17. Do you administer any grants, loans, or other disbursed funds related to this program? If so, is the size of your administrative staff commensurate with the magnitude of the outlays?

The commission currently does not administer any grant or loan funds.

18. If your appropriations were reduced, how would you absorb the cut-by

an overall reduction or by cutting or curtailing certain activities?

A cut in appropriations probably could not be absorbed by an overall program reduction. Much of our workload in this program category is not controllable—such as requests for legislative reports, correspondence from the public, annual studies and reports required by law, regulations and instructions to implement new laws, consideration of appeals, classification of all positions in grades GS-16, 17, and 18 by the three Commissioners as required by law, and certain work in support of other Commission or executive branch programs which might not be cut back.

Cutting and curtailing would have to be done selectively by such actions as:

Curtailing or delaying certain policy research and developmental projects.

Reducing the number of agency inspections and the scope of review.

Reviewing agency management problems in less depth.

Reviewing fewer agency position classification actions and other actions for legal and regulatory requirements.

Lessening or delaying the response to agency requests for technical assistance and advice.

Necessarily refusing agency requests for consultative services.

Delaying action on employee classification appeals.

Reducing the level of written and oral training guidance to agencies.

Reducing the number of evaluative studies of agency training.

Foregoing study and assessment of training technology. Reducing activity in the executive manpower subcategory.

19. If additional funds were available, what would you do with the new money?

If additional funds were available, we would be able both to undertake certain significant work which has been deferred and to intensify our efforts and accelerate the timetables on work now being done at a lower level and a slower pace than seems desirable. Examples of some of these possible actions are:

Producing trades, labor, and crafts job grading standards within the original

3 years planned rather than the now projected 5 years.

Providing more expeditious service—such as reducing the backlogs in areas

involving higher entrance rates in hard-to-fill jobs.

Undertaking certain occupational studies which have necessarily been deferred. Giving much more attention to the special personnel problems of overseas operations.

Extending our occupational projections to additional occupations and breaking them down by geographic regions. Improving our manpower planning generally. Intensifying efforts to improve and reduce costs to interagency boards and

others in rating training and experience.

Resuming work to improve the personnel issuance system, eliminate obsolescent material and manuals, and improve the quality of issuances.

Making examining handbooks more responsive to the new interagency board setup.

Simplifying appointment systems, both competitive and excepted, with elimination of overlaps in present systems.

Increasing the number of indepth agency personnel management reviews which would place more attention on the opportunity for management improvements and which would better relate personnel programs to agency mission.

Reviewing a greater number of installations through the inspection process

to achieve greater impact.

Making more and better followups on inspections to insure that improvements are made.

Increasing response to agency requests for consultative service on their personnel management problems.

Advancing the schedule for providing a fully tested training evaluation criteria and collecting and assessing data on training technology.

Extending the coverage of training evaluation studies.

Stepping up work with agencies to achieve effective executive manpower staffing reviews.