

EVALUATION

It is difficult to evaluate the Title V program on the basis of comparison with other programs because there is but limited experience by other agencies in serving this population. A recent study by the Department of Labor reports on public assistance recipients trained under MDTA program from the beginning of that program through February 1965. The placement rate under MDTA was estimated to be 64 percent. The Department of Labor report refers only to the placement rate of public assistance recipients who "graduated" from MDTA programs. Using a similar concept for the Title V program in terms of "graduation"—i.e., those who have completed their assignment, the rate of employment is 62 percent.

The Department of Labor report was based on a cumulative total of public assistance recipients trained as of February 1965. Their information is based on a sample of 14,000 recipients representing about 18,000 public assistance recipients trained. It is interesting to note that two and one-half years after MDTA began operations, only 18,000 public assistance recipients out of a total of 195,000 trainees were served by the Department of Labor. During a comparable length of time (December 1964 to April 1967), approximately 100,000 Title V trainees were drawn from this same category.

The effectiveness of the MDTA program is hard to compare with that of Title V because of the wide variation in the characteristics and location of the public assistance recipients trained. Nearly all of the MDTA trainees came from densely populated and highly industrialized States where employment opportunities are relatively more abundant. Title V, in contrast, has allocated about 40 percent of its training spaces to rural areas and about 30 percent of all Title V funds are allocated to rural projects. As of March 1967, more than 7,700 trainees (12 percent) were in projects in Eastern Kentucky and Mississippi where only negligible efforts were made by the MDTA program.

Moreover, the education level of Title V trainees was significantly lower in comparison to that of public assistance recipients trained under the MDTA. In the latter program, about 19 percent of the trainees had eight grades or less of formal schooling, whereas in Title V more than 40 percent fell into this category.

Finally, the previous work experience of these two groups of trainees varied considerably. About one-third of all Title V trainees had less than six months continuous work experience before enrolling in Title V. Of all public assistance MDTA trainees, only 17 percent had no prior work experience.

In sum, the public assistance recipients trained under the MDTA were better evaluate a program such as Title V. Not only do other programs not reach the high labor demand. Despite the fact that Title V trainees were more severely disadvantaged, the rate of employment based on a similar concept of "graduation" was comparable.

The paper prepared by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Program Coordination of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and submitted for the record describes the complexities surrounding any attempt to meaningfully evaluate a program such as Title V. Not only do other programs not reach the same population, neither do they bring to bear such a wide variety of resources to bear on the problems. The paper points out that evaluations of Title V have been hampered by the lack of baseline data with which Program performance can be compared. For this reason, aggregative measures of "success" such as the placement rates which were discussed above are of limited value for evaluate purposes.

Aggregative analyses also overlook the wide variations in the effectiveness of individual projects. Approximately 50 percent of this variation is attributable to differences in:

prevailing economic conditions and social and demographic characteristics of participants

These factors operate independently of any particular administering agency.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON STAFF PAPER PREPARED FOR THE SUBCOMMITTEE BY DR. SAR LEVITAN ENTITLED "WORK EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING"

1. "High" drop-out rate

The paper refers to a high drop-out rate as evidenced by the figures that "only one out of every four completed the assigned course of training." This statement does not take into account the number who left to take a job before completing their assignment (approximately 16,320). Nor does it take into account the fact that many who left will probably return once their problems are taken