ 41,948 4%	$ 49,200 12%
Coordination	4,931 4%	44,525 4%	48,393 18%	38,008 10%	25,001 4%	53,933 5%	14,050 3%
Pooling	0 0%	14,105 1%	14,397 5%	9,772 3%	25,001 4%	23,969 2%	10,085 2%
Information and referral		416,666 36%	27,636 10%	(f) -	0 0%	115,154 10%	28,740 7%
Outreach		0 0%	14,565 6%	23,908 6%	84,444 12%	0 0%	0 0%
Transportation	e/84,256 74%	0 0%	23,330 9%	(g) -	50,739 7%	128,606 12%	138,150 34%
Escort		0 0%	5,986 2%	0 0%	48,282 7%	0 0%	0 0%
Gap-filling		520,184 45%	124,106 48%	251,978 67%	418,142 61%	728,527 67%	170,527 42%
Total	$113,789 100%	$1,161,157 100%	$263,791 100%	$377,769 100%	$684,943 100%	$1,092,137 100%	$410,752 100%

e/Breakouts for the allocation of resources for support services and gap-filling services were not available. Figure reported represents allocation for information and referral, outreach, transportation, escort, and gap-filling services.

f/Area plan for area agency XVIII states that information and referral is an area agency activity. Therefore, resources for this activity would appear in the administrative portion of the budget.

g/Summary budget for delivery of services for area agency XVIII states that allowances for transportation services are included with multiservice center contracts.

SUMMARY SCHEDULE OF TITLE III AND MATCHING RESOURCES ALLOCATED TO VARIOUS ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES (WITH PERCENTAGES) BY AREA AGENCIES ON AGING

Activity or service	XXII	XXIII	XXIV	XXV	XXVI	XXVII
Program planning	$ 36,734 11%	$ 99,084 17%	$ 28,252 8%	$ 28,161 24%	$ 32,000 5%	$
Coordination	13,486 4%	0 0%	21,007 6%	12,179 10%	24,000 4%	k/84,795 15%
Pooling	0 0%	0 0%	22,715 6%	12,327 10%	24,000 4%	
Information and referral		42,093 7%	75,547 21%	41,369 35%	47,845 7%	44,892 8%
	h/42,104 13%					
Outreach		j/213,769 36%	105,765 30%	8,365 7%	170,667 26%	23,353 4%
Transportation	- -	115,578 20%	71,081 20%	16,578 14%	43,480 7%	81,200 14%
	i/47,596 14%					
Escort		0 0%	less than 1% 90	0 0%	17,070 3%	4,988 1%
Gap-filling	193,977 58%	120,358 20%	29,778 8%	0 0%	289,218 44%	326,370 58%
Total	$333,897 100%	$590,882 100%	$354,235 100%	$118,979 100%	$648,280 100%	$565,598 100%

h/Information and referral and outreach services combined for area agency XXII. No breakouts available.

i/Transportation and escort services combined for area agency XXII. No breakouts available.

j/Allocation for outreach services includes an allocation for home services for area agency XXIII.

k/The allocation of resources for program planning, coordination, and pooling are presented as a combined total for area agency XXVII. No further breakouts available.

SCHEDULE OF NON-FEDERAL MATCHING FUNDS

BY AREA AGENCIES ON AGING (note a)

Area agency	Source of match	Percent of match to total budget: Form of match: Cash	In-kind	Total
I	State government	0	0	0
	Local government	6	0	6
	Private organizations	7	15	22
	Total	13	15	28
II	State government	0	0	0
	Local government	46	0	46
	Private organizations	0	0	0
	Total	46	0	46
III	State government	1	0	1
	Local government	8	1	9
	Private organizations	0	0	0
	Total	9	1	10
IV	State government	0	0	0
	Local government	2	9	11
	Private organizations	0	0	0
	Total	2	9	11
V	State government	0	0	0
	Local government	6	10	16
	Private organizations	0	0	0
	Total	6	10	16
VI	State government	0	0	0
	Local government	26	2	28
	Private organizations	0	0	0
	Total	26	2	28

a/One area agency is not included in this schedule because it was unable to supply complete budgetary data.

Area agency	Source of match	Percent of match to total budget: Form of match: Cash	In-kind	Total
VII	State government	0	0	0
	Local government	12	4	16
	Private organizations	5	0	5
	Total	17	4	21
VIII	State government	0	3	3
	Local government	17	7	24
	Private organizations	3	1	4
	Total	20	11	31
IX	State government	0	0	0
	Local government	9	0	9
	Private organizations	0	16	16
	Total	9	16	25
X	State government	0	0	0
	Local government	0	7	7
	Private organizations	0	2	2
	Total	0	9	9
XI	State government	0	0	0
	Local government	0	15	15
	Private organizations	0	1	1
	Total	0	16	16
XII	State government	0	0	0
	Local government	39	15	54
	Private organizations	0	0	0
	Total	39	15	54
XIII	State government	0	0	0
	Local government	14	8	22
	Private organizations	7	11	18
	Total	21	19	40

Area agency	Source of match	Percent of match to total budget: Form of match: Cash	In-kind	Total
XIV	State government	0	0	0
	Local government	7	0	7
	Private organizations	0	5	5
	Total	7	5	12
XV	State government	(note b)		
	Local government			
	Private organizations			
	Total			15
XVI	State government	0	0	0
	Local government	7	0	7
	Private organizations	0	8	8
	Total	7	8	15
XVII	State government	48	0	48
	Local government	5	8	13
	Private organizations	4	16	20
	Total	57	24	81
XVIII	State government	(note c)		8
	Local government			
	Private organizations			9
	Total			17
XIX	State government	0	0	0
	Local government	3	0	3
	Private organizations	3	24	27
	Total	6	24	30
XX	State government	(note b)		
	Local government			
	Private organizations			
	Total			33

b/No breakouts available; only total non-Federal match.

c/No breakouts of cash or in-kind; also State and local figures combined.

Area agency	Source of match	Percent of match to total budget: Form of match: Cash	In-kind	Total
XXI	State government	0	0	0
	Local government	29	10	39
	Private organizations	less than 1	0	less than 1
	Total	29+	10	39+
XXII	State government	0	0	0
	Local government	0	13	13
	Private organizations	0	15	15
	Total	0	28	28
XXIII	State government	0	0	0
	Local government	1	3	4
	Private organizations	0	10	10
	Total	1	13	14
XXIV	State government	0	0	0
	Local government	3	0	3
	Private organizations	(note d)		17
	Total			20
XXV	State government	less than 1	0	less than 1
	Local government	13	1	14
	Private organizations	(note d)		2
	Total			16+
XXVI	State government	3	0	3
	Local government	17	less than 1	17+
	Private organizations	19	6	25
	Total	39	6+	45+

d/Only total available.

Area agency	Source of match	Percent of match to total budget: Form of match: Cash	In-kind	Total
XXVII	State government Local government Private organizations	(note e)		
	Total			16

e/No breakouts available; only total non-Federal match.

SUMMARY OF FUNCTIONS PERFORMED AND PERCENTAGE OF TIME EXPENDED PERFORMING EACH FUNCTION

	Number of area agencies performing		Number of area agencies not performing	Percentage of time expended by area agencies					No answer (note b)
	Directly	Under contract/ grant		0 (note a)	1-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	
Leadership and advocacy	26	2	-	2	11	9	5	-	1
Determine needs	24	4	-	4	18	5	1	-	1
Inventory resources	24	3	1	4	19	4	-	-	1
Establish objectives	27	1	-	1	26	-	-	-	1
Planning	27	1	-	1	21	5	-	-	1
Coordinating	26	1	1	1	14	8	1	3	1
Pooling	26	1	1	1	18	8	-	-	1
Evaluation	23	1	4	5	18	4	-	-	1
Public hearings	21	-	7	7	20	-	-	-	1
Information on needs	26	1	1	2	25	-	-	-	1
Technical assistance	26	1	1	2	15	8	2	-	1
Provision of legal services	8	3	17	20	7	-	-	-	1
Use in child care	5	2	21	22	5	-	-	-	1
Advisory council	27	-	1	1	23	3	-	-	1
Solicit views of older persons	26	1	1	2	24	1	-	-	1

a/No time is expended if the area agency performs the function under contract or does not perform the function at all.

b/One area agency declined to indicate the percentage of time expended on each function.

ENCLOSURE V

INDICATORS OF EXISTING COORDINATION BETWEEN TITLE III AND VII PROGRAMS

The area agencies were asked:

(1) Do the title VII projects and the area agencies use the same?

	Number of area agencies responding "YES"
Outreach	16
Paid personnel	11
Volunteers	16
Facilities	19

(2) Does the area agency provide any of the following supporting social services for the title VII projects?

Supportive social services	Number of area agencies responding "YES"
Information and referral	20
Health and welfare counseling	16
Nutrition education	8
Shopping assistance	14
Recreation activities	16
Transportation	20

ENCLOSURE VI

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF AREA AGENCY ADVISORY COUNCILS

	Number of area agencies citing each accomplishment
Participation in the development of area plan	15
Advocacy with State and local government	8
Performing needs study	5
Conducting hearings	3
Approving and/or monitoring of subcontracts	3
Participating in the allocation of funds	3
Increasing pooling capability of area agency	1
Reviewing and commenting on non-title III projects	1
None-often advisory council is too new to have made contribution	7

SUMMARY OF STATE AGENCY PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES (note a)

	Total number in each position	Total number of State employees by position and educational background				
		Doctorate degree	Masters degree	Bachelors degree	Less than college degree	Educational data not obtained
Director (note b)	12	-	6	3	1	2
Assistant director/ other administrators	19	1	8	9	1	-
Planner/coordinator	37	1	20	10	1	5
Fiscal/grants manager	27	-	-	13	14	-
Other management specialist	13	-	2	2	7	2
Research analyst (note c)	5	-	2	3	-	-
Information and referral/public information specialist	20	1	8	9	1	1
Nutrition project specialist	22	-	14	6	-	2
Training and employment specialist	18	1	11	6	-	-
Field representatives	76	1	40	30	3	2
Program development/ community services	10	-	7	3	-	-
Other technical specialist	15	-	1	10	2	2
Not determined	d/103	5	43	37	18	-
Total	377	10	162	141	48	16

a/In addition to the positions listed, some State agencies have employees involved with programs not directly funded by titles III and VII and do not include such employees in their State plan.

b/The director's position at one State agency was vacant at the time of our interview. We were unable to determine the exact functions of the employees of two other States.

c/In several cases the planner/coordinator also has responsibility for the research and evaluation functions.

d/Total number of professional employees of two State agencies. We were unable to determine the exact functions of these employees from the information supplied by these two States.

ENCLOSURE VIII

SUMMARY OF AREA AGENCY PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES

PAID WITH TITLE III FUNDS

	Total number of people in each position (note a)	Total number of persons by position and educational background			
		Doctorate degree	Masters degree	Bachelors degree	Less than college degree
Directors	b/26	1	14	8	3
Assistant directors	2.5		1	.5	1
Planner/coordinator	47.35		25.35	17	5
Fiscal/general manager	16		5	4.5	6.5
Research analyst	6		3	3	
Information and referral	3		1	2	
Nutrition project director	1			1	
Caseworker and caseworker aide	2.5			2.5	
Program developer	2		1	1	
Personal care screening coordinator	1			1	
Specialist in aging	5		3	1	1
Total	112.35	1	53.35	41.5	16.5

a/Decimal numbers are used here because some of the individuals are not full-time employees of the area agencies, and, therefore devote part of their workweek to other activities.

b/One area agency indicated it had no staff. The director of another was not included in this list because she was not paid with title III funds.

SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS BY REGIONAL, STATE, AND AREA AGENCY OFFICIALS FOR CHANGING THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT

1. There should be a requirement for coordination between titles III and VII by the area agencies.

2. The authorized funding for administration of title III programs should be increased.

3. The authorized funding for all of title III should be increased.

4. More emphasis should be placed on serving rural elderly.

5. Program priorities should be established at the local level and not by the Administration on Aging and the States.

6. The area agencies should be responsible for administering programs such as the nutrition, Foster Grandparents, and Retired Senior Volunteer programs.

7. Program planning should be required for periods of 3 years.

8. A separate authorization should be made for administration of title VII.

9. Specific funding allocation should be made for the Administration on Aging programs serving elderly Indians living on reservations.

10. In rural areas the State Agency on Aging should be authorized to perform the functions of an area agency.

11. The Administration on Aging should be authorized to directly fund large urban area agencies.

12. The 25-percent matching requirement for area agency administrative funding should be decreased.