

REPORT TO THE GOVERNOR

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND RESOURCES

Prepared By:

Department of Personnel Commission on Higher Education Office of State Planning and Budgeting

November 14, 1978



OFFICE OF STATE PLANNING AND BUDGETING

102 State Capitol Building Denver, Colorado 80203 (303) 839-3386 Budgeting 839-3317

Planning 839-3386

November 15, 1978

State Buildings 839-2626 617 State Services Bldg. 1525 Sherman Street

Richard D. Lamm Governor David L. Foote Executive Director

> The Honorable Richard D. Lamm Governor State of Colorado 136 State Capitol Denver, Colorado 80203

Dear Governor Lamm:

In compliance with Footnote 26, House Bill 1252, Second Legislative Session of the Fifty-First General Assembly, we are pleased to transmit to you the results of the training needs assessment and resources study conducted jointly by our departments. The study was a direct result of your identification of staff development as a major issue which needed to be addressed by the Legislative and Executive Departments.

The recommendations concentrate on efficient and effective utilization of existing State resources while recognizing the need to provide seed money in the areas of Career Development and Management and Supervisory Skills.

We would call your attention to several pages of the report which will assist you in understanding the recommendations. Obviously, we believe all of the report is important but we understand your need to come to grips with the main points as quickly as possible.

Introduction Recommendations Survey of Departmental Director's Views of Training Needs Tables 2, 3 and 4 Needs Assessment Survey FY 77-78 Expenditures Pages 1-2 Pages 5-8

Pages 9-11 Pages 26, 30, 31 Pages 12-13 Pages 32-36

We would be pleased to meet with you at your conveninece to discuss the recommendations and examine the policy implications.

Sinceré Rudolph Livingston, Executive Director Department of Personnel R. Kerschner, Executive Director Colorado Commission on Higher Education

David L. Foote, Executive Director Office of State Planning & Budgeting

TABLE OF CONTENTS

-104

		Page
PART I	Introduction	1
PART II	Study Process	3
PART III	Recommendations	5
PART IV	Departmental Directors' Views of Training Needs Current Training Areas and Groups Currently Requiring Training Training Priorities Commitment	9
DADTY	Centralized Training Miscellaneous	12
PART V	Needs Assessment Survey Summary Findings Introduction Method Instrument Procedure Results and Discussion: Background Variables Results and Discussion: Training Needs Inventory	13 14 15 17 18 19 25
PART VI	FY 1977-78 Expenditures for Training or Education Programs	32
PART VII	Training Resource Inventory	38
	State Training Resources Higher Education Resources Other Private and Federal Resources	38 41 46

APPENDICES

			Page
Α.	Sumi	maries of Interviews with Departmental Directors	47
в.	Sumi	mary Tables of TRaining Needs Priority Ratings	91
с.	Departmental Responses to FY 1977-78 Expenditures for Training or Education Survey		
D.	Surv	ey Instruments	146
	Ι.	Interview Questions	147
	2.	Training Needs Survey	148
	3.	Expenditures for Training or Education Programs Survey	173

PART I

INTRODUCTION

The Governor's Executive Budget Summary for 1978-79 contained five policy themes focusing on general and important problems facing State government which the Governor viewed as significant issues which needed to be addressed by the second legislative session of the Fifty-First General Assembly. Among those policy themes was a discussion of Staff Development.

The special analysis of Staff Development requested a General Fund appropriation of \$150,000 to begin impacting upon the following problems:

- No existing centralized method for identifying statewide training needs;
- The need to provide middle level managers with training in specified areas identified by top-level management, allowing agencies the ability to add new responsibilities to middle level management in lieu of asking for new FTE;
- The need to accelerate the training of managers and supervisors in areas of budgeting, the personnel system, management principles, etc.;
- The need to provide opportunities for lower graded non-supervisory employees to fulfill career expectations through training; and
- The need to increase flexibility by allowing mobility for middle and upper level managers among various agencies.

The Governor established a primary staff development goal of increased productivity of the State's employees. The proposed allocation of fiscal resources was aimed at achieving the following objectives, all of which impact productivity:

- Improving employees' morale;
- Reducing staff turnover;
- Equiping management with the skills necessary to conduct the State's business in a more productive way; and

- - -

- Encouraging employees to achieve career goals.

The Executive Budget proposed addressing the identified problem areas through the use of training institutes, such as the Public Service Institute in the Department of Personnel, limited college courses, through a cooperative program with the two and four year institutions of higher education, the potential implementation of a Career Executive Program, and a consolidation of fragmented agency training efforts.

In rural or non-metropolitan areas, emphasis was to be placed on utilizing existing programs in two and four year colleges. In the metropolitan areas, the emphasis was to be on large scale, limited time period training institutes.

PART II

STUDY PROCESS

After examining the Executive's proposal for Staff Development, the General Assembly determined that "a comprehensive training needs assessment and training resource assessment study..." should be jointly conducted by the Department of Personnel, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, and the Office of State Planning and Budgeting. The study (referred to as the Footnote 26 Study) was to be submitted to the Joint Budget Committee by December 1, 1978.

The Governor asked Rudy Livingston, Executive Director of the Department of Personnel to assume responsibility for the completion of the study and directed Dr. Lee Kerschner, Commissioner of Higher Education, and David Foote, Executive Director of the Office of State Planning and Budgeting, to cooperate and assist in the project.

Data for the study was collected in the following manner:

- A personal interview was conducted with each Departmental Executive Director and the Presidents of three of the institutions of higher education (a large, a medium, and a small school) to solicit their opinions and perceptions on staff development needs. Each interviewee was asked the same questions. (See Appendix D-1). A summary of the interviews is included to this report.
- A Training Resource Inventory Sheet was completed by each departmental training officer to identify actual and potential organizational training resources. Training resources include central State operated resources, departmentally operated resources, higher education resources, Federally operated or sponsored reosurces, and private or non-profit resources (See Part VII).

-3-

- 3. A Fiscal Questionnaire was completed by most departments and three institutions of higher education to identify actual 1977-78 expenditures for staff training or educational programs for staff positions covered by the State Personnel system (see Appendix D-3). The questionnaire was limited to training paid directly by the State. If State employees on their own time and at their own expense were involved in training or education, such costs were not captured. Additionally, expenses related to conferences, meetings, etc., which may have involved some training but whose primary purpose was not training, were not included.
- A Training Needs Assessment survey instrument was developed to identify the training needs of employees as perceived by the various levels of management (see Appendix D-2).

Questionnaires were sent to a total of 150 randomly selected employees in three groups: first line supervisors, middle managers and upper level managers. They reported their perceptions of the adequacy of the present training effort both in terms of scope and time expended and indicated those areas where they perceived their employees had the greatest training needs.

The recommendations made in this report are a result of the compilation and analysis of the data collected through the interviews, training resource inventory sheets, fiscal questionnaires, and training needs assessment instruments.

-4-

PART III

RECOMMENDATIONS

Management and Supervisory Skills

- A. That as a matter of State policy, management and supervisory skills training programs needed for present job performance should be provided during working hours at State expense. Estimated Cost: \$20,000 for special training programs not available within current training resources. Improved coordination of training programs will result in better utilization of existing appropriated funds. Employee time for attending training programs included within current budgets.
- B. That the Department of Personnel's Public Service Institute serve as the Training Coordinator for all State agencies. Estimated Cost: \$25,000 1.0 FTE.
- C. That prior to establishing any new training programs each department shall submit a proposal to the Training Coordinator to ascertain whether a comparable program currently exists or could reasonably be developed within State resources.
- D. That prior to sending an employee or employees to a non-state sponsored program or contracting for management and supervisory skills training for classified State employees each department shall inquire with the Training Coordinator as to the availability of existing programs within State resources. Only when it is determined that a comparable program does not exist within State resources or cannot reasonably be developed shall a department be permitted to send an employee to a non-state sponsored program or contract for management and supervisory skills training.
- E. That programs currently offered by departments shall be made available to employees of other departments on a space available basis.

Discussion

Currently the Department of Personnel is operating training and education programs in various areas related to supervisory/management skills through the Public Service Institute (PSI). These programs have served nearly 1,000 employees. Need for expansion of these types of programs exists. As almost all colleges in the State are capable of providing such programs it is recommended that the Department of Personnel would serve as a coordinator, select the lowest cost option, and either contract with higher education institutions through Outreach, use other existing State training programs, or offer directly, programs to meet the increased needs in this area. Such a coordinator would receive requests for training programs from all departments. Programs which are now available to specific agencies would then become available to employees across the State. In addition, such coordination would assure that the most economic alternatives were being used to provide the needed training. Funds now spent on travel or for non-economic class sizes could be expended to meet a greater portion of the State's need.

Job Specific Skills

- A. That as a matter of State policy, job specific training programs should be provided during working hours at State expense. Estimated Cost: No additional fiscal impact. Improved coordination to result in better utilization of existing appropriated funds. Employee time for attending training programs included within current budget. Each department should request funding for job specific training programs through the annual appropriations process. The Department of Personnel should review each request and make recommendations with priorities for funding in compliance with its statutory obligations under Section 24-50-122, CRS 1973, as amended.
- B. That the Department of Personnel's Public Service Institute serve as the Training Coordinator for all State agencies. <u>Estimated Cost: See</u> Recommendation B Management and Supervisory Skills.
- C. That prior to establishing any new training programs each department shall submit a proposal to the Training Coordinator to ascertain whether a comparable program currently exists or could reasonably be developed within State resources.
- D. That prior to sending an employee or employees to a non-state sponsored program or contracting for job specific skills training for classified State employees each department shall inquire with the Training Coordinator as to the availability of existing programs within State resources. Only when it is determined that a comparable program does not exist within State resources or cannot reasonably be developed shall a department be permitted to send an employee to a non-state sponsored program or contract for job specific skills training.
- E. That job specific programs currently offered by departments shall be made available to employees of other departments on a space available basis.

Discussion

The great majority of expenditures for training is currently made to provide programs or experiences for developing skills needed by employees in their current jobs. A large percentage of these programs are very specific to the agency but for many others, there could and should be transferability across agency lines.

The quality and availability of training in specific job skills could be improved statewide through coordination of these training efforts. Coordination would prevent unnecessary duplication of effort as well as providing access to training to a greater number of employees.

Career Development

- A. That the Department of Personnel make available to the Personnel and Training officers information on the necessary training and education requirements for career advancement in the various fields of State employment. Also to inventory and make available information about the availability of programs to meet those training and education needs. Estimated Cost: \$25,000 1.0 FTE.
- B. That the Department of Personnel review job classifications to determine what specific requirements can be more broadly defined so as to allow the maximum mobility of career employees. Cost included above.
- C. That the State fund the provisions of CRS 24-50-122 for tuition reimbursements for employees seeking career advancement in areas where the State has difficulty locating job applicants. Estimated Cost: \$20,000.

Discussion

Career Development was mentioned by almost all departments as an area of concern. It is felt that major improvements can be made in this area by making available to employees the specific requirements they will face in seeking higher levels of employment. Currently employees are often limited in their ability to advance due to rather specific training or educational requirements for jobs. Further, mobility between the various departments of the State is often limited by requirements of specific training or experience with the departments. It is felt that by making available information about the training and education requirements career motivated emplyees can avail themselves of the programs existing within either the State's higher education institutions or other sources. It is also felt that by more broadly defining job criteria the maximum mobility of State employees can be achieved. Hopefully, through such a change the State could encourage career employees who see their role as managers of the State's resources rather than as employees of specific agencies or departments.

Who should pay for career advancement is a major issue. Given limited resources and the general third priority ranking it is recommended that the employees who will benefit should bear the cost at this time. The State, by policy, has set tuition levels at public higher education institutions at 25% of the cost. In addition, student aid programs are available for those in need of financial assistance. Career advance ment programs are thus considered available at reasonable cost and it is felt the major focus should be on making clear the training and education requirements for advancement.

Consideration was given to requesting the colleges to accept all State employees on a space available basis as is done now with college employees. This is not now recommended as it is felt that with current demand levels for business and other career programs such an approach would provide only very limited opportunities for State employees. To offer program opportunities that could not be met would be more disruptive than beneficial.

It is recommended that the Career Development Coordinator within the Department of Personnel be responsible for contacting the institutions of higher education to determine if programs (courses) could be provided on a space available basis. It is recognized that any opportunities provided by the institutions will be on a basis which is not inconsistent with the governing boards' policies for their own institutional employees.

One exception is proposed to the general policy of who pays for the cost of career advancement training and education. The exception relates to those career areas where the State has not been able to attract ample applicants for existing jobs. These presently include positions in the clerical, professional data processing and highly technical medically related fields as examples. It is recommended that in these areas tuition assistance be made available under the provisions of CRS 24-50-122.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. That the Department of Personnel shall establish procedures for including in the annual performance evaluation process an evaluation of the training needs of each employee.
- B. That the central accounting system be adjusted to reflect object codes for training under each of the personal service, contractual services, operating, travel and capital outlay line items to begin accurately collecting data on central training expenditures.

SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL FUNDING NEEDS

Management and Supervisory Skills Special Training Programs Training Coordinator 1.0 FTE	\$20,000 25,000
Job Specific Skills Training Coordinator (See Management and Supervisory Skills	
Career Development Career Development Coordinator Tuition Reimbursements	25,000 20,000
TOTAL	 \$ 90,000

PART IV

DEPARTMENTAL DIRECTOR'S VIEWS OF TRAINING NEEDS

Interviews were held with almost all departments directors. Summaries of these interviews can be found in Appendix A. All interviews began with a series of uniform questions. These included questions on their views on the current training programs, the types of employees needing training (clerical, maintenance, professional, supervisory) as well as the types of training needed (general skills, specific or technical skills, and career development). In addition questions were asked regarding their commitment to training and their views on centralized training.

This section will summarize the major findings of this process.

Current Training

All of the departments are conducting, or participating in, some form of training. Much of it is on the job or in programs offered through the Personnel Department's Public Service Institute. Several of the departments are using programs operated by the State's higher education institutions. In addition national associations provide training in several specialized areas such as budgeting and governmental accounting. Only four departments reported staff training units; Corrections, Labor and Employment, Personnel and Institutions. Several other departments reported either one person involved in training or a person given the responsibility on a part time basis. The majority of training going on now appears to relate to meeting the needs for specific job skills and a more limited amount of general management training. Only at the Colleges and at the Department of Highways are tuition assistance programs in effect for attending higher education institutions.

Areas and Groups Currently Requiring Training

Almost all of the department heads indicated a need for increased training in the area of general management and supervisory skills. Current job classification criteria appear to be directed to specific technical skills or academic training; thus a large portion of supervisory personnel need additional training to assist in dealing with their management and supervisory responsibilities.

The need for additional training in the specific skills required for the departments appears to be related to the availability of staff previously trained in the areas for the private sector or the availability of specific in-house training. Human service areas such as Social Services, Corrections and Institutions which have no private sector counterparts, all indicated the need for additional training directed at specific job skills.

Several departments commented on the need for training related to State accounting procedures, personnel procedures, as well as budget procedures. Clerical skills were mentioned as a need as well as training to promote the job advancement of minority employees.

Career development and counseling was mentioned by several department heads as an area of need. Currently, though employees may advance through the various levels of employment, there are few programs to promote such advancement nor to advise employees of long term career opportunities in government. Employees seeking a long term career must predetermine the necessary education and training requirements to meet their goal. Several department heads commented that this lack of a coordinated career development program has lead to capable employees not being eligible for promotion due to failure to meet technical requirements.

Training Priorities

The priorities overall appear to be:

- I. Management and Supervisory Skills
- 2. Specific Job Skills
- 3. Career Development

Commitment

All of the department heads appear committed to the need to expand the availability of training. Day to day operations and the tightness of funds have limited the increased resources they have been able to apply to training from existing budgets. All, however, have managed to keep some existing training operating. With the increasingly restrictive budgets of the past three years training has been a high enough priority to be maintained while other programs had to be curtailed due to lack of funds.

Centralized Training

Many of the departments are using the Department of Personnel's Public Service Institute to meet some of their training needs. Most feel the current programs are successful in meeting their purposes in specific areas but do not feel that an expanded central agency is an appropriate way to go. Suggestions have been made that a central unit, either Personnel or Higher Education could serve to coordinate and facilitate the offering of training programs in all of the departments. Some of the smaller departments find centralized training attractive as, apparently, fewer options are available to them.

Miscellaneous

Some form of tuition sharing or reimbursement program beyond those existing in Higher Education and Highways appears desired to promote greater career development and mobility.

PART V

NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

Based on a population of 3,258 supervisory personnel in the State Personnel System, a total sample of 150 supervisory employees was randomly selected to be included in a study of training needs of State employees as perceived by supervisors. The sample was stratified according to pay grade level, which in turn is indicative of supervisory level. Three strata were derived: first line supervisors, mid-level managers and upper-level managers.

Questionnaires were developed and mailed out to all participants in the sample. The questionnaire consisted of two parts. Part I contained 40 variables addressing: sample characteristics; indices of general training needs in terms of money, time, area of training and location of facilities; quality of training efforts; and commitment to training, both by supervisors and employees.

Part II consisted of a list or inventory of 105 areas in which training may be needed. Each area was grouped under one of ten broad categories:

- 1. Fiscal Management (15 areas);
- 2. Personnel Management (15 areas);
- 3. Supervisory Skills (7 areas);
- 4. Human Relations (8 areas);
- 5. Communications (12 areas);
- 6. Safety (8 areas);
- 7. Job Orientation (5 areas);
- 8. General Job Skills (14 areas);
- 9. Clerical Skills (11 areas);
- 10. Career Development (10 areas).

In addition to these categories a blank page labeled "Other Areas" was included for respondents to specify unique training needs areas.

- 1. A need for more time devoted to training was reported. On the average, supervisors felt their subordinates should spend between 2 and 3 weeks in training per year, as opposed to the current 1 to 2 weeks.
- 2. More money should be allocated to the training effort. Currently only .5% to 1% of the unit, division, or organization's budget was reported to be going to training, and it was felt that between 1% and 3% should be allotted.
- 3. The location of training and availability of courses and programs were considered to be "marginally" adequate.
- 4. For personnel below the mid-level manager level, an overall need for increased training resources in general job skills training (including supervisory and management skill) was reported. Increases for mid-level managers should be dedicated to seminars and conferences, according to survey data.
- 5. Technological change and the economic situation were identified as the two external factors having the greatest influence on training needs.
- 6. The quality of training in terms of courses was considered to be "marginally" adequate. Instructors, on the other hand, were reported to be "generally adequate."
- 7. Most supervisors reported they would be willing to give employees time off work (paid) to attend relevant job skills training, although only about 40% felt career development training should be given during work hours. A general indication was given that employees would probably be willing to attend career development training after work and even would be willing to pay for part of such training. Job skill training, however, probably should come during work hours, at the expense of the agency, according to survey results. An interpretation of the results was made which concludes that the current commitment to training, both by employees and their supervisors, is favorable to the overall training effort.
- 8. Approximately 43 relatively high need training areas were identified by supervisors from each stratum.
- 9. The pattern of inventory responses suggest training efforts for non-supervisory, non-professional employees should be directed towards the categories of Supervisory Skills, Human Relations, and Safety.
- 10. Training needs for non-supervisory professionals and administrators and first-line supervisors are most heavily concentrated in the Supervisory skills category. Also, considerable training need was expressed in terms of Job Orientation, Personnel Management, Career Development, and Communications.
- 11. Mid-level managers evidenced a distinct need for increased training in Supervisory Skills and Fiscal and Personnel Management. In addition, the Human Relations category also received relatively high endorsement as a need.
- 12. The highest priority need specified across all groups was for seminars (and conferences) in areas pertinent to the career field. Also of high priority are training in team building, report writing, work planning, organizational development, motivation, and the management of conflict. Unique priority areas were also identified for each stratum, generally conforming to the categories listed in findings 9 through 11 above.

Introduction

Ideally, training needs should be assessed from an individual standpoint, where highly specific measures may be taken of need and direct linkages made between deficient performance areas and training curricula. As one moves from the individual level of measurement to the organizational and, as in the case of this study, the system level, measures, by necessity, must be more generalized. In assessing training needs across the entire personnel system, the extent of abstraction becomes a real problem which threatens the meaningfulness of the results.

In an attempt to maximize specificity and, at the same time, maintain a sufficient level of generality, a training needs "checklist" was developed for this study. Briefly, this checklist consists of a listing of job performance areas, amenable to training efforts and common to a wide variety of jobs, which an assessor simply checks if relevant to jobs he or she supervises. For those areas checked, a rating is made of the extent of training need and the priority that need has relative to all others. Work with such checklists or inventories has demonstrated numerous advantages over other methods of data collection. Itemizing the areas to be surveyed provides a standard terminological framework for the respondents. The need for recall ability, which typically must be very high in open ended questionnaires, is greatly reduced, allowing the rater to concentrate more on the assessment than on his memory. Perhaps the most significant advantages are the cost effectiveness of data collection, ease of administration, and the adaptability to computer analysis. Studies using task inventories, similar in nature to the present inventory, have demonstrated that the data obtained are generally accurate and reliable and conform to that acquired through less efficient methods, such as observation-interview.

Supervisors were selected as the sample for two major reasons:

1. It is part of the responsibility of all supervisors to keep abreast of their subordinates' training needs. In addition, supervisors potentially can provide more objective ratings since they are rating the needs of others rather than themselves.

2. Supervisors are in a position to rate the training needs of several employees, while self-ratings provide a picture of only one employee at a time.

The objectives of this part of the study were: 1) to obtain some overall indices of training needs in the State Personnel System in terms of such factors as time, money, and location of training facilities; 2) to measure how current training efforts are perceived in terms of quality and commitment; and 3) to determine, as specifically as possible, the training needs of employees in the system and the priority such needs take on. The study addresses the needs of three groups: 1) non-supervisory employees; 2) non-supervisory professionals and administrators and first-line supervisors; and 3) mid-level managers.

METHOD

Sample

Based on a population of 3258 supervisory personnel in the State Personnel System, ¹ a total sample of 150 employees was randomly selected. The sample was stratified according to pay grade level, which in turn is indicative of the supervisory level. Three strata were derived: 1) First line supervisors (N-90, supervisory positions below grade 63); 2) Mid-level managers (N-30, supervisory positions from grade 63 up to and including grade 75, with supervisory responsibilities over positions at or above grade 45); 3) Upper-level managers (N-30, supervisory positions at or above grade 75, with supervisory responsibilities over positions at or above grade 45); 3) Upper-level managers (N-30, supervisory positions at or above grade 75, with supervisory responsibilities over mid-level managers). Pay grade criteria for the three strata were primarily based on demarcations in the Professional-Administrative-Technical (PAT) classification series, where PAT I - III jobs (grade 45 through 57) are considered first-line supervisors, PAT IV and V (grades 63 through 69) are mid-level

Population figures were taken from the July 12, 1978 ISIS report, using classifications known to be supervisory in nature.

managers, and PAT VII (grade 75) and above are upper-level managers. The stratification was designed to allow first-line supervisors to evaluate the training needs of non-supervisory professionals and administrators and first-line supervisory, and, finally, upper-level managers to evaluate the needs of mid-level managers. The number of respondents per stratum was determined on the basis of the proportion of the stratum population to the total population and estimates of the variance that might be encountered using the scales found in the questionnaire.

A 91% (N=82) return rate was achieved for Stratum I (first-line supervisors). Only two members failed to respond. Two returned questionnaires were not processed because of significant omissions. The remaining outstanding questionnaires were accounted for by sick leave. Follow-up phone calls were made during the final week of data collection to insure a high rate of return.

A 100% return rate was achieved for both Stratum II (mid-level managers, N=30), and Stratum III (upper-level managers, N=30). Follow-up phone calls were also used to promote a high return rate.

The standard error of the means for items on a five point scale closely approximates the estimates used in determining the sample sizes, and generally centered around the .18 level (and often lower) for all strata. The standard error for the total number of training areas checked was 2.21 (all strata), with a standard deviation of 26.42, which also closely approximates the sample determination estimates. These findings lend support to the representativeness of the overall sample and the respective strata.

Extensive demographic variables were not included in the questionnaires, since the study was not designed to test theoretical hypotheses concerning respondent characteristics in relation to response profiles. The three strata, however, may be described in terms of sex, age, length as a supervisor in the particular level, education, and number of subordinates.

-16-

Stratum I (first-line supervisors) is comprised of 56% males, 44% females. The mean age of respondents is 45 years old. Employees in this group have, on the average, been first-line supervisors for 5.24 years. Educationally, the highest level attained is typically between one to four years of college. The average number of subordinates is 8.63, although considerable variability was noted (SD=7.15).

Stratum II (mid-level managers) was found to have 93% males, 7% females. The average age is 46. Length of time as a mid-level manager centers around 3.85 years. Respondents in this group typically indicated having completed some graduate work, with many possessing advanced degrees. The average number of subordinates is 5.13, again with a fair amount of variability (SD=6.11).

Stratum III (upper-level managers) is comprised totally of males. Average age is approximately 47. Length of time as an upper-level manager centers around 5.59 years. The mean level of education attained is completion of a Bachelor's degree with some graduate work. As in Stratum II, many have advanced degrees. The average number of subordinates is 4.53 (SD=4.19).

INSTRUMENT

Data were collected via a mail-out questionnaire consisting of two parts. Part I contains 40 variables addressing: sample characteristics; indices of general training needs in terms of money, time, area of training, and location of facilities; quality of training efforts; and commitment to training, both by supervisors and employees.

Part II consists of a list or inventory of 105 areas in which training may be needed. Each area is rationally grouped under one of ten broad categories:

- I. Fiscal Management (15 areas);
- 2. Personnel Management (15 areas);
- 3. Supervisory Skills (7 areas);
- 4. Human Relations (8 areas);
- 5. Communications (12 areas);

-17-

- 6. Safety (8 areas);
- 7. Job Orientation (5 areas);
- 8. General Job Skills (14 areas);
- 9. Clerical Skills (11 areas);
- 10. Career Development (10 areas);

In addition to these categories a blank page labeled "Other Areas" was included for respondents to specify unique training need areas. The list of training areas was initially derived through a review of previous checklists used by Federal and State governments, as well as some of those used by private firms. This list was submitted to training administrators from each of the principal departments for modifications, with the final inventory incorporating their input.

For each area, the respondents were asked to provide up to three ratings. The first rating involved indicating if the area specified pertained to the duties of the respondents' subordinates. If the area were checked, the respondent was then requested to estimate the extent of training need based on a 0 ("None") to 5 ("Very Great") scale. Training need was defined generally as a "discrepancy between the level of knowledge, skill, ability, or personal characteristic currently possessed by your subordinates in some area and the level necessary to meet program objectives and the mission of the organization." Training, in turn, was considered to include job skill training, both specific and general, and career development activities (e.g., seminars, conferences, continuing education courses, etc.). A third scale was incorporated to determine the priority one area has relative to another. Respondents were requested to indicate the priority of areas experiencing a training need on a 1 (Very Low) to 5 (Very High) scale. A copy of the guestionnaire is included in Appendix D-2.

PROCEDURE

Questionnaires were mailed to all participants approximately on the same date. Three weeks were provided, in most cases, for completion. Respondents were instructed to immediately contact the Department of Personnel if they did not meet the criteria of their stratum. In a few cases, additional names were selected to replace those who no longer had supervisory responsibilities (10 cases in Stratum I).

-18-

Detailed instructions were provided and considerable emphasis placed on whose training needs the respondents were to rate (e.g., upper-level managers were only to rate mid-level managers' needs). A definition of training was provided which basically included any activity designed to improve an employee's knowledge or skill in line with job related factors, enhance his or her promotional opportunities, or provide general job enrichment. Respondents were given a phone number to call if they encountered any difficulties. Follow-up phone calls, as previously mentioned, were made by the investigator to insure a high return rate.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: BACKGROUND VARIABLES

General Needs Indices

To first establish if a general need for training was perceived, respondents were asked to indicate how much time their subordinates currently spent in training in a one year period and how much time should be spent in training. The outcome of concern, of course, is the actual difference between what there is and what there should be. A similar patter was noted for all three strata: employees, be they non-supervisory, firstline supervisors, or mid-level managers, are receiving, on the average, only one to two weeks of training per year, and it is felt that between two and three weeks are necessary.

A similar contrast was made in terms of the amount of money currently allocated to training and the amount which should be spent. Again, mean responses were quite similar across strata, with respondents typically indicating current training expenditures at between .5% and 1% of the work unit, division, or organizational budget. A perceived deficiency was noted, based on the mean response that between 1% and 3% of the budget should be allocated.

-19-

Training availability represents another area in which training may be limited. Most respondents, regardless of strata, indicated that at least "some" training is available in their agencies. Another item, however, revealed that the amount of training available is generally "marginal". The location of training facilities was rated as being between "marginally adequate" and "generally adequate", with the lowest mean value being obtained for respondents rating non-supervisory employees below the professional level. These results, of course, are to some extent contingent on the location of the respondents. Fifty-one percent of Stratum I were found to be from outside the Denver-Metro area, which is a possible explanation of the lower ratings on training availability for this group. Eighty-three percent of both Stratum II and III respondents, on the other hand, are from the Denver-Metro area, where university and agency sponsored training is more likely to exist. In any event, the location and amount of training available were not rated extremely low; thus, there does not appear to be a need for a radical increase in training facilities.

t--

It is of little surprise that a perceived deficiency was found between the money and time currently being dedicated to training in the State and the amounts that should be dedicated. A more significant question is to which areas should additional training resources be channeled. Besides the inventory responses and prioritization by individual area, respondents were asked to indicate which of three broad categories of training has the greatest need for increased resources and efforts:

- 1. Specific Job Skills -- training in highly specific areas, unique to the job, which permit the employee to perform at a satisfactory level (e.g., computer languages for a computer programmer; use of accounting machines for Accounting Technicians; counseling handicapped workers for a Rehabilitation Counselor, etc.).
- 2. General Job Skills -- training in general areas appropriate to a variety of jobs and designed to improve overall performance (e.g., effective report writing, speed reading, supervisory and/or management training, etc.).

3. Career Development -- training designed to allow employees to increase their career skills and knowledges for purposes of advancement or general job enrichment (e.g., a seminar or professional ethics for Psychologists: coursework leading to a Bachelor's degree in Criminology for a Correctional Officer; conventions, etc.).

6)

15

It may be seen from Table I that general job skill training, such as management development, is typically favored as that area demanding the greatest attention. Interestingly, a difference was noted in the responses from Stratum III, which suggested career development should be emphasized over other areas for mid-level managers. Based on the inventory responses and mean educational level of mid-level supervisors, it is the seminars and conferences which influence this rating, as opposed to such areas as "coursework leading to an advanced degree".

Factors Influencing Training Need

Given that there is a general need for increased training, what factors have influenced or enhanced this need? To answer this, sample members were presented a list of six areas which are likely to foster training needs:

- 1. Technological change (e.g., introduction of a new piece of equipment, improvement in computer systems, etc.)
- 2. Legal requirements (e.g., legislation or court rulings which modify the method in which candidates may be tested for employment, new OSHA requirements, etc.)
- 3. Social attitudes (e.g., expectation of society that government be responsible for regulating a given practice)
- 4. Economic situation (e.g., a tax cut which reduces the work force, making it necessary to get increased productivity from the resources available)
- 5. Promotion (e.g., a worker is promoted to a supervisory position who has had no supervisory training)
- 6. Selection procedures (e.g., employment tests are easy, permitting marginally and/or unqualified employees to be placed on eligible lists)

Responses from all strata indicated that each of the factors listed has influenced the need for training at least "to a little extent". The two factors having the greatest influence were found to be <u>technological change</u> and the <u>economic situation</u>. Some increase was noted in the effect <u>legal requirements</u> have upon training need as one progresses in grade level.

TABLE I

WHERE INCREASED TRAINING RESOURCES SHOULD BE DEDICATED

Area of Training	Stratum I Where resources should be allocated for non-super- visory, non-professional employees	Stratum II Where resources should be allocated for non-super- visory professionals and administrators and first line supervisors	Stratum III Where resources should be allocated for mid-level managers	Total Sample
1. Specific Job Skills	34%	27%	33%	31%
2. General Job Skills	42%	43%	27%	41%
3. Career Development	24%	30%	40%	28%

-22-

NOTE: Results are in terms of the percentage of respondents endorsing each particular area as having the greatest need for increased resources.

In addition to the external factors listed, qualitative factors associated with the delivery of training can affect the overall need. A major qualitative issue, of course, is the ability of instructors providing training. Generally, however, respondents across all strata perceived the "quality of instructors" as being "generally adequate." Another qualitative factor, the adequacy of training needs assessment, was perceived as being "marginal" but not necessarily inadequate.

1

Commitment to Training

Even if sufficient resources are given to training programs, if commitment, both by management and employees, is insufficient, training cannot be successful. Although all three strata indicated the commitment of top management is only "marginal", there was a strong indication that employee commitment, at least up through mid-level managers, is adequate.

Motivation is often measured in terms of the expectation that a particular activity will lead to a desired outcome. Although a multi-item scale was not employed, there appeared to be a general perception by all respondents that training can, "to a great extent", improve work performance. This finding was considered as also being supportive of the supervisory commitment to training efforts. In line with this finding, it was noted that a majority of respondents (59% Stratum I, 63% Stratum II, 57% Stratum III) considered participation in training as a factor when appraising work performance.

Another way of looking at commitment is in terms of what supervisors and employees are willing to give up in behalf of training. From the supervisory perspective, the obvious question is "Are you willing to give employees paid time off to attend training?". Nearly all supervisors agreed they would be willing to allow time off for relevant job skill training (94% Stratum I, 100% Stratum II and III), and furthermore, such training should be given during regular work hours (97% favoring regular work hours in Stratum I and III, 93% Stratum II).

-23-

Giving time off for career development training, however, was less well received. Still, 66% of Stratum I, 80% of Stratum II, and 75% of Stratum III indicated they would grant paid leave. Only about 61% of the respondents felt career development training should be given during regular working hours, with about 35% favoring after work, weekdays.

15.

V

The resources of the study did not prevent a direct measure of the employee's commitment to training. Questions were included, however, to tap the supervisor's perception of such commitment. Although about 30% indicated they were uncertain, responses suggested that employees typically would be willing to attend career development training after work, weekdays. It appears questionable that they would be willing to attend job skill training (with the exception of first-line supervisors and/or non-supervisory professionals and administrators, where it was anticipated that 60% would be willing) after work, weekdays. Training of any kind during the weekends would appear to have little chance of success.

In terms of financing training, employees appear unwilling to attend job skill training if they had to pay for all of it out of their own pocket, according to supervisory perceptions. Respondents were undecided in terms of how willing employees would be to pay for all of their career development training.

A more favorable picture appears to exist if part of the training costs are covered by the agency. About 33% of Stratum I, 60% of Stratum II, and 43% of Stratum III feel their subordinates will be willing to attend job skill training where part of it is at the employee's expense. Even more encouraging; 41% of Stratum I, 73% of Stratum II, and 60% of Stratum III indicated a willingness on behalf of their subordinates to attend career development training where the employee was required to match part of the expense. This finding is of particular interest vis-a-vis tuition assistance programs, where the State must rely on an employee contribution

-24-

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: TRAINING NEEDS INVENTORY

In the previous section, it was shown that additional training efforts, both in terms of time and money, are needed to meet the needs of State employees from mid-level managers on down. The extent of this training need, however, is greater than one might anticipate. Arbitrarily defining a high training need area as one in which at least 20% of the supervisors endorsed as being relevant and which has a mean need rating of "moderate" (3.00) or greater, an average number of 43 out of 105 areas were identified. Tables B1 and B5 in Appendix B, present a summary of the need and priority ratings for "high need areas" both by individual stratum and by the overall sample. It is suggested that these tables be used as a guide in determining how future training resources will be allocated.

While it would be preferable to describe the inventory results in terms of empirically defined factors, the "missing" data from areas considered irrelevant restricts the effectiveness of such analysis. Consequently, results will be discussed in terms of the a priori classification of training areas used in the questionnaire.

To gain a feel for how areas identified as being high in need (according to the above criteria) are distributed across the major inventory categories, a frequency count was made of the number of high need items in each category. The sum for each category was multiplied by a factor to allow each category to have equal weight. Table 2 presents the distribution of the high need areas after such weighting.

-25-

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF HIGH TRAINING NEEDS AREAS

	Classifi	ated		
Training Category	Non-Supervisory Non-Professional	Administrators & First-Line Supervisors	Mid-Level Managers	Total Sample
A. Fiscal Management	3%	10%	17%	11%
B. Personnel Mgmt.	9%	13%	10%	11%
C. Supervisory Skills	16%	17%	25%	24%
D. Human Relations	17%	6%	18%	15%
E. Communications	6%	12%	10%	6%
F. Safety	17%	3%	4%	9%
G. Job Orientation	9%	14%	0%	5%
H. Job Skills	6%	7%	10%	7%
I. Clerical Skills	4%	. 7%	0%	4%
J. Career Develop.	13%	12%	6%	9%

8

With respect to the training needs of non-supervisory, non-professional employees (as perceived by their supervisors), three categories show high endorsement: Supervisory Skills, Human Relations, and Safety. While the emergence of Supervisory Skills as a salient needs category might suggest a career development orientation on behalf of the supervisors (raters), inspection of the high priority areas (see Table B1, Appendix B) within this category reveals that such areas are applicable to leadwork or senior employees as well as supervisory workers. The top three Supervisory Skills need areas are: Team Building, Techniques of Instruction, and Disciplining Employees. The elevation of Supervisory Skills in the needs distribution concurs with the results reported earlier, where general job skills, which were defined as including supervisory skills, received the highest rating for increased resource allocation.

A somewhat unanticipated finding was the number of high need areas specified under the Safety category for non-supervisory, non-professional personnel. This, of course, may be largely an artifact of the large number of Highway supervisors in Stratum I (29% of the sub-sample). Safety training high need areas, however, typically had relevance ratings of 40% or greater (with two of the top priority areas exceeding 60%), suggesting such training may have fairly widespread applicability. In any event, safety training drops drastically in significance as one moves to the next two strata, accounting for only 3% of the high need areas for Stratum II and 4% for Stratum III.

The distribution of high needs areas flattens out somewhat for non-supervisory professionals and administrators and first-line supervisors (as perceived by mid-level managers). Only Supervisory Skills shows a relatively high concentration of needs. Four additional categories, however, showed moderately high needs, each accounting for between 12% and 14% of the areas specified. These categories are: Job Orientation, Personnel Management, Career Development, and Communications.

-27-

Results for Stratum II suggest an increased management development orientation over the previous Stratum, where training in areas designed to help employees adapt to their work environment (Human Relations and Safety Training) accounted for much of the high needs isolated. This orientation continues with the next group of ratings which identify the training needs of mid-level managers.

The profile of high need areas for mid-level managers is the most skewed of the three strata. A distinct pattern of management and supervisory training needs may be discerned, with Supervisory Skills accounting for 25% of the high need areas and Fiscal and Personnel Management accounting for 27%. Also showing high elevation in the needs profile is Human Relations training, which accounts for 18% of the high needs area.

A major decline in the importance of Career Development training is noted in the ratings for mid-level managers, although the highest priority need (seminars on areas pertinent to the Career Field) came from this category. This result is probably explained by the types of items in the category, many of which address degree acquisition needs. It may be recalled that the random sample of mid-level managers (from Stratum II) were found to already have Bachelor's and, often, advanced degrees.

Viewing the sample as a whole, which provides a picture of the training needs of employees in mid-level manager positions and below, Supervisory Skills and Human Relations exhibit the largest set of needs. Of intermediate value are the categories of Fiscal and Personnel Management, Safety, and Career Development.

Another way of viewing the results is from the priority perspective. Table 3 presents a summary of the high need, high priority areas common to two or more strata. It is those areas that are likely to represent the greatest payoff for additional training resources.

-28-

When the top fifteen high need areas in terms of priority are studied, it is interesting to note the number of unique areas that emerge by stratum. To a large extent, they reflect the profile differences discussed above. These unique, high priority needs areas do, however, suggest possible avenues for allocating future training resources. Table 4 presents a summary of these areas.

Additional Needs Areas

Additional needs areas were generally not specified by the respondents. Where identifications were made, the areas usually were already represented in the inventory. It is recognized, of course, that specific training needs exist, especially in the area of continuing education to maintain professional competency. This, in fact, was reflected in the high priority and high need rating given to the area "Seminar on Pertinent Issues in Career Field". Comments on the page provided for additional areas were favorable in terms of the representiveness of the inventory data.

TABLE 3

HIGH NEED, HIGH PRIORITY TRAINING AREAS WITH HIGH COMMONALITY

Training Area	Non-Supervisory Non-Professional	Non-S Profe Admini <u>First-Lir</u>	Mid-Level Managers	
Seminars on Pertinent Issues in Career Field	Х		X at	×
Team Building	×		Х	Х
Report Writing	Х		Х	Х
Work Planning (Work Flow Organization of Work, etc.	X		×	
Organizational Development (Diagnosing Problems, Inter- vention Strategies, etc.)			Х	×
Motivation	X			X
Management of Conflict	×			Х

NOTE: An "X" indicates this area is within the top 15 needs in terms of priority ratings.

TABLE 4

UNIQUE HIGH NEED, HIGH PRIORITY TRAINING AREAS

Non-Supervisory Non-Professional Employees

First Aid

Defensive Driving

Handling Hazardous Materials

Safety Rules and Regulations

Management of Stress

Environmental Safety Procedures for Operating Equipment Safely

Personnel Rules

Job Satisfaction and Morale Factors

Techniques of Instruction

Non-Supervisory Professionals and Administrators and First-Line Supervisors

Labor/Management Relations

Research Methods

Career Planning and Counseling of Subordinates

Professional Ethics

Continuing Education

Problem Identification

Equal Employment Opportunity/ Affirmative Action

Techniques of Negotiation and Persuasion

Developing Staffing Patterns

Organizational Mission and Objectives Mid-Level Managers

Records Systems (Including Management Information Systems)

Grant Administration

Budget Preparation

Leadership Styles

Management by Objectives (MBO)

Techniques of Decision-Making (Problem Solving)

Computer Programming

Cost-Budget Analysis

Technical Writing

PART VI

FY 1977-78 EXPENDITURES FOR TRAINING OR EDUCATION PROGRAMS

A fiscal questionnaire was sent to each departmental budget officer to determine the actual FY 1977-78 expenditures for training or education programs. Where actual data was not available, agencies were requested to provide their best estimates of expenditures. The report was limited to training or education programs provided to staff positions covered by the State Personnel system and for which training was paid for directly by the State. Where classified employees on their own time and at their own expense were involved in training or education, such costs were not included. Expenses related to conferences, meetings, etc., which may have involved some training, but whose primary purpose was not training, also were not included. The questionnaire attempted to elicit three primary types of information:

I. Expenditures by type of program;

1.16

2.

- 2. Expenditures by line item source; and
- 3. The percentage of funds expended by training priority.

Responses were received from 16 of the 20 departments. For the Department of Higher Education, three schools were surveyed, CU-Boulder, Metropolitan State College and Arapahoe Community College, and the data was extrapolated to estimate the expenses for the entire department.

All of the responding departments completed the two portions concerning expenditures by type of program and by line item source. However, several of the departments failed to complete the portions concerning the percentage of funds expended by training priority resulting in less complete data.

-32-

The budgetary data indicates that \$1,374,938 was expended during FY 1977-78 for training or education programs for classified State employees. Of that amount \$855,365 or 62.2 percent was funded from the General Fund. The training expenditures resulted in 27,091 trainees at an average cost of \$51 per trainee.

At this point, it must be recognized that a trainee is not equivalent to an FTE. A trainee is simply one person completing one organized instructional program which may vary from one hour of classroom instruction to as many as 48 hours of classroom instruction; additionally, that one person may be counted as several trainees, having completed more than one instructional program. The pattern of counting one person as more than one trainee would be particularly prevalent in the Departments of Institutions and Corrections where job specific training programs appear more frequently.

As a percent of the total funds expended for training, direct operational cost of programs operated by the departments for their own employees is by far the largest category of expenditure, resulting in 74.3 percent of the total expenditures. This is attributable to the large programs of the Departments of Corrections, Institutions and Natural Resources which account for \$945,688 or 92.6% of that category of training.

Personal services was the largest line item source of training funds, with \$886,801 or 64.5 percent of the expenditures charged against personal service lines. The second largest line item source of funds was contractual services, accounting for \$244,890 or 17.8% of the expenditures. While certainly not the largest item, it is significant and should be noted that \$101,219 of the training expenditures came from travel line items. This may indicate that a large amount of out-of-state travel for training purposes is taking place without knowledge of existing comparable programs in-State.

The needs assessment survey found that supervisors typically indicated that between .5% and 1% of the work unit, division, or organizational budget was devoted to training. The \$1,374,938 expended for training in FY 1977-78 is only .0008 percent of the original FY 1977-78 operating budget appropriation of Senate Bill 581. There are several explanations, but the two most probable are that:

-33-

- 1. The .5 to I percent figure may be accurate, as compared to staff units, as a percentage of most State agency budgets when disributions to other units of government are considered.
- 2. The accounting system is not structured to provide good data at this time on the actual cost of training, resulting in distorted perceptions of available training funds as a percent of total appropriations.

Finally, of those departments that responded to the portion of the survey concerning the percentage of funds expended by training priority, twelve reported that sixty percent or more of their training expenditures went towards skills to allow better performance in existing job status. Of those twelve departments five reported that 100 percent of their expenditures were for that purpose. Only four departments reported any expenditures for skills to allow advancement in job status, and of those four, three reported five percent or less. Six departments reported expenditures varying from five to fifty-six percent for training due to changes in existing process or procedures. Six departments reported expenditures of two to forty-four percent for training which was primarily for the career development of the individual and not directly job related.

*See Items A through E "Expenditures for Training and/or Education Programs for Staff in 1977-78" Appendix C.

TABLE 5

SUMMARY TABLE

EXPENDITURES FOR TRAINING AND/OR EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR CLASSIFIED STAFF IN FY 1977-78 BY SOURCE OF PROGRAMS

Department	State Inst.	A Private Inst.	* Inst. In Other States	B Colorado	Other States	C State Agencies	Other Costs	Dept's Employees	E" Other Departments	Total Training Costs	Total <u>Trainees</u>	Ave. Cost Per Trainee
Administration	425	-	-	-	812	135	1,500	240	-	3,112	285	11
Agriculture	65	-	-	50	•	305		-	-	420	36	12
Corrections	-	900	-	-	2,100	-	-	175,000	•	178,000	307	580
Education	•	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Heal th	1,813	50	-	7,575	12,793	2,378	3,909	500	1,055	30,073	819	37
Higher Education/3	86,934	-	-	11,351	6,400	26,143	-	49,744	-	180,572	4,751	38
Highways/1												
Institutions		-	1,175	20,985	1,017	8,124	•	592,583	703	624,587	17,214	36
Labor & Employment	50	-	-	13	1,205	195	-	3,204	-	4,667	68	69
Law/1	-	-	-			-	-	-	-		-	
Local Affairs	-	-	-	1,603	200	600	-	-	-	2,403	19	126
Hilitary Affairs	-	-	-	175		140	-		-	315	3	105
Natural Resources	-	-	,*	2,932	3,040		780	178,105	-	184,857	215	860
Personnel OSPB/1	-	T	-	330	-	1,844	1,810	•	84,155	88,139	1,950	45
Regulatory Agencies	48	-	5,056	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,104	5	1,021
Revenue	5,000	-	-	1,773	1,732	300	-	21,867	-	30,672	1,236	25
Social Services	14,090	-	-	1,238	9,416	1,224	15,019			40,987	175	234
State	394	-	-	240	376	20	-	-	-	1,030	8	129
Treasury <u>/1</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
TOTAL Percent of Total	108,819 7.9	950 .1	6,231	48,265 3.5	39,091	41,408 3.0	23,018 1.7	1,012,243 74.3	85,913 6.2	1,374,938 100.0	27.091	51

/1 Did not report.

မ်န

/2 The Department of Social Services was appropriated \$400,000 for Schools of Social Work and \$350,000 for Contractual Training funds in FY 1977-78. It was reported that none of these funds were used for training classified State employees.

1

13 Expenditures for the Department of Higher Education are extrapolated from data provided by CU-Boulder, Metropolitan State College and Arapahoe Community College.

1

TABLE 6

SUMMARY TABLE

LINE ITEM AND SOURCE OF FUNDS TRAINING AND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR CLASSIFIED STAFF - 1977-78

	Personal Services	Contractual Services	Operating	Travel	Capital Outlay	Total	General Fund	Non-General Fund
Administration Agriculture Corrections Education Health Higher Education /3	- 175,000 - 46,244	1,500 185 - 445 118,059/4	812 1,000 1,525 11,159	800 235 2,000 		3,112 420 178,000 - 30,073 180,572	3,112 364 178,000 - 14,008 165,801	- 56 - 16,065 14,771
Highways <u>/1</u> Institutions Labor & Employment Law <u>/1</u> Local Affairs	459,256	112,802	29,786	18,790 4,399	3,953	624,587 4,667 2,403	369,240 3,364 - 1,927	255,347 1,303 476
Military Affairs Natural Resources Personnel OSPB <u>/1</u>	315 118,226 62,545	6,159 740	25,156 23,845 -	32,646	2,670 179	315 184,857 88,139	315 - 68,166 -	- 184,857 19,973 -
Regulatory Agencies Revenue Social Services <u>/2</u> State Treasury <u>/1</u>	2,561 21,697 - 689 -	- - 5,000 - -	1,373 8,158 30,000 - -	1,170 817 5,987 341 -	- - -	5,104 30,672 40,989 1,030	10,551 39,487 1,030 -	5,104 20,121 1,500 -
TOTALS Percent of Total	886,801 64.5	244,890 17.8	135,217 9.8	101,219 7.4	6,802 .5	1,374,938 100.0	855,365 62.2	519,573 37.8

/l Did not report.

The Department of Social Services was appointed \$400,000 for Schools of Social Work and \$350,000 for Contractual Training Funds in FY 1977-78. It was reported that none of these funds were used for financing classified State employees.

<u>/3</u> Expenditures for the Department of Higher Education were extrapolated from data provided by CU-Boulder, Metro State and Arapahoe Community College.

<u>/4</u> Includes tuition waivers.

Ð

-36-

TABLE 7

FY 1977-78 PERCENT OF EXPENDITURES

BY TRAINING PRIORITY

	Category*				
Department	1	11	111	IV	Other
Administration Agriculture Corrections		93 100 100	5	2	
Education Health Higher Education Highways	2	84 80	- 9 20	5	-
Institutions Labor & Employment Law	- 5	- 75	15	- 5	-
Local Affairs Military Affairs Natural Resources Personnel OSPB	2	64 100 100	56	34 44	2
Regulatory Agencies Revenue Social Services State Treasury	59	100 78 60 41	40	6	16

*Category:

- 1 -- Skills to allow advancement in job status.
- II -- Skills to allow better performance in existing job status.
- III -- Changes in existing processes or procedures (forms, reports, etc.) requiring retraining of employees.
- IV --- Personal enrichment of the individual and indirect benefit to the State. --- Other

PART VII

TRAINING RESOURCE INVENTORY

State Training Resources

Several agencies, notably the Department of Highways, Division of Employment and Training, the Department of Institutions, and the Department of Natural Resources regularly schedule a number of formal training programs on job related topics specific to their respective agencies. These are provided at no cost to their employees and would not be appropriate for employees of other agencies. Other agencies occasionally set up formal agency specific programs to supplement the individualized training provided by supervisors and a few have no formal training programs at all.

Training programs covering more broadly applicable topics such as Supervisory Skills, Human Relations, First Aid, etc., are provided on a regular basis by several agencies in addition to the Public Service Institure. The courses offered by the individual agencies include specific references to situations typical in that setting are set up for the employees of that particular agency. While all of these agencies have indicated they would permit employees of other State agencies to attend if requested and if space were available, no efforts are made to publicize the programs outside of the agency.

Most State agencies that do not provide regularly scheduled generic training have sent employees to training conducted by the Public Service Institute. Additionally, a number of agencies have set up a course internally on a one-time basis or have contracted with an outside organization (typically with a Continuing Education Unit) for a particular program.

The following is an outline of the types of generic training programs that are regularly scheduled and conducted by State agencies for State employees:

Management Development

The Public Service Institute Department of Highways Department of Institutions

Supervisory Skills

The Public Service Institute Department of Highways Department of Institutions Department of Revenue University of Colorado-Boulder (Physical Plant only)

Communications

The Public Service Institute Department of Highways Department of Institutions

Human Relations

The Public Service Institute Department of Institutions Department of Revenue

Career Development

The Public Service Institute Department of Institutions

First Aid-CPR

Department of Highways Department of Natural Resources Department of Social Services

Pre-Retirement Planning

The Public Service Institute Department of Revenue Department of Social Services

Clerical/Secretarial Skills

The Public Service Institute

Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action

The Public Service Institute Department of Institutions Department of Labor and Employment Department of Revenue

Technical Personnel Training

The Public Service Institute

A training needs assessment package for middle managers was developed under an IPA grant by the Department of Personnel. The package includes a variety of simulated job sample exercises designed to measure an individual's skills in a number of dimensions identified as important for successful performance as a manager. Specific strengths and weaknesses can be identified and a prescriptive training plan developed. These exercises can be adapted to individual agency settings.

Higher Education Resources

There are currently 31 publicly supported postsecondary institutions in the State operating at 38 locations. In addition there are 5 major private colleges and universities. These include:

Comprehensive Research and Doctoral Granting Institutions

Colorado State University - Fort Collins University of Colorado - Boulder

Comprehensive Doctoral Granting Institutions

University of Denver - Denver (Private)

Limited Doctoral Granting Institutions

University of Colorado at Denver University of Northern Colorado – Greeley

Special Purpose Research and Doctoral Granting Institutions

Colorado School of Mines – Golden University of Colorado Medical Center – Denver

Comprehensive Master's Granting Institutions

Adams State College – Alamosa University of Colorado – Colorado Springs Western State College – Gunnison

Limited Master's Granting Institutions

University of Southern Colorado - Pueblo

Comprehensive Baccalaureate Granting Institutions

Colorado College - Colorado Springs (Private) Colorado Women's College - Denver (Private) Fort Lewis College - Durango Loretto Heights College - Denver (Private) Mesa College - Grand Junction Metropolitan State College - Denver Regis College - Denver (Private)

Two-Year Colleges

Arapahoe Community College - Littleton Community College of Denver Denver Westminster Golden Lamar Community College - Lamar Morgan Community College - Fort Morgan Otero Junior College - LaJunta Pikes Peak Community College - Colorado Springs Trinidad State Junior College - Trinidad

Local District Colleges

Aims Community College – Greeley Colorado Mountain College Glenwood Springs Leadville Colorado Northwestern Community College – Rangely Northeastern Junior College – Sterling

Postsecondary Area Vocational Schools

Emily Griffith – Denver Boulder Valley – Boulder Larimer County – Fort Collins San Luis Valley – Monte Vista San Juan Valley – Cortez Delta-Montrose – Delta Aurora – Aurora

All of the public institutions offer programs in business/management areas. With the exception of Loretto Heights College, all of the private institutions offer programs in the business/management area. All of the two year colleges and most of the postsecondary area vocational schools have programs in the secretarial and clerical areas as well as other office related fields. A publication of the Commission on Higher Education entitled <u>Degree Programs Offered and Certificates and Degrees Conferred in</u> Colorado Colleges and Universities, lists the full program offerings at these institutions.

A review of the data in the CCHE publication indicates that programs in almost all areas of study of interest to the State are now available. Part-time tuition for residents at the public institutions range from \$14.00 to \$44.00 per semester credit hour. Each semester credit hour consists of 14 to 16 total hours of instruction. The specific rates are:

Institution	Rate per Credit Hour Per Semester (Except as Noted)
Colorado State University	\$19
University of Colorado-Boulder	\$33
University of Colorado-Denver	\$23 (per quarter)
University of Northern Colorado	\$22
Colorado School of Mines	\$44
University of Colorado School of Nursing	\$20
Adams State College	\$22
University of Colorado-Colorado Springs	\$26
Western State College	\$22
University of Southern Colorado	\$26
Fort Lewis College	\$25
Mesa College	\$22
Metropolitan State College	\$18
Community Colleges and Area	\$9.35 per quarter or \$14.0
Vocational Schools	per semester

These institutions are geographically distributed throughout the State. In addition programs can be offered through Outreach.

05

Outreach is the term applied specifically to the off-campus program of instruction offered by the eleven four-year State colleges and universities and coordinated by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. Under Commission policies, specified primary service areas are assigned to the various institutions, thus guaranteeing that citizens residing in every area of the State have at least one institution to look to for educational programs. These assignments preclude institutional competition and duplication of effort. Other policies ensure that quality standards are met and maintained in off-campus programs.

Instruction off-campus through Outreach can be offered for credit in any field or discipline taught by any of the State's colleges or universities. Assuming a sufficient number of potential students, a large majority of the courses available on-campus can be made available in off-campus locations. Virtually any area of the State can be served in this way. Locations distant from the campus, highly specialized courses, and a small number of enrolling students all may necessitate tuition at higher than normal levels. Credit courses can be organized for full semesters or quarters or for more concentrated periods of time. They also may be given in daytime, evening, or weekend hours.

Non-credit or instruction for which the Continuing Education Unit (CEU) is awarded may be developed for virtually any subject matter. Such instruction is particularly appropriate for persons who do not care to earn a degree but who need specific knowledge or skills, oftentimes knowledge or skills relating closely to their jobs. For State employees, many existing credit courses are available, but specialized courses, related to mid-management supervisory skills, for example, or such generally useful skills as first aid could be tailor-made and offered for non-credit or for CEU. In either case certificates of completion are awarded. Colleges and universities may also offer merely one discrete course or they may offer a sequence of related courses. Large parts of degree programs are available through Outreach and the University of Northern Colorado has the capability of offering some of its degree programs in their entirety off-campus.

Except for unusual circumstances which might drive up costs, Outreach credit classes are offered at standard tuition rates. These are as follows:

Per Semester Hour of Credit

Rural Areas*	Lower Division \$25	Upper Division/ Graduate \$33
Urban Areas*	\$27	\$35

A three semester hour course in Denver would cost \$81 if a lower division course and \$105 if an upper division or graduate course, for example.

-44-

Outreach institutions also could contract with a State agency for delivery of credit classes. The rate for each person enrolling in a contract course is:

I or 2 Semester Hours

\$30

Each Additional Hour

\$15

If unusual costs are involved a contract fee may be negotiated between the agency and the college or university. Fees for non-profit organizations would not exceed costs of delivery of the instruction.

Non-credit and CEU instruction does not have standard tuition and fees. These types of instruction could be contracted with an agency for less cost to individuals enrolling. Non-credit or CEU instruction costs might run from as little as \$5 or \$10 per day up to \$500 for a two or three day workshop for top management.

Institutions which participate in Outreach are:

Adams State College - Alamosa Colorado State University - Fort Collins Fort Lewis College - Durango Mesa College - Grand Junction Metropolitan State College - Denver University of Colorado - Boulder University of Colorado - Colorado Springs University of Colorado - Denver University of Northern Colorado - Greeley University of Southern Colorado - Pueblo Western State College - Gunnison

Other Private and Federal Resources

There are a number of other organizations which offer training programs of interest to State employees.

The broadest range of courses is offered by the Denver Regional Training Center, U.S. Civil Service Commission. The length of each course typically ranges from one to four days with an average cost of thirty to forty (\$30-\$40) dollars per day for each trainee. Courses are conducted during regular business hours. While some of the courses offered are applicable only to the Federal system, the majority are generic enough to be useful to State employees. Most of the courses are offered only in Denver although some are sometimes conducted in Colorado Springs, Grand Junction and Pueblo.

Several public school districts throughout the State (e.g., Jefferson County and Denver) have adult education components that offer vocational courses. These courses are offered free or at a nominal charge to residents of the districts and are often scheduled during the evenings or on weekends.

Private organizations such as the Beaumont Center for Executive Development, College of Business Administration, University of Denver and the American Management Association offer a number of seminars on management related topics. The courses are generally conducted in Denver during the business day at a typical cost of \$130-\$170 per day per trainee. This cost sometimes includes lunch and some materials but is considerably more expensive than other sources of training programs.

No attempt is being made to list all the private vendors of general training programs with regular offerings in Colorado. Almost all fit the schedule and cost models of the examples listed.

Advanced technical training for data processing professionals is offered by several corporations on contract using video taped training packages. These are presently being used by the Department of Administration and the Administrative Data Processing Center of the University of Colorado.

-46-

APPENDIX A

SUMMARIES OF INTERVIEWS

WITH

DEPARTMENTAL DIRECTORS

AGRICULTURE

1. Current Training.

OJT comprises the largest part of training currently utilized. This consists mainly of new field employees being assigned to work with more experienced personnel. Other types of training include a one to two hour <u>Department</u> <u>Orientation</u> session for new employees, some clerical and supervisory <u>PSI</u> instruction, and various meetings, seminars and classes provided by diverse agencies geared for <u>specific</u> job oriented skills such as poultry inspectors.

2. Areas and Groups Currently Requiring Training.

Although field personnel are qualified as having the greatest need for training, the current OJT system is considered adequate. Inadequately met training needs are those of the <u>supervisory and management personnel</u> who require general administrative instruction. These employees require training in such areas as budgeting and personnel. A <u>clerical workshop</u> is also seen as beneficial in standardizing clerical procedures. More specific skills training is also needed but at a lower, yet unspecified, amount. The funds to use current PSI or DRTC courses is viewed as a significant aid in meeting these needs.

3. Training Priorities.

An <u>in-house needs assessment</u> is the top training training priority, however the areas which currently appear to require higher priorities are <u>managerial</u> and <u>supervisory</u> <u>skills</u> training and <u>clerical</u> skills training. Other need areas could be prioritized and the priorities mentioned changed upon the completion of an in-house needs assessment.

4. Commitment.

Training is considered to be very important to the efficiency of the department. Work time is and will continue to be authorized for training when relevant and and useful instruction is made available.

5. Centralized Training.

A centralized training system is considered to be the "way to go." Although certain specialized training must be conducted internally, the generic training needs could be met through a central system. Currently there is an extremely small amount of training money available and therefore it would not be possible to use Department training funds to help support such a system.

6. Miscellaneous.

A tuition reimbursement/sharing system is viewed as needed.

ADMINISTRATION

1. Current Training.

. }-

The Department utilizes a fairly wide variety of general training. Instruction in <u>performance planning</u> <u>and review</u>, <u>personnel regulations</u>, <u>orientation</u> and, occasionally, PSI <u>Supervisory Skills</u> is currently utilized. A more detailed listing of current training is available in the training officer questionnaire.

2. Areas and Groups Currently Requiring Training.

<u>Communication skills</u> for all employee levels and especially for those above supervisory level are in need of improvement. In addition, basic <u>Supervisory and Manage-</u> <u>ment skills</u> instruction in such areas as discipline and personnel regulations should be expanded. Good instruction in new <u>accounting procedures</u> and <u>financial management</u> is viewed as necessary. <u>General clerical skills</u> could also benefit from training.

3. Training Priorities.

Aside from the areas mentioned above, no prioritization was given.

4. Commitment.

Training as a whole is given a high priority within the Department as demonstrated by past performance. It is considered important to an efficiently run organization. Work time is and would continue to be authorized for useful and relevant training on a spot-need basis.

5. Centralized Training.

If a centralized system were properly managed, it could be advantageous. However it is considered possible that the system would not be able to offer sufficient Departmental-relevant courses to accrue any significant

-50-

advantage. It is felt that an in-house training program usually could meet the need more effectively than a centralized system, although centralization might provide a certain monetary savings. Demonstration of the effectiveness of a centralized system would be needed to achieve strong Departmental support.

6. Miscellaneous.

None.

CORRECTIONS

1. Current Training.

LEAA is providing funds for a <u>training center</u> at Canyon City. In addition, an initial 40-hour course is provided in <u>basic skills and orientation</u> and another 40 hours focusing on <u>crisis intervention</u>. The remainder of the training provided appears to be sporadic in nature, occurring when specific seminars/meetings are held and specific individuals take the initiative to locate funds to attend. <u>OJT</u> is the largest area of training, however on-the-job training is not formalized and is, therefore, open to poor teaching practices.

2. Areas and Groups Currently Requiring Training.

Currently a training needs assessment is being conducted to determine the areas and groups requiring training. However groups mentioned spontaneously as needing training were <u>parole officers</u>, <u>managers</u>, <u>mid-managers</u>, <u>supervisors</u> and <u>clericals</u>. These groups require <u>specialized</u> <u>training</u> in various aspects of their individual tasks. In addition, training sessions on <u>budget procedures</u> for management level and <u>clerical workshops</u> would be beneficial. However, the vast majority of training needed, including those areas generic in nature, should be tailored to the Department given its unique responsibilities.

3. Training Priorities.

No priorities for training were given due to newness of programs within the Department. The results of the Needs Survey could help in prioritizing the needs.

4. Commitment.

Training is listed as the <u>highest priority</u> due to the current formulation of the Department and its policies. The desire is to help that formulation through training. It is hoped that eventually all Department employees would receive 40 hours/year of various types of training designed for their specific jobs, with 80 hours/year going to those individuals having direct inmate contact.

5. Centralized Training.

The Department might profit from such things as centralized clerical workshops and budget procedure training; however, it is felt that most training should be geared specifically to the problems of the Department. This is due primarily to the relative newness of the Department and its administration and to the unique tasks assigned to it.

It is felt, however, that the Department would profit from Human Relations Training in which several prison guards, parole officers, employees from Social Services and individuals from other related areas would meet together to discuss techniques and problems and receive training.

6. Miscellaneous.

The training needs survey currently being conducted and scheduled to be completed by November 1978 should provide much additional information on the needs of the Department.

EDUCATION

1. Current Training.

<u>One-day orientation</u> sessions for new employees is virtually all the training used at the Department. Other minor training includes occasional Secretarial Association seminars and occasional special seminars on such topics as telephone etiquette.

2. Areas and Groups Currently Requiring Training.

The Assistant Commissioners listed the following six areas as most needed/requested by their classified employees:

- 1. <u>Stress Management</u> Physical fitness and its relation to the work environment.
- <u>General Office Techniques</u> Mailing, filing, etc.
- 3. Telephone etiquette.
- 4. Time Management Planning, organization, etc.
- 5. Orientation to the Department and State Government - "Who does what?"
- 6. <u>Opportunities for Upward Mobility</u> within the State system.

3. Training Priorities.

No specific priorities were expressed.

4. Commitment.

The need for training within the Department is listed as moderate. Although it is important, reduction of turnover rates and improvements in the employee evaluation processes must take precedence. Work time has been and will continue to be authorized for relevant training. A Tuition Reimbursement Program does not have a "high priority."

5. Centralized Training.

The use of centralized training is "in some cases a much more efficient way to go." In addition, all of the

-54-

above areas could be accommodated through a centralized system.

6. Miscellaneous.

Currently the Department spends less than \$1,000 on training for its entire staff (classified and non-classified) consisting of approximately 200 persons.

HEALTH

1. Current Training.

The majority of the current training utilized is that required to <u>maintain current knowledge in the profes-</u> <u>sional areas</u>. This includes such things as maintaining certifications and license renewals. This training is provided mainly through external sources such as conferences. Other training is utilized on a spot-need basis.

2. Areas and Groups Currently Requiring Training.

The largest area of need is the training involved in <u>maintaining professional currency</u>. However this is an ongoing need which is apparently being adequately met. Another need area is that of <u>report writing</u>. Courses on the use of the written English language would be useful.

3. Training Priorities.

Outside of the continuing education for the Department's professionals, training priorities are determined mainly on a <u>spot-need basis</u>. Those needs often fall within the structure of newly created programs.

4. Commitment.

The day-to-day importance of training within the Department is low, not including the professional continuing education. When a situation exists where a choice must be made between meeting a "substantive" problem or a training need, the "substantive" problem is met.

The policy authorizing work time for training can be continued if more relevant instruction is made available.

5. Centralized Training.

The concept of centralized training is met with skepticism. It is believed that such a program would create its own raison d'etre and become "convoluted." However, the idea of providing training consultants to

-56-

assist individual departments with their own training programs is "appealing."

(2)

6. Miscellaneous.

It is believed that an unspecified amount of training should be done by the employee himself. In other words, the employee (especially the professionals) should be self-motivated toward training. In a related area, it is mentioned that problems in handling such managerial tasks as budgeting and personnel relations could be an issue of motivation rather than training.

HIGHER EDUCATION

NOTE: Due to the nature of higher education governance interviews were held with three institutions of differing sizes to serve as samples of the training needs in the department. The three institutions were:

Arapahoe Community College Metropolitan State College University of Colorado at Boulder

1. Current Training

All three institutions currently provide some training for their classified employees. Training is provided in various ways including OSPB and Personnel Department training sessions, national organizations, the Public Service Institute and well as their own staff and faculty. They all provide under policies of their respective boards tuition waivers for course work at their institutions. Up to 6 hours per year at half cost at CU-Boulder, 6 hours per year at no cost at Metro, and 9 hours per year at no cost at Arapahoe. All such enrollments are on a space available basis. Paid time off for attending courses is given on a very limited basis and only if it is at the request of the institution and specifically job related. All three institutions will allow some rescheduling of the work day to accomodate classes but the time must be made up.

2. Areas and Groups Currently Requiring Training

The desire by classified staff for training appears widespread as well as the recognition of the need for training by administrators. Areas of training mentioned included general supervisory skills including better understanding of the State's personnel system and procedures, as well as technical skills in the budget, accounting, computer areas and energy conservation. Concern was expressed that though most employees are well versed in their technical fields, their training and the State's job criteria often leave weakness in the semitechnical areas such as personnel management and writing, or in related technical fields (accounting and data processing as examples).

Career development of classified employees was seen as a problem at all three institutions. Concern was expressed that the classified system was not conducive to career development or mobility. Staff could develop the technical skills for promotions but not be eligible for promotion due to specific classification requirements. In addition staff could develop general administrative skills which where transferable to other areas but not be able to transfer due to job classifications being tied primarily to technical skills or educational levels.

3. Training Priorities

The priorities expressed by the three institutions were:

- 1. Supervisory Skills
- 2. Technical Skills
- 3. Career Development

Higher Education Page Two

4. Commitment

All three institutions expressed a strong commitment to training. Each set aside some specific funds for training (approximately \$4,000 each for classified staff) and had established procedures for maintaining and encouraging training programs. At all three institutions a staff person or committee was responsible for supervising training though at no institution did that effort exceed 0.4 FTE. All three saw the need for more funds in the training area though they were cautious about the marginal benefit of significant increases. In general, time off for specific skill training such as personnel and budget procedures, higher education accounting procedures, supervisory skills for supervising staff, energy conservation training for plant operations staff, etc. were seen as items to be conducted at State expense on State time. Training and educational programs for career advancement or development were seen as items to be conducted on the employees own time and expense, except to the extent their governing board has approved tuition waivers for their employees.

5. Centralized Training

There was general acceptance and some limited use of the program now offered by PSI. They saw PSI as providing training related to the operations of the State's accounting and personnel systems as well as some general management and supervisory programs. They felt in other areas they had to turn to other sources for their training needs. Specifics mentioned were higher education accounting, budgeting, personnel, and plant operations. Most felt a more appropriate role would be for a central coordinator and facilitator of programs at the colleges or in conjunction with other colleges. All appeared to be opposed to centralized funding of their current training resources.

6. Miscellaneous

The three institutions were asked if they would be willing to allow employees of other agencies to participate in their training programs. All indicated they would be so long as the other agencies paid their share of the costs and space was available. They were also asked if they would be willing to admit, on a space available basis, employees of other agencies in the academic and vocational classes. Arapahoe indicated they might agree to such a program so long as their employees had priority. CU-Boulder indicated they might agree so long as the funds that came in from the half tuition charge could be used for program enrichment. Metro expressed concern that the majority of employees would want to enter programs already overtaxed, such as business. In addition concern was expressed about their responsibility to the taxpayers. If all State employees get some form of tuition benefit, why not all taxpayers.

HIGHWAYS

1. Current Training.

Upon entry into the Department, all new employees attend an <u>orientation training session</u> where such things as Personnel Rules and Regulations, Safety, Benefits and other areas of standard operating procedures are taught. A system of MBO is being phased in and <u>relevant training</u> <u>concerning MBO</u> is being given. <u>OJT</u> is also provided for many employees in such areas as construction. <u>Mid and upper</u> <u>level management training</u> is being planned to begin in the Fall of 1978, concentrating on generalized managerial skills such as employee relations, budgets and other basic supervisory and management skills. There is also a <u>1/2 tuition</u> <u>reimbursement program</u> for career development. The program however is not widely participated in.

2. Areas and Groups Currently Requiring Training.

Mid and upper level managers are the groups identified as requiring increased training. The types of instruction needed by the managers are the general supervisory/ managerial skills in such areas as budget preparation and personnel rules. Adequate training is currently being provided in the more technical areas.

3. Training Priorities.

The training of <u>mid and upper level managers</u> in general managerial skills and MBO appears to have highest priority. Other training areas appear to be equally important.

4. Commitment.

It is considered important and is listed as one of the Highway Commission's 13 objectives. Work time is, and would continue to be, authorized for relevant training.

5. Centralized Training.

For upper level managers, it is felt that centralized training in such generic managerial skills as general planning and budgeting would not only be economical but also provide needed contact among upper level managers of different Departments. At the mid level management level, it is felt that the areas dealt with are too specialized and agencyspecific to profit from centralization. At the clerical level it is felt that centralization would be practical, but it might not provide any significant advantage.

6. Miscellaneous.

The training budget is considered to be fairly adequate. In addition, the area cited as needing training the most (general mid and upper level management skills) will be the area addressed in an upcoming training program.

INSTITUTIONS

1. Current Training.

The Department currently is utilizing <u>a very wide</u> <u>range of instructional courses</u>, ranging from specialized job related areas such as training for Retardation Technicians to broader areas such as supervisory skills. It is felt that most training needs are currently being met adequately.

A more detailed listing of current training is available in the training officer questionnaire.

2. Areas and Groups Currently Requiring Training.

Although it is felt that most training needs are currently being met, need areas which were mentioned as being requested include: <u>Human Relations</u>, training in <u>cross-discipline</u> and/or cross-departmental <u>cooperation</u>, <u>Supervisory Entry Level</u>, financial management. It is felt that the majority of training needed is specialized, job specific in nature. Areas such as financial management are more general in nature, however application specifically to the Department needs to be made.

3. Training Priorities.

Those with direct clientele contact and those at management level and above are viewed as having the highest training priority.

4. Commitment.

Training is viewed as extremely important. A fact substantiated by the significant training done, both past and present. In addition, training for many of the professionals is mandatory for such things as license renewal.

5. Centralized Training.

With the possible exception of a small number of general courses such as training in Affirmative Action

-62-

guidelines, a centralized training system is not desired. Instead, it would be considered advantageous to have a central supportive service which would provide funds, resources and listings of course and instructor availabilities. The system would assist in-house training programs by providing a needed "clearinghouse" of information and/or resources. 1

6. Miscellaneous.

A threat is perceived by the entire survey that it will be an attempt to "justify and bolster" the PSI operation at the expense of in-house training programs. Currently the Department appears to be meeting most of its own training needs either through in-house courses or through contracting for training services.

LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT

1. Current Training Provided/Used.

. . .

Currently the Division of Employment makes use of training within the Department. Funding for the Division's training comes mainly from federal funds. The Department as a whole uses various, low cost courses on a spot-need basis. Lack of funding, especially for the Division of Labor greatly restricts training use.

2. Areas and Groups Currently Requiring Training.

"Teaching supervisors to supervise" is the first priority listed. Instruction in grievance procedures, evaluation of employee performance, discipline, budgeting and Affirmative Action were pointed out as areas where the supervisory personnel needed training. It was stated that if such general supervisory training was offered, the Department would "benefit tremendously." In addition, attendance for supervisory personnel in relevant courses/ seminars would be "mandatory."

Career Development programs for all levels were mentioned as a second needy area. It was stated that assistance to individuals proceeding up the career ladder would be beneficial in retaining superlative employees. The use of a tuition credit program was mentioned as a possible solution.

<u>Clericals</u> were also mentioned as needing occasional instruction in new office machinery and basic job skills.

3. Training Priorities.

Supervisory training would receive top priority. Other areas would require closer examination before clear priorities could be set. Overall training has a relatively high priority.

-64-

4. Commitment.

The commitment to training within the Department appears relatively high, especially supervisory training. It seemed that a genuine need for training is perceived and a desire to meet the need exists. An example would be the mandatory attendance of supervisory personnel at supervisory skills training sessions. 11

5. Centralized Training.

Generally viewed as a good way for smaller Departments/Divisions to secure badly needed training in some management and most clerical skills. Centralized training in budget preparation, personnel procedures and general managerial skills is considered profitable, however specialized training is also needed to retain overall effectiveness to the individual Departments. It was stated that a centralized system is needed in the state as long as some specialized training is still available for the unique skills required within Labor and Employment.

6. Miscellaneous.

Ideas suggested as beneficial included: (1) <u>Career Manager Program</u> where top level managers would go from office to office, thus spreading their profitable managerial practices and obtaining better insights into State Government as a whole; (2) Use of experienced <u>field</u> <u>personnel to train</u> new employees; and (3) <u>Model Office</u> <u>Concept</u> where a functioning office is established to train new employees. Other training needs were mentioned, such as instruction of employment counselors, job developers and job areas unique to the Department. There is no data to submit for the Department of Law. Several appointments were cancelled and phone messages were not returned.

1

LOCAL AFFAIRS

......

1. Current Training.

Instruction within the Department currently consists of various <u>specialized courses for field employees</u>. Other types include a limited number of <u>PSI</u> courses and two days/month currently set aside for training in needed areas. In addition, many courses are given for members of local governments.

2. Areas and Groups Currently Requiring Training.

The primary group in need of training is listed as <u>supervisory and management skills</u> in such areas as budget management and the personnel system. The techniques of such skills as <u>giving dictation</u> and the use of office equipment are also in need of instruction. <u>Clerical skills</u> training is also an area which would benefit from training. It is felt also that there is a genuine need for an <u>orientation</u> to the structure of State government session for employees including some type of <u>career ladder</u> counseling which would continue throughout the employee's term with the State System.

3. Training Priorities.

Supervisory skills training is listed as the most important need area. The training will need to include such aspects as general management skills, budgeting and employee relations. Following in priority behind supervisory training are the orientation sessions for new employees and Career Pattern counseling.

4. Commitment.

Training is viewed as extremely important, but on a day-to-day basis it is consigned to a lower priority due to lack of resources available for training. There exist pressing needs which cannot be met with present funding.

-67-

In addition, work time is and will continue to be authorized for training when additional relevant instruction is available.

5. Centralized Training.

The use of a centralized system for the generic training needs of the department is viewed as a profitable idea. There is a willingness to commit funds toward such a facility if the funds existed. Current training resources apparently are being utilized to provide essential instruction.

6. Miscellaneous.

It is felt that in order to increase the productivity of the bureaucracy, the employees must be trained to achieve their maximum efficiency. There is a genuine frustration at not being able to provide needed training. The sources needed to meet this training gap are varied and are dependent on specific needs.

It is felt also that a tuition sharing/reimbursement plan would be advisable to help meet the need for Career Development as long as the instruction is beneficial to the State in some way.

MILITARY AFFAIRS

1. Current Training.

The training being utilized currently is limited to those <u>courses with no tuition charges</u>. These consist mainly of PSI courses in EEO and occasional management and clerical skills training. This limitation is due to insufficient funds to pay any tuitions.

2. Areas and Groups Currently Requiring Training.

The preference within the Department is to hire those individuals who already possess the needed skills. However there currently exists a need for training in <u>all areas with supervisory skills</u> such as employee relations, documentations and organization having a significantly pressing need. In addition an <u>orientation to the organization and functioning of State government</u> is viewed as beneficial to all state employees.

3. Training Priorities.

The number one training priority in the Department is to train community leaders in disaster preparedness. Within the State system the most important training need is that of the supervisor. The remaining areas were not prioritized.

4. Commitment.

Training is considered secondary to the completion of the day-to-day tasks of the Department. However isolated as a contributing factor to the attaining of Department goals, it ranks relatively high. Work time is and would continue to be authorized for relevant and useful training.

5. Centralized Training.

The concept of centralized training is viewed as being more efficient than a totally decentralized system.

-69-

Important factors in the success of such a system are listed as the professionalism of the instructors, relevancy of courses, an avoidance of "training for training's sake," and easy access by the departments. The concepts of a "training team" which would travel within the state and/or a system of centralized funding are viewed as desirable forms of centralized training.

6. Miscellaneous.

 The preference of hiring those individuals who already possess the needed skills is viewed as alleviating a large portion of training needs.

2. The State employees should be made aware of the unique dual funding of the National Guard by both the Federal and State Governments.

3. The Department spent less than \$200 in any of the preceding five years for training.

NATURAL RESOURCES

31

1. Current Training.

Each Division is currently utilizing <u>specific job</u> <u>skills training</u> for certain employees. In addition, a <u>limited amount of PSI</u> courses are used such as certain clerical training and Affirmative Action seminars.

2. Areas and Groups Currently Requiring Training.

Training for minority employees to fill specific job openings and for promotions is seen as a need. Similarly additional training in Affirmative Action guidelines would be useful.

Also, <u>clerical training</u> in such skills as shorthand, equipment operation and office organization is needed. Other areas are perceived as needing training, however it is felt that their needs are more easily met.

3. Training Priorities.

Training for <u>minority employees</u> and <u>clericals</u> are the highest training priorities. Other need areas were not prioritized.

4. Commitment.

Training is of reasonably high importance, however it is not as important as continuation of current substantive programs. In addition work time is and would continue to be authorized if relevant training were available.

5. Centralized Training.

It is felt that centralized training is useful, however a demonstration of its effectiveness and worth would need to be made in order to enjoy strong support. In addition it would be difficult to use any current Departmental training funds to help support such a system.

6. Miscellaneous.

None

PERSONNEL

1. Current Training.

The areas where training is currently being utilized include various PSI courses such as <u>basic supervisory</u> <u>skills training</u>, <u>Management Development School</u> and certain <u>clerical</u> courses. In addition various courses/seminars are utilized which deal with such areas as <u>rules interpretation</u> and record keeping.

2. Areas and Groups Currently Requiring Training.

Mid and upper level managers were qualified as in need of developing managerial skills with a lack of time on the part of the managers listed as a contributing factor. In need of fairly individualized training are <u>clericals</u> and members of the <u>Classification Staff</u>. The clericals are in need of specific skills for operation of new equipment and career development. The Classification Staff would benefit from instruction in more advanced classification systems. There exists a <u>need to infuse</u> new <u>technologies and procedures</u> throughout the Department which can be accomplished through a coordinated plan of general (non-agency specific), specific and career development training.

3. Training Priorities.

The development of <u>Managerial Skills</u> and training of <u>new operating procedures</u> are listed as having the highest priorities in training. The remaining need areas occupy a lower priority and were not themselves listed in any priority.

4. Commitment.

On a scale of 1 to 10 (1 being highest), training was given a 4 in importance toward accomplishing the Department goals. Work time is currently, and would continue to be, authorized for relevant training.

5. Centralized Training.

The concept of centralized training "makes sense." The logical justification for this being that because private industry continues to centralize its training, then it must be cost effective. In addition, an unspecified amount of funds currently used for generic training within the Department could be used to help support such a system.

6. Miscellaneous.

1. An increase to 5 percent of employee time devoted to training appears desirable and realistic.

2. An expansion of a tuition sharing/reimbursement program should be made available to all state employees.

3. A diversity of sources is viewed as the best way to ensure good and complete training within the State.

OSPB

1. Current Training.

There is <u>no systematic training program</u> currently being used. The majority of training is individual case basis and consists of various symposiums and meetings.

2. Areas and Groups Currently Requiring Training.

<u>All groups</u> are qualified as needing training with no priority mentioned. The areas in which agency specific training is needed were stated to be <u>writing skills</u>, <u>analytical work</u> and the <u>use of computers</u>. Career Development instruction of generic value to the individual was also mentioned as a need.

3. Training Priorities.

No specific training priorities were given. However the Division directors have been asked to ascertain from their subordinates what areas need training. The results of this inquiry are due in November.

4. Commitment.

Training is viewed as one of the top two or three priorities, but due to a lack of funds it has been consigned to a lower position. The use of administrative leave for training could be expanded on a case by case basis, however it is felt that an unspecified amount of self development training should be done on the employee's own time. There should also be an unspecified upper limit percentage of an employee's work time devoted to training.

5. Centralized Training.

Centralized training is not viewed as a highly desirable training system. Rather, a tie to the Department of Higher Education is viewed as a better system. This tie is seen as being more efficient by utilizing resources

-74-

readily available. In addition, a centralized system is viewed as being "redundant."

6. Miscellaneous.

A Tuition Sharing Plan was mentioned as a possible help in the meeting of Career Development goals. The scheme would be for the individual employee to share an unspecified amount of the training cost with the State.

REGULATORY AGENCIES

1. Current Training.

The various <u>Examiners</u> within the Department currently attend their field's National Training School. In addition, some PSI courses for <u>clerical</u>, <u>supervisory</u> and <u>management skills</u> are utilized on a spot-need basis. All the training is done outside the Department and most is done out of state.

2. Areas and Groups Currently Requiring Training.

The attached memo lists the areas mentioned as needing training. Listed separately are the needs for <u>clerical skills training</u>, <u>basic supervisory and management</u> <u>skills training</u> and <u>budget procedures</u> primarily for Division Directors.

3. Training Priorities.

Supervisory and management training are listed as having the highest priority, with <u>clerical training</u> having second priority. All other areas and groups were not prioritized.

4. Commitment.

Training is viewed as important, but second to accomplishing the tasks of the Department. It is considered to be the first item cut when budget reduction occurs. In addition, the current policy of authorizing work time for training will continue when more relevant training becomes available.

5. Centralized Training.

A centralized training system is viewed as a "good idea." However it is felt that the best source of training is within the Department, followed by in-state. In addition, no training funds from the Department could

-80-

be used to help support such a system due to the fact that currently the vast majority of training money goes toward travel expenses.

6. Miscellaneous.

It is felt that the closer to the training need the instruction is provided, the better the need is met. Therefore in-house programs are preferable to in-state programs and in-state programs are preferable to out of state. In addition, it is not known how to determine the additional amount of training funds needed without some type of experience or base. It is necessary to first ascertain cost and location of the additional training desired. GAIL H. KLAPPER Executive Director

FROM: JEAN E. SHELTON Departmental Personnel Officer

SUBJECT: Staff Development

DATE: August 18, 1978

TC:

In response to your request of August 1, 1978, 1 have assessed the training needs of the Department of Regulatory Agencies and have compiled the following which are areas of concern as recommended by the agencies:

Professional/Management Management Development Supervisory Skills Budget & State Accounting Systems (basic operating) Effective Report Writing Personnel Rules and Regulations Interpersonal Skills Communications Skills Organizational Development Cverview of State Government Effective Communication - Tact & Diplomacy **Fublic Relations** Affirmative Action Guidelines & Laws Colorado State Government organization and operation Computer language and technology Personnel Management Reading and Interpreting reports

Technical and Clerical

Office procedures Telephone Communications Record Keeping Supervision (Basic) Gail H. Klapper August 18, 1978 Staff Development – Poge 2

Technical and Clerical (Cont'd.)

Office Skills Use of Office equipment Business English Letter Composition C.R.T. Training (computer terminal) Career Mobility Basic Accounting Accounting Theoryy Data Processing Knowledge of Departmental functions & responsibilities

Specialty Areas as Described by the Agencies

Pharmacy – Law enforcement; Field work in Pharmaceutical Inspections; Investigative Techniques; Statistical & dø

Civil Rights – Statistical & demographic training

Securities - Securities Regulations

Personnel - Extensive Personnel Rules training; class training; examination process; Task analysis; Personnel transaction codes; Payroll variance reports

Racing - Hearing procedures

6

Insurance – Underwriters Training; Property & Casualty Underwriter caurses; Life Underwriter Courses; Statutroy Accounting & examination problems to auditing Insurance companies

Banking - Examining computerized Banks; Basic and advanced technical Bank exam training; Regulating Banks (Chartered)

Savings & Loan – Examination procedures; Laws and regulations (Savings & Loan) Consumer Rights, Real Estate appraising

Investigative – Laws relative to Interviewing complaints, respondents and witnessess; Subpoening; administrative procedures Act versus individuals board statutes/rules and regulations

Many of these courses are currently being provided by the Public Service Institute, others are being provided by the agencies and others are provided by private industries. Employees need assistance in fanancial support.

REVENUE

1. Current Training.

A large portion of current training consists of <u>OJT</u>. In addition, <u>Management and Development</u> instruction provided by CU is utilized along with in-house courses for <u>first line supervisors</u>. <u>Specific instruction</u> in <u>specialized</u> <u>areas</u>, such as inheritance tax laws and regulations is also utilized.

2. Areas and Groups Currently Requiring Training.

Increased instruction for <u>clericals</u> in the keyboard skills and data entry is listed as a need. There are also needs for the training of those employees whose jobs require public contact. A greater amount of general <u>managerial</u> skills training is another needy area.

3. Training Priorities.

The expansion of "<u>home grown training</u>" is the highest priority within training. The increased in-house instruction is viewed as preferable to other types of training. The remaining need areas were not prioritized although the need for management training was stressed.

4. Commitment.

Training is very important within the Department. It is felt that instruction does have benefits. In addition work time is and would continue to be authorized for relevant and useful training.

5. Centralized Training.

A centralized training system is not viewed favorably due to such factors as the perceived need for instruction to be carried out with Departmental peers. It is felt that scheduling could be accomplished more effectively in an in-house system. In addition the highest training

-84-

priority is the establishment of new and the expansion of existing in-house training programs.

6. Miscellaneous.

It is felt that more concern should be focused on non-training aspects of Staff Development such as recruiting practices and "cross-fertilization."

SOCIAL SERVICES

1. Current Training.

PSI courses in the areas of <u>personnel regulation</u>, <u>clerical skills</u> and various <u>administration and management</u> areas comprise a large portion of the training utilized by the Department. In addition, various courses/seminars are provided by the Department for specialized employees such as Eligibility Technicians. However, they are considered inadequate.

2. Areas and Groups Currently Requiring Training.

Due to the nature of the job and the high turnover rate, <u>Eligibility Technicians</u> are in need of more training in such skills as public relations and specific job tasks. <u>Case Workers</u> require additional training in dealing with crises confronting them on the job. <u>Managers</u> are qualified as in need of some type of integrated management program in which all management level employees are instructed in similar basic management skills. In addition, <u>Career</u> <u>Development</u> is listed as an area in which the scope of opportunities should be expanded.

Some instruction is currently offered to attempt to fill the training gap; however, insufficient funds prevent alleviation of the needs.

3. Training Priorities.

The increased training of <u>Eligibility Technicians</u>, Case Workers and Managers all receive high priority.

4. Commitment.

The overall importance of training should be high. However, staff development in general is usually sacrificed to continue primary public services. It is believed that in the long run a lack of training will be detrimental.

In addition, work time is and will continue to be authorized for training. It is considered that such

-86-

authorization is one of the few extra incentives for training.

5. Centralized Training.

A centralized system to handle the more generic Departmental training is considered to be advantageous by heightening the efficient use of resources. It appears redundant to have several departments giving similar instruction at the same time. In addition, it would be possible to use some Department training funds currently used for such generic training to help support this type of system.

6. Miscellanous.

1. The best source of instruction to meet the Department's training needs is the seminar.

2. A tuition reimbursement program is considered a valuable program in facilitating needed Upward Mobility within the State system.

3. An increase of 25 - 30 percent in the Department's training funds would probably still not meet all the needs.

4. It is encouraging that such a survey as the training needs assessment is being conducted.

STATE

1. Current Training.

<u>PSI</u> and various <u>university courses</u> are currently being utilized in such areas as <u>letter writing</u>, <u>retirement</u> and <u>Affirmative Action</u>. <u>Supervisory skills training</u> was the area used most often. All requests for training were approved, with a total expenditure of \$688. However approximately \$11,000 was reverted from Personal Services, part of which was available for additional training if the demand was present.

2. Areas and Groups Currently Requiring Training.

Those most likely to cause a crisis are identified as needing training the most. This group is qualified as those with high potential to move into management positions, the rationale being that a new manager without management skills training is a potential "weak link" in the Department. Specific management skills training in such areas as <u>budgeting</u>, job scheduling and <u>conflict management</u> were listed as areas where training should concentrate.

3. Training Priorities.

The need to develop a first line <u>supervisor</u> and a <u>management training program</u> are the top priorities in training. A seminar style of instruction is believed best suited to meeting this need.

4. Commitment.

Current programs for administrative leave for training and tuition reimbursement can be expanded. There was an opportunity to conduct a training needs survey within the Department; however, the idea was voted down unanimously at a meeting of all managers (project level and above). The image of training is that there is much said concerning the need for it but when action is called for "it's just not quite that important."

5. Centralized Training.

"Sure" was the response to the concept of centralized training. However the Department is not willing to use any funds they have available for training to fund such a facility without an increase in appropriation. A type of expanded PSI operation is the system most usable to the Department.

6. Miscellaneous.

Due to the small staff of the Department, it is difficult to retain personnel after they have been trained to fill a higher position. It is believed that there exists a need for an interdepartmental pool of career employees, thereby facilitating interdepartmental movement up career ladders. In addition, an overall increase of \$2,000 for training is considered to be realistic.

TREASURY

1. Current Training.

The training the Department is utilizing consists mainly of journals, circulars and occasional <u>seminars</u>. No PSI courses are being utilized.

2. Areas and Groups Currently Requiring Training.

Overall training needs are minimal with clericals needing the greatest amount. Most of the 14 employees are career employees and therefore assume most of the responsibility for their own training. Career Development is cited as the area where some assistance could be directed in order to alleviate upward mobility stagnation.

3. Training Priorities.

Aside from the continuing needs of the investors, there is little need for training within the Department. It is <u>difficult to assign priorities</u> to areas of need the State could/should fill without an in-house needs survey.

4. Commitment.

Not including those areas of training need which are being met by the employee himself, the commitment (as represented by the relative overall priority of training as a whole) is low. However work time is and would continue to be authorized to attend relevant training sessions.

5. Centralized Training.

A system of centralized training would be "disfunctional" to a Department of this size.

6. Miscellaneous.

None.

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY TABLES OF

TRAINING NEEDS PRIORITY RATINGS

Priority of Training Needs: Non-supervisory, Non-professional Employees

Training Area	% endorsing as relevant (N=82)	trai	nt of * ning need	Relati Priori	ty
		x	SD	x	SD
First Aid (including CPR)	65	3.34	1.06	3.52	1.24
Motivation	72	3.54	1.01	3.48	1.02
Work Planning	59	3.30	1.13	3.40	1.05
Defensive Driving	48	3.28	1.36	3.40	1.35
Handling Hazardous Materials	43	3.39	1.37	3.39	1.37
Team Building	50	3.34	1.22	3.34	1.26
Safety Rules & Regulations (OSHA, etc.)	63	3.21	1.25	3.32	1.30
Seminars on Pertinent Issues in Career Field	45	3.43	.96	3.30	1.20
Management of Stress	46	3.53	1.16	3.29	1.06
Environmental Safety (Procedures for operating equip-	49	3.15	1.41	3.28	1.32
ment safely) Personnel Rules	71	3.27	1.01	3.28	1.09
Job Satisfaction and Morale Factors	71	3.45	1.03	3.26	1.10
Report Writing	49	3.37	1.07	3.22	1.11
Instruction Techniques	51	3.45	1.09	3.21	1.09

Note - Only areas endorsed by at lesst 15% of the sample with mean training need ratings of "moderate" (3) or greater are included.

* Training need scale: O=None; 1=Very Little; 2=Little; 3=Moderate; 4=Great; 5=Very Great **Priority scale: 1=Very Low; 2=Low; 3=Moderate; 4=High; 5=Very High

-92-

Priority of Training Needs: Non-supervisory, Non-professional Employees

•

Training Area	% endorsing as relevant (N=82)		stent of * raining need		Relative ** Priority
		x	SD	x	SD
Management of Conflict	46	3.34	1.15	3.18	1.3
Retention and Recall of Information	38	3.03	• 1.43	3.17	. 1.0
Techniques of Decision Making (Problem solving)	56	3.24	1.06	3.15	. 1.1
Work Unit Rules, Regulations, Procedures	79	3.11	1.02	3.14	1.1
Continuing Education (Academic Coursework in Career Field)	44	3.16	1.04	3.14	1.1
Effective Listening	63	3.08	1.19	3.12	1.1
Disciplining Employees	55	3.44	1.20	3.11	1.1
Management-by-Objectives (MBO)	42	3.41	.99	3.09	1.0
Organizational Development (Diagnosing Problems, Intervention Strategies, etc.)	31	3.22	1.12	3.07	1.0
Group Dynamics (i.e., role theory; group development; group effectiveness, etc.)	37	3.22	1.02	3.00	.8
Security Procedures	43	3.08	1.38	3.00	1.5
Techniques of Negotistion and Persuasion	38	3.23	1.31	2.97	1.2

Note - Only areas endorsed by at least 15% of the sample with mean training need ratings of "moderate" (3) or greater are included.

* Training need scale: O=None; 1=Very Little; 2=Little; 3=Moderate; 4=Great; 5=Very Great

**Priority scale: 1=Very Low; 2=Low; 3=Moderate; 4=High; 5=Very High

Priority of Training Needs: Non-supervisory, Non-professional Employees

Training Area	.% endorsing as relevant (N=82)	Extent		Relativ Priorit	
		x	SD	x	SD
Learning Theory	37	3.26	1.03	2.97	.95
Research Methods (including data gathering techniques)	29	3.21	1.18	2.96	1.20
Coursework Leading to an Associate of Arts Degree	20	3.38	1.09	2.94	1.29
Records Systems (includes management information systems)	31	3.21	1.10	2.92	1.06
Professional Ethics	32	3.36	1.16	2.89	1.37
Federal, State and Local Laws Affecting Work	50	3.05	.99	2.88	1.14
Assertiveness	51	3.02	1.32	2.88	1.10
Administering Corrective and Disciplinary Actions	44	3.28	1.23	2.83	1.2
Grievance and Appeal Procedures	54	3.00	1.18	2.82	1.1
Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action	40	3.00	1.23	2.79	1.14
Career Planning and Counseling of Subordinates	34	3.07	1.05	2.79	.9
Coursework Leading to a Bachelor's Degree	26	3.19	1.47	2.76	1.3
Leadership Styles	52	3.05	1.17	2.74	1.0

Note - Only areas endorsed by at least 15% of the sample with mean training need ratings of "moderate" (3) or greater are included.

* Training need scale: 0=None; 1=Very Little; 2=Little; 3=Moderate; 4=Great; 5=Very Great **Priority scale: 1=Very Low; 2=Low; 3=Moderate; 4=High; 5=Very High Priority of Training Needs: Non-supervisory, Non-professional Employees

Training Area	% end relev	orsing ant (Nª	as •82)	tr	tent of * aining need		Relat Prior	ive ** ity
				Ř	SD	x		SD
Labor/Hanagement Relations	s	35		3.03	1.21	2.76		1.22
office Management	- 12	28		3.13	1.26	2.67		1.34
Cest Taking Techniques		44	14	3.03	.99	2.67		1.17
	1 - 1							
	•	•						
				5				
	i siy						•	
	19 B.				а "Г 14			•
				=				
	s						8.8	а. С
		a c						
		÷ .					- ×	
					·			

Note - Only areas endorsed by at least 15% of the sample with mean training need ratings of "moderate" (3) or greater are included.

* Training need scale: O=None; 1=Very Little; 2=Little; 3=Moderate; 4=Great; 5=Very Great **Priority scale: 1=Very Low; 2=Low; 3=Moderate; 4=High; 5=Very High

-95-

.Priority of Training	Needs:	First-line	Supervisors and/or	
Non-Supervisory	profes:	sionals and	administrators	

Training Area	% endorsing as relevant (N=30)	Extent o training			Relative Priority	
		x	SD	x		SD
Seminars on Pertinent Issues in Career Field	63	3.58	.40	3.95		.78
Labor/Management Relations	27	3.50 ·	.76	3.50	• 220	1.41
Team Building	50	3.27	1.16	3.47	-	1.25
Research Methods (including data gathering techniques)	53	3.25	1.24	3.44		1.41
Career Planning and Counseling of Subordinates	23	3.57	1.13	3.43	۵.	1.13
Professional Ethics	37	3.00	1.00	3.36	- 3	1.43
Organizational Development (Diagnosing Problems, Intervention Strategies, etc.)	47	3.57	1.16	3.36		1.22
Report Writing	. 67	3.20	1.11	3.30		1.26
Continuing Education (Academic Coursework in Career Field)	47	3.50	.94	3.29	•	.99
Problem Identification	47	3.50	1.02	3.29		1.14
Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action	37	3.18	1.40	3.27		1.19
Work Planning	53	3.25	1.39	3.25		1.07
Techniques of Negotiation and Persuasion	53	3.25	1.07	3.25		1.00

Note - Only areas endorsed by at least 15% of the sample with mean training need ratings of "moderate" (3) or greater are included.

* Training need scale: O=None; 1=Very Little; 2=Little; 3=Moderate; 4=Great; 5=Very Great

**Priority scale: 1-Very Low; 2-Low; 3-Moderate; 4-High; 5-Very High

Training Area	% endorsing as relevant (N≈30)	Extent traini	of # ng need	Relative ** Priority		
		x	SD	x	SD	
Developing Staffing Patterns (Organizational Charts, Identifying Staffing Needs, etc.)	33	3.20	1.32	3 .20 .	1.03	
Organizational Mission and Objectives	50	3.13	1.13	3.20	1.01	
Administering Corrective and Disciplinary Actions	33	3.10	1.29	3.20	• 1.32	
Public Speaking	37	3.36	.92	3.18	1.08	
Techniques of delegation	60	3.11	.96	3.17	.86	
Management of Stress	47	3.21	.89	3.14	1.17	
Records System (including management information systems)	47	3.36	1.28	3.14	1.35	
Techniques of Instruction	27	3.00	1.70	3.13	. 1.81	
Grievance and Appeal Procedures	27	3.00	1.07	3.13	1.13	
Personnel Rules	63	3.16	1.07	3.11	1.05	
Statistical Analysis	37	3.18	1.33	3.09	1.22	
Grant Administration	37	3.09	1.14	3.09	1.14	

. Priority of Training Needs: First-line Supervisors and/or Non-Supervisory professionals and administrators

Note - Only areas endorsed by at least 15% of the sample with mean training need ratings of "moderate" (3) or greater are included.

* Training need scale: O-None; 1-Very Little; 2-Little; 3-Moderate; 4-Great; 5-Very Great **Priority scale: 1-Very Low; 2-Low; 3-Moderate; 4-High; 5-Very High

-97-

Priority of Training Needs: First-line Supervisors and/or Non-supervisory professionals and administrators

Training Area	% endorsing as relevant (N=30)		of # ng need	Prior	ive **
		x	SD	x	SD
Group Dynamics (i.e., role theory; group development; group effectiveness, etc.)	43	3.39	.96	3.08	1.19
Estimating Resource Requirements (Resource Identifica- tion)	33	3.10	1.37	3.00 -	1.16
Formulating Personnel Policies	37	3.56	.93	3.00	.78
Work Unit Rules, Regulations, Procedures	. 43	3.00	1.16	3.00	1.00
Use of Word Processing Equipment	20	3.00	1.90	3.00	1.90
Office Management	47	3.00	1.24	3.00	1.04
Coursework Leading to an Advanced Degree (M.S., Ph.D., L.L.B., etc)	33	3.30	1.06	3.00	.94
Technical Writing	40	3.00	1.48	2.92	1.51
Test Taking Techniques	37	3.00	1.34	2.91 -	1.51
Learning Theory	27	3.00	1.60	2.88	1.64
Cost/Benefit Analysis	47	3.27	1.34	2.87	1.60
Barriers to Communication	57	3.06	1.03	2.82	1.02

Note - Only areas endorsed by at least 15% of the sample with mean training need ratings of "moderate" (3) or greater are included.

* Training need scale: O=None; 1=Very Little; 2=Little; 3=Moderate; 4=Great; 5=Very Great

**Priority scale: 1=Very Low; 2=Low; 3=Moderate; 4=High; 5=Very High

-96-

Training Area	% endorsing as relevant (N=30)	Extent of * training need	Relative ** Priority
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•	x SD	x SD
Retention and Recall of Information	33	3.10 1.29	2.80 1.32
Disciplining Employees	50	3.00 . 1.13	2.80 . 1.01
Report Presentation (oral)	47	3.00 .68	2.79 .80
Techniques of Budget Analysis	40	3.08 1.51	2.75 1.42
First Aid (including CPR)	37	3.18 1.47	2.73 1.35
Management-by-Objectives (MBO)	60	3.17 .86	2.59 1.12

Priority of Training Needs: First-line Supervisors and/or Non-supervisory professionals and administrators

Note - Only areas endorsed by at least 15% of the sample with mean training need ratings of "moderate" (3) or greater are included.

* Training need scale: 0=None; 1=Very Little; 2=Little; 3=Moderate; 4=Great; 5=Very Great **Priority scale: 1=Very Low; 2=Low; 3=Moderate; 4=High; 5=Very High

-99-

Priority of Training Needs: Mid-level Managers

Training Area	% endorsing as relevant (N=30)	Extent of training r	need	Relative Priority	
		x	SD	x	SD
Seminars on Pertinent Issues in Career Field	77	3.64	.95	3.55	1.22
leport Writing	80	3.21	1.35	3.54	1.06
Records Systems (includes management information systems)	60	3.05	1.31	3.53	1.17
Grant Administration	30	3.44	.88	3.44	.88
Organizational Development (Diagnosing Problems, Intervention Strategies, etc.)	63	3.72	1.07	3.42	.96
Budget Preparation	57	3.41	1.06	3.41 -	1.23
Team Building	77	3.05	.90	3.41	1.14
Kotivation	83	3.25	.79	3.40	1.08
Leadership Styles	83	3.40	.91	3.40	1.12
fanagement-by-Objective (MBO)	77	3.48	.79	3.39	1.16
echniques of Decision Making (Problem Solving)	80	3.35	.89	3.35	1.19
Computer Programming	40	3.17	1.53	3.33	1.44
Cost/Benefit Analysis	60	3.44	.98	3.33	1.24

Note - Only areas endorsed by at least 15% of the sample with mean training need ratings of "moderate" (3) or greater are included.

* Training need scale: 0=None; 1=Very Little; 2=Little; 3=Moderate; 4=Great; 5=Very Great

**Priority scale: 1=Very Low; 2=Low; 3=Moderate; 4=High; 5=Very High

-100-

Priority of Training Needs: Mid-level Managers

Training Area	% endorsing as relevant (N-30)		Extent of * training need		Relative Priority	**
		x	SD	x		SD
Technical Writing	57	3.25	1.34	3.31		1.25
Management of Conflict	77	3.35	1.07	3.30	• 0	1.15
Continuing Edcuation (Academic Coursework in Career Field)	60	3.11	1.37	3.28		1.27
Federal, State and Local Laws Affecting Work	67	3.05	1.03	3.26		1.33
Management of Stress	70	3.48	.93	3.24		1.14
Techniques of delegation	87	3.15	.78	3.23		.91
Work Planning (Work Flow, Organization of Work, etc.)	97	3.32	72	3.21	•	1.0
Techniques of Negotiation and Persuasion	73	3.18	1.22	3.18	4	1.10
Job Satisfaction and Morale Factors	87	3.24	.88	3.15	•	1.19
Problem Identification	70	3.05	.95	3.15	- ^{- 1}	1.14
Techniques of Instruction	47	3.07	.99	3.14	·	1.0
Speed Reading and Reading Comprehension	37	3.55	1.21	3.00	•	1.6
Disciplining Employees	77	3.17	1.19	2.96		1.1

Note - Only areas endorsed by at larst 15% of the sample with mean training need ratings of "moderate" (3) or greater are included.

* Training need scale: O=None; 1=Very Little; 2=Little; 3=Moderate; 4=Great; 5=Very Great **Priority scale: 1=Very Low; 2=Low; 3=Moderate; 4=High; 5=Very High

Priority of Training Needs: Mid-level Managers

Training Area	% endorsing as relevant (N=30)	Extent of * training need	Relative ** Priority
a distance of the second strange frequency of the second strains of		x SD	x SD
Administering Corrective and Disciplinary Actions	77	3.26 .96	2.96 1.19
Grievance and Appeal Procedures	67	3.35 1.04	2.95 1.19
Contracting Procedures	57	3.00 1.00	2.94 1.03
Zero Base Budgeting (ZZB)	50	3.27 1.16	2.93 1.16
Group Dynamics (i.e., role theory; group development; group effectiveness, etc.)	60	3.11 .96	2.89 1.37
Techniques of Budget Analysis	63	3.11 .57	2.79 .98
Labor/Management Relations	27	3.38 .92	2.75 .71
Formulating Personnel Policies	30	3.22 .67	2.67 .50
Public Speaking	73	3.00 1.20	2.59 1.01
Internal Auditing Procedures	47	3.07 .83	2.43 - 1.02
Civil Defense	- 27	3.00 1.69	2.38 1.19

Note - Only areas endorsed by at least 15% of the sample with mean training need ratings of "moderate" (3) or greater are included.

* Training need scale: O=None; 1=Very Little; 2=Little; 3=Moderate; 4=Great; 5=Very Great

**Priority scale: 1=Very Low; 2=Low; 3=Moderate; 4=High; 5=Very High

-102-

Priority of Training Needs: Employees in General

Training Area	% endorsing as relevant (N≈142)	Extent of * training need		Relative ** Priority	
· * *		x	SD	x	SD
Seminars on Pertinent Issues in Career Field	55	3.52	.93	3.60	1.08
Team Building	53	3.27	1.15	3.39	1.22
Motivation	74	3.45	1.00	3.23	. 1.11
Report Writing	58	3.28	1.12	3.30	1.15
Work Planning	58	3.23	1.22	3.28	1.08
Handling Hazardous Materials	32	3.17	1.53	3.26	1.47
Organizational Development (Diagnosing Problems, Intervention Strategies, etc.)	40	3.44	1.13	3.24	_ 1.10
Management of Stress	49	3.42	1.04	3.23	. 1.09
First Aid (including CPR)	52	3.25	1.14	3.23	1.30
Continuing Education (Academic Coursework in Career Field)	47	3.27	1.06	3.21	1.08
Techniques of Instruction	42	3.31	1.22	3.19	1.24
Research Methods (including data gathering techniques)	40	3.18	1.21	3.19	1.28
Techniques of Decision Making (Problem Solving)	61	3.15	1.13	3.18	1.13

Note - Only areas endorsed by at losst 15% of the sample with moon training need ratings of "moderate" (3) or greater are included.

* Training need scale: O=None; 1=Very Little; 2=Little; 3=Moderate; 4=Great; 5=Very Great

**Priority scale: 1-Very Low; 2-Low; 3-Moderate; 4-High; 5-Very High

-103-

Priority of Training Needs: Employees in General

Training Area	% endorsing as relevant (N=142) t:	xtent of * raining need		Relative ** Priority
		x	SD	x	SD
Job Satisfaction and Morale Factors	72	3.25	1.01	3.14	1.13
Personnel Rules	68	3.16	1.04	3.14	1.09
Defensive Driving	43	3.07	1.38	3.14	1.27
Management of Conflict	52	3.13	1.09	3.14	1.09
Records Systems (including management information systems)	. 39	3.24	1.20	3.12	1.20
Techniques of Negotistion and Persussion	47	3.21	1.19	3.11	1.10
Problem Identification	51	3.10	.1.11	3.09	• 1.17
Retention and Recall of Information	35	3.04	1.32	3.03	1.12
Group Dynamics (i.e., role theory; group development; group effectiveness, etc.)	41	3.27	.98	3.01	1.05
Professional Ethics	35	3.07	1.16	2.99	1.41
Disciplining Employees	56	3.27	1.18	2.99	. 1.09
Labor/Management Relations	31	3.20	1.08	2.98	1.26
Career Planning and Counseling of Subordinates	32	3.18	1.05	2.96	1.03

Note - Only areas endorsed by at least 15% of the sample with mean training need ratings of "moderate" (3) or greater are included.

* Training need scale: O=None; 1=Very Little; 2=Little; 3=Moderate; 4=Great; 5=Very Great **Priority scale: 1=Very Low; 2=Low; 3=Moderate; 4=High; 5=Very High

-104-

Priority of Training Needs: Employees in General

Training Area	% endorsing as relevant (N=142)	Extent of * training need	Relative ** Priority	
	·	x SD	x SD	
Techniques of delegation	59	3.05 1.01	2.96 .99	
Administering Corrective and Disciplinary Actions	44	3.23 . 1.18	2.95 1.22	
Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action	40	3.03 1.29	2.95 1.17	
Management-by-Objective (MBO)	52	3.32 .91	2.94 1.11	
Grievance and Appeal Procedures	46	3.05 1.13	2.90 1.11	
Grant Administration	20	3.06 1.16	2.89 1.23	
Learning Theory	34	3.13 1.18	2.89 1.19	
Leadership Styles	60	3.04 1.09	2.87 1.12	
Office Management	36	3.03 1.20	2.82 1.18	
Internal Auditing Procedures	24	3.00 1.27	2.82 . 1.30	
Coursework Leading to an Advanced Degree (M.S., Ph.D., L.L.B., etc.)	21	3.20 1.33	2.78 1.18	
Cost/Benefit Analysis	33	3.13 1.31	2.78 1.42	
Techniques of Budget Analysis	29	3.04 1.21	2.78 1.13	

Note - Only areas endorsed by at least 15% of the sample with mean training need ratings of "moderate" (3) or greater are included.

* Training need scale: O-None; 1=Very Little; 2=Little; 3=Moderate; 4=Great; 5=Very Great **Priority scale: 1=Very Low; 2=Low; 3=Moderate; 4=High; 5=Very High

-105-

ŗ	raining Area		% endorsing as relevant (N=142)	Extent of * training need	Relative ** Priority
· · · · · · · ·	×	÷.		x SD	x SD
formulating Personne	l Policies	· ·	31	3.21 1.13	2.75 .91
Public Speaking			39	3.05 1.18	2.73 1.23
Judget Preparation			34	3.02 1.26	2.71 1.20
				10 N	
e 		a se ^{de} a su	•		
		ensi Age			
					· ·
• •		•			-
· ·				ан ^а 1 ₁₁ с	
			22 1020		12
				and they will be	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
•				~~ s.	

Note - Only areas endorged by at least 15% of the sample with mean training need ratings of "moderate" (3) or greater are included.

* Training need scale: 0=None; 1=Very Little; 2=Little; 3=Moderate; 4=Great; 5=Very Great **Priority scale: 1=Very Low; 2=Low; 3=Moderate; 4=High; 5=Very High

-106-

TABLE B

Priority of Training Needs: Employees in General

APPENDIX C

DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSES

TO FY 1977-78 EXPENDITURES

FOR TRAINING OR EDUCATION SURVEY

EX. INDITURES FOR TRAINING AND, JR EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR STAFF IN 1977-78

Department Higher Education

Prepared By Extrapolation of data submitted by CU-Boulder, Metro State and Arapahoe Community College.

The following questions are to be answered based on actual expenditures in 1977-78. Where actual data is not available estimates are to be used and all estimates are to be marked with an asterisk(*).

- 1. In 1977-78 how much did your department spend on:
 - A. Tuition waivers, reimbursements or other payments to or for State employees for attending college or taking college courses at:

		Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
ii	 Colorado State Institutions Colorado Private Institutions Institutions in Other States 	\$86,934	1,923
	Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions Sponsored by NON-State of Colorado Agencies in:		
	. Colorado	\$11,351	82
ÎÌ	i. Other States (provide a separate listing of the training sessions held in other states and include your total cost of each and a statement on the nature of the training provided).	6,400	16
\$	Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by State of Colorado agencies.	\$26,143	548
D. (Other Training Costs (specify)		
i	• 604		
ii	·		
11			

		Dollars	# of Trainees
gr (c	rect Operational costs of Training pro- ams operated directly by your department or directly contracted for by the depart- ent).		
	For your department's employees For employees of other Colorado departments	\$49,744	2,181
TOTAL TRA	NING COSTS	\$186,572	4,751
	these costs how much was expended each of the following items?		
Pe	rsonal Services	\$ 46,244	
Or Ti	ontractual Services perating ravel apital Outlay	118,059 11,159 5,110	
៣	the training costs listed above how the was purchased from the Department Personnel?		
	ow much was financed thorough non- eneral Funds?	14,771	
ti	the dollars expended and people ained what percentage was directed imarily towards:	% of Dollars	% of Trainees
i	Skills to allow advance in job status:		
i i	Skills to allow better performance in existing job status:	80	80
111	Changes in existing processes or procedures (forms, reports, etc.) requiring retraining of employees:	20	20
iv	Personal enrichment of the indivi- dual and indirect benefit to the State:		

Department Arapahoe Community College

Prepared By Norman Lloyd

The following questions are to be answered based on actual expenditures in 1977~78. Where actual data is not available estimates are to be used and all estimates are to be marked with an asterisk(*).

1. In 1977-78 how much did your department spend on:

1

A. Tuition waivers, reimbursements or other payments to or for State employees for attending college or taking college courses at:

	Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
 i. Colorado State Institutions ii. Colorado Private Institutions iii. Institutions in Other States 	822	35
B. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by NON-State of Colorado Agencies in:		
 Colorado Other States (provide a separate listing of the training sessions held in other states and include your total cost of each and a 	245	6
statement on the nature of the training provided).	1,600/1	4
C. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by State of Colorado agencies.		
D. Other Training Costs (specify)		
i.		
ii		. <u></u>
iii		
<u>/1</u> Accounting training session - Grants & Spo Atlanta, Georgia (1 participant)	nsored Programs -	\$606
Workshop - Staff and Organizational Develo Illinois, (1 participant)	pment - Chicago,	321
NACUBO - Intermediate Accounting Workshop (2 participants)		673
-110)_	

			20
		Dollars	# of Trainees
grams	t Operational costs of Training pro- operated directly by your department lirectly contracted for by the depart-		
ii. F	or your department's employees or employees of other Colorado departments	120	15
TOTAL TRAININ	IG COSTS	\$2,787	60
	nese costs how much was expended ach of the following items?		
FTE	-		
Opera Trave		2,064 723	<u>60</u> 8
much	ne training costs listed above how was purchased from the Department ersonnel?	-0-	1
	nuch was financed thorough non- ral Funds?	137]]
trair	ne dollars expended and people ned what percentage was directed arily towards:	% of Dollars	% of Trainees
	Skills to allow advance in job status:		
	Skills to allow better performance in existing job status:	100	100
F	Changes in existing processes or procedures (forms, reports, etc.) requiring retraining of employees:		
c	Personal enrichment of the indivi- dual and indirect benefit to the State:		

Department Metropolitan State College

Prepared By Patricia A. Peck

- 1. In 1977-78 how much did your department spend on:
 - A. Tuition waivers, reimbursements or other payments to or for State employees for attending college or taking college courses at:

	Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
 Colorado State Institutions ii. Colorado Private Institutions iii. Institutions in Other States 	\$2,218	44
B. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by NON-State of Colorado Agencies in:		
 Colorado Other States (provide a separate listing of the training sessions held in other states and include your total cost of each and a statement on the nature of the training provided). 	1,032	9
C. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by State of Colorado agencies.	2,210	14
D. Other Training Costs (specify)		
i.		
111.	<u></u>	<u></u>

		Dollars	# of Trainees
gra (or	ect Operational costs of Training pro- ms operated directly by your department directly contracted for by the depart- t).		
	For your department's employees For employees of other Colorado departments		
TOTAL TRAIN	ING COSTS	\$5,460	67
	these costs how much was expended each of the following items?		,
F Con Ope Tra	sonal Services TE tractual Services rating wel ital Outlay	4,878	67
muc	the training costs listed above how h was purchased from the Department Personnel?	*	*
	much was financed thorough non- neral Funds?	782	6
tra	the dollars expended and people ined what percentage was directed marily towards:	% of Dollars	% of Trainees
i.	Skills to allow advance in job status:		
ii.	Skills to allow better performance in existing job status:	80	80
	Changes in existing processes or procedures (forms, reports, etc.) requiring retraining of employees:	20	20
iv.	Personal enrichment of the indivi- dual and indirect benefit to the State:		

*Information on courses taken through PSI is not available.

Department University of Colorado-Boulder

Prepared By Barbara Martin/Duane Hickman

The following questions are to be answered based on actual expenditures in 1977-78. Where actual data is not available estimates are to be used and all estimates are to be marked with an asterisk(*).

1. In 1977-78 how much did your department spend on:

d.

A. Tuition waivers, reimbursements or other payments to or for State employees for attending college or taking college courses at:

	Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
 i. Colorado State Institutions ii. Colorado Private Institutions iii. Institutions in Other States 	\$19,157* unknown unknown	412* unknown unknown
B. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by NON-State of Colorado Agencies in:		
 Colorado Other States (provide a separate listing of the training sessions held in other states and include your total cost of each and a statement on the nature of the training provided). 	1,630*	6*
C. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by State of Colorado agencies.	4,469*	126*
D. Other Training Costs (specify)		
i.		
ii.	an a	
iii.		

			Dollars	# of Trainees
E.	gra	ect Operational costs of Training pro- ns operated directly by your department directly contracted for by the depart- t).		
	i. ii.	For your department's employees For employees of other Colorado departments	12,584*	542*
TOTAL T	RAIN	ING COSTS	\$37,840*	1,086*
F.		these costs how much was expended each of the following items?		
	F Con Ope Tra		11,802* unknown 6,099* 782* unknown	542* 132* 463*
G.	Tui Of	ital Outlay tion Waivers the training costs listed above how h was purchased from the Department	unknown 19,157	412*
		Personnel?	2,800*	56*
Н.		much was financed thorough non- eral Funds?	2,850*	80*
١.	tra	the dollars expended and people ined what percentage was directed marily towards:	% of Dollars	% of Trainees
	i.	Skills to allow advance in job status:		
	11.	Skills to allow better performance in existing job status:		and a second
ī	ii.	Changes in existing processes or procedures (forms, reports, etc.) requiring retraining of employees:		
	iv.	Personal enrichment of the indivi- dual and indirect benefit to the State:	8 <u>-</u>	

Department Social Services

Prepared By Al Martinez

- 1. In 1977-78 how much did your department spend on:
 - A. Tuition waivers, reimbursements or other payments to or for State employees for attending college or taking college courses at:

	Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
i. Colorado State Institutionsii. Colorado Private Institutionsiii. Institutions in Other States	\$14,090	102
B. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by NON-State of Colorado Agencies in:		
 Colorado Other States (provide a separate listing of the training sessions held in other states and include your total cost of each and a 	1,238	
statement on the nature of the training provided).	9,416 (Attached)	22
C. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by State of Colorado agencies.	1,224	31
D. Other Training Costs (specify)		
i. Training Materials	4,124	and the second
Cost of Staff attendance at training ii. <u>sessions sponsored by local agencies</u>	373]
Contractual training costs for iii. State department employees	1,097	8
iv. In-State travel	9,425	

	Dollars	# of Trainees
E. Direct Operational costs of Training pro- grams operated directly by your department (or directly contracted for by the depart- ment).		
 For your department's employees ii. For employees of other Colorado departments 	\$40,987	175
TOTAL TRAINING COSTS	aya ay ah an an an a da an	
F. Of these costs how much was expended in each of the following items?		
Personal Services FTE Contractual Services Operating Travel Capital Outlay	-0- 5,000 30,000 5,987 -0-	
G. Of the training costs listed above how much was purchased from the Department of Personnel?		
H. How much was financed thorough non- General Funds?	1,500	21.
I. Of the dollars expended and people trained what percentage was directed primarily towards:	% of Dollars	% of Trainees
i. Skills to allow advance in job status:		
ii. Skills to allow better performance in existing job status:	60	100
iii. Changes in existing processes or procedures (forms, reports, etc.) requiring retraining of employees:	40	100
<pre>iv. Personal enrichment of the indivi- dual and indirect benefit to the State:</pre>		

•

Department Agriculture

Prepared By Jerry Millar/Neil Peters

- 1. In 1977-78 how much did your department spend on:
 - A. Tuition waivers, reimbursements or other payments to or for State employees for attending college or taking college courses at:

		Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
i. Colorado State ii. Colorado Priva iii. Institutions i	te Institutions	\$. 65	1
	expenses for sending training sessions tate of Colorado		
held in other your total cos	training sessions states and include t of each and a the nature of the	50	22*
	expenses for sending training sessions of Colorado agencies.	305	13
D. Other Training Cos	sts (specify)		
i	,		
ii	•		-
111.			26

			Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
Ε.	gran	ect Operational costs of Training pro- ns operated directly by your department directly contracted for by the depart- c).		
	i. ii.	For your department's employees For employees of other Colorado departments		
TOTAL T	RAINI	NG COSTS	\$420	36
F.		chese costs how much was expended each of the following items?		
		sonal Services		
	F1 Cont	TE tractual Services	185	5
		rating		
	Trav Capi	ital Outlay	235	36
G.	much	the training costs listed above how n was purchased from the Department Personnel?	205	7
Н.		much was financed thorough non- eral Funds?	56	2
١.	tra	the dollars expended and people ` ined what percentage was directed narily towards:	% of Dollars	% of Trainees
	i.	Skills to allow advance in job status:		
	ii.	Skills to allow better performance in existing job status:	100	100
ī	11.	Changes in existing processes or procedures (forms, reports, etc.) requiring retraining of employees:		
	iv.	Personal enrichment of the indivi- dual and indirect benefit to the State:		

Department Corrections

Prepared By	/ Training	Staff
-------------	------------	-------

- 1. In 1977-78 how much did your department spend on:
 - A. Tuition waivers, reimbursements or other payments to or for State employees for attending college or taking college courses at:

			Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
1	i. ii.	Colorado State Institutions Colorado Private Institutions Institutions in Other States	<u>\$ 900</u>	2
Β.	Stat spor	tion and Travel expenses for sending te employees to training sessions nsored by NON-State of Colorado ncies in:		
	i.	Colorado	2,100	5
	ii.	Other States (provide a separate listing of the training sessions held in other states and include	"Zero Based Budgeting" University	Michigan State
		your total cost of each and a statement on the nature of the training provided).	"Sex Offender Therapy" New Mexico	University of
C.	Sta	tion and Travel expenses for sending te employees to training sessions nsored by State of Colorado agencies.		
D.	Oth	er Training Costs (specify)		
	ī.			
				<u></u>
	111.			

		Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
E.	Direct Operational costs of Training pro- grams operated directly by your department (or directly contracted for by the depart- ment).		
	 For your department's employees ii. For employees of other Colorado departments 	175,000*	300
TOTAL T	TRAINING COSTS	\$178,000	
F.	Of these costs how much was expended in each of the following items?		
	Personal Services FTE Contractual Services Operating Travel Capital Outlay	<u>175,000*</u> <u>11.0</u> <u>1,000</u> 2,000	
G.	Of the training costs listed above how much was purchased from the Department of Personnel?	-0-	
Н.	How much was financed thorough non- General Funds?	-0-	
١.	Of the dollars expended and people trained what percentage was directed primarily towards:	% of Dollars	% of Trainees
	i. Skills to allow advance in job status:		
	ii. Skills to allow better performance in existing job status:	100	100
	iii. Changes in existing processes or procedures (forms, reports, etc.) requiring retraining of employees:		
	<pre>iv. Personal enrichment of the indivi- dual and indirect benefit to the State:</pre>		

Department Military Affairs

Prepared By Joe Levesque

The following questions are to be answered based on actual expenditures in 1977-78. Where actual data is not available estimates are to be used and all estimates are to be marked with an asterisk(*).

1. In 1977-78 how much did your department spend on:

6.

A. Tuition waivers, reimbursements or other payments to or for State employees for attending college or taking college courses at:

	Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
 i. Colorado State Institutions ii. Colorado Private Institutions iii. Institutions in Other States 		
B. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by NON-State of Colorado Agencies in:		
 Colorado Other States (provide a separate listing of the training sessions held in other states and include your total cost of each and a statement on the nature of the 	175]
training provided).	X	
C. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by State of Colorado agencies.	140	2
D. Other Training Costs (specify)		
i.		
ii		
iii.		

			Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
E.	gran	ect Operational costs of Training pro- ms operated directly by your department directly contracted for by the depart- t).		
	i. ii.	For your department's employees For employees of other Colorado departments		
TOTAL 1	[RAIN	ING COSTS		
F.		these costs how much was expended each of the following items?		
	F Con Ope Trav	sonal Services TE tractual Services rating vel ital Outlay	315	3
G.	muc	the training costs listed above how h was purchased from the Department Personnel?		
н.		much was financed thorough non- eral Funds?		
ſ.	tra	the dollars expended and people ined what percentage was directed marily towards:	% of Dollars	% of Trainees
	i.	Skills to allow advance in job status:		
	11.	Skills to allow better performance in existing job status:		
1	111.	Changes in existing processes or procedures (forms, reports, etc.) requiring retraining of employees:	56%	33%
	iv.	Personal enrichment of the indivi- dual and indirect benefit to the State:	44%	67%

is,

-123-

Department Health

Prepared By Don Rice

- 1. In 1977-78 how much did your department spend on:
 - A. Tuition waivers, reimbursements or other payments to or for State employees for attending college or taking college courses at:

	Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
 Colorado State Institutions Colorado Private Institutions Institutions in Other States 	<u>1,813</u> 50	<u> </u>
B. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by NON-State of Colorado Agencies in:		
i. Colorado ii. Other States (provide a separate	7,575	39
listing of the training sessions held in other states and include your total cost of each and a statement on the nature of the training provided).	12,793	29
C. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by State of Colorado agencies.	_2,378	34
D. Other Training Costs (specify)		
i. PACT Regional Health Workshops	529	11
ii. HFAC Training Session	3,380	18
III		

			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
gra (o	rect Operational costs of Training pro- ams operated directly by your department r directly contracted for by the depart- nt).	- -	
i. ii.	For your department's employees For employees of other Colorado departments	500 1,055	<u> </u>
TOTAL TRAIN	NING COSTS	\$30,073	819
	these costs how much was expended each of the following items?	×	
Col Ope Tra	rsonal Services FTE ntractual Services erating avel pital Outlay	445 1,525 28,103	55 393 371
mu	the training costs listed above how ch was purchased from the Department Personnel?	260	8
	w much was financed thorough non- neral Funds?	16,065	571
tr	the dollars expended and people ained what percentage was directed imarily towards:	% of Dollars	% of Trainees
i.	Skills to allow advance in job status:	2%	0.5%
11.	Skills to allow better performance in existing job status:	84%	97.0%
111.	Changes in existing processes or procedures (forms, reports, etc.) requiring retraining of employees:	9%	1.5%
iv.	Personal enrichment of the indivi- dual and indirect benefit to the State:	5%	1.0%

Department Regulatory Agencies-PUC

Prepared By Dalton O. Ford

- 1. In 1977-78 how much did your department spend on:
 - A. Tuition waivers, reimbursements or other payments to or for State employees for attending college or taking college courses at:

	Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
 i. Colorado State Institutions ii. Colorado Private Institutions iii. Institutions in Other States 	48	4
B. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by NON-State of Colorado Agencies in:		
 Colorado Other States (provide a separate listing of the training sessions held in other states and include your total cost of each and a statement on the nature of the training provided). 	(See sheet 4)	
C. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by State of Colorado agencies.	N/A	
D. Other Training Costs (specify)		
i. <u>N/A</u>		
ii.	and the second se	
111.		

	Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
E. Direct Operational costs of Training pro- grams operated directly by your department (or directly contracted for by the depart- ment).		
 For your department's employees For employees of other Colorado departments 	<u>N/A</u>	
TOTAL TRAINING COSTS	\$5,104	<u></u>
F. Of these costs how much was expended in each of the following items?		
Personal Services FTE Contractual Services Operating Travel Capital Outlay	2,561 1,373 1,170	
G. Of the training costs listed above how much was purchased from the Department of Personnel?	N/A	
H. How much was financed thorough non- General Funds?	N/A	
I. Of the dollars expended and people trained what percentage was directed primarily towards:	% of Dollars	% of Trainees
i. Skills to allow advance in job status:		
ii. Skills to allow better performance in existing job status:	100	100
iii. Changes in existing processes or procedures (forms, reports, etc.) requiring retraining of employees:		
iv. Personal enrichment of the indivi- dual and indirect benefit to the State:		

4

Department Natural Resources

Prepared By Jim Corlett

- 1. In 1977-78 how much did your department spend on:
 - A. Tuition waivers, reimbursements or other payments to or for State employees for attending college or taking college courses at:

	Dollars	#	of Trainees
 i. Colorado State Institutions ii. Colorado Private Institutions iii. Institutions in Other States 	-0-		
B. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by NON-State of Colorado Agencies in:			
i. Colorado	2,932		135
ii. Other States (provide a separate listing of the training sessions held in other states and include your total cost of each and a statement on the nature of the training provided).	3,040		14
C. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by State of Colorado agencies.			
D. Other Training Costs (specify)			
i.	780		47
ii		·	
111.			

	Dollars	# of Trainees
E. Direct Operational costs of Training pro- grams operated directly by your departmen (or directly contracted for by the depart ment).	t	
 i. For your department's employees ii. For employees of other Colorado departments 	1,781	19
TOTAL TRAINING COSTS	\$184,857	215
F. Of these costs how much was expended in each of the following items?		
Personal Services FTE Contractual Services Operating Travel Capital Outlay	118,226 9.25 6,159 25,156 32,646 2,670	
G. Of the training costs listed above how much was purchased from the Department of Personnel?		
H. How much was financed thorough non- General Funds?	184,857	215
I. Of the dollars expended and people trained what percentage was directed primarily towards:	% of Dollars	% of Trainees
i. Skills to allow advance in job status:		
ii. Skills to allow better performance in existing job status:		
iii. Changes in existing processes or procedures (forms, reports, etc.) requiring retraining of employees:		
iv. Personal enrichment of the indivi- dual and indirect benefit to the State:		

Department Local Affairs

Prepared By Alice A. Trognoski

- 1. In 1977-78 how much did your department spend on:
 - A. Tuition waivers, reimbursements or other payments to or for State employees for attending college or taking college courses at:

		Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
i. ii. iii.	Colorado State Institutions Colorado Private Institutions Institutions in Other States	 	
Sta spc	tion and Travel expenses for sending te employees to training sessions onsored by NON-State of Colorado encies in:		
i.		1,603	6
ii.	Other States (provide a separate listing of the training sessions Tui	tion200	3
	held in other states and include your total cost of each and a statement on the nature of the training provided).	University of Arizons-Fo University of Alabama-Ve Metro Investigators-Konk	rma-Dentistry
Sta	tion and Travel expenses for sending ate employees to training sessions onsored by State of Colorado agencies.	600	10
D. Oth	ner Training Costs (specify)		
i.			
11.	·		
111.			

		Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
E.	Direct Operational costs of Training pro- grams operated directly by your department (or directly contracted for by the depart- ment).		
	 For your department's employees For employees of other Colorado departments 	\$2,403	19
TOTAL T	RAINING COSTS		
F.	Of these costs how much was expended in each of the following items?		
	Personal Services FTE Contractual Services Operating Travel Capital Outlay	\$2,403	<u> </u>
G.	Of the training costs listed above how much was purchased from the Department of Personnel?	600	10
Н.	How much was financed thorough non- General Funds?	476	2.9
١.	Of the dollars expended and people trained what percentage was directed primarily towards:	% of Dollars	% of Trainees
	i. Skills to allow advance in job status:	2%	5%
	ii. Skills to allow better performance in existing job status:	64%	63%
1	ii. Changes in existing processes or procedures (forms, reports, etc.) requiring retraining of employees:		
	<pre>iv. Personal enrichment of the indivi- dual and indirect benefit to the State:</pre>	34%	32%

.

MEMORANDUM

Colorado Department of Education / State Office Building / Denver, Colorado 80203

TO: Stephen M. Jordan

FROM: Planning and Evaluation DB

DATE: September 19, 1978

SUBJECT: Staff Development - Footnote 26 Study

All Professional Personnel within the Department of Education are exempt from the State Personnel System. Therefore, only the Classified Personnel would be covered. The amount of State expenditure during Fy 78 for the purpose of training for this section of our employees is almost negligible and, due to its limitation, unfortunately there are no records kept for such training. As such, I am unable to provide a Financial Accounting or even an Estimate that would be beneficial to your purpose.

DCB/mj



Department Revenue

Prepared By Gary Krueger

- 1. In 1977-78 how much did your department spend on:
 - A. Tuition waivers, reimbursements or other payments to or for State employees for attending college or taking college courses at:

	Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
 i. Colorado State Institutions ii. Colorado Private Institutions iii. Institutions in Other States 	5.000	125
B. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by NON-State of Colorado Agencies in:		
 Colorado Other States (provide a separate listing of the training sessions held in other states and include your total cost of each and a statement on the nature of the training provided). 	1,773 1,732/ ¹	13 2/ ¹
C. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by State of Colorado agencies.	300	9
D. Other Training Costs (specify)		
i		
iii		<u> </u>

	Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
E. Direct Operational costs of Training pro- grams operated directly by your department (or directly contracted for by the depart- ment).		
 i. For your department's employees ii. For employees of other Colorado departments 	21,867*	1,087*
TOTAL TRAINING COSTS	\$30,672*	1,236*
F. Of these costs how much was expended in each of the following items?		
Personal Services FTE Contractual Services Operating Travel Capital Outlay	\$21,697* .9 -0- 8,158* 817 -0-	1,087*/2 -0- -0- 149/2 /2 -0-
G. Of the training costs listed above how much was purchased from the Department of Personnel?	270_	8
H. How much was financed thorough non- General Funds?	20,121*	816*
I. Of the dollars expended and people trained what percentage was directed primarily towards:	% of Dollars	% of Trainees
i. Skills to allow advance in job status:	<u> </u>	
ii. Skills to allow better performance in existing job status:	78%*	94%*
iii. Changes in existing processes or procedures (forms, reports, etc.) requiring retraining of employees:		
<pre>iv. Personal enrichment of the indivi- dual and indirect benefit to the State:</pre>	6%*	6%*
v. Administration, Planning and Evaluation of Training Program	<u> </u>	

1

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE FY 77-78 Training Costs

9/26/78

FOOTNOTES

(1 Out-of-State Training Costs, FY 77-78

a) "Forms Design Course" held in Chicago, Illinois, sponsored by The American Management Association.

Cost: (1 trainee) Tuition \$565 Travel \$281 \$846

b) "Records and Their Uses" held in Evanston, Illinois, sponsored by The Traffic Institute. Funding was provided by a Traffic Safety grant from the Division of Highway Safety. The purpose was to achieve objective #5.05 of the grant: "attend workshops and training sessions relating to federal standards applicable to driver testing and traffic safety."

Cost: (1 trainee) Tuition \$350 Travel \$536 \$886

c) Total out-of-state training cost: \$1732

(2 There is some overlap in the categories.

Department Personnel

Prepared By Jim Wood

The following questions are to be answered based on actual expenditures in 1977-78. Where actual data is not available estimates are to be used and all estimates are to be marked with an asterisk(*).

- 1. In 1977-78 how much did your department spend on:
 - A. Tuition waivers, reimbursements or other payments to or for State employees for attending college or taking college courses at:

	Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
 i. Colorado State Institutions ii. Colorado Private Institutions iii. Institutions in Other States 	<u> </u>	
B. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by NON-State of Colorado Agencies in:		
 Colorado Other States (provide a separate listing of the training sessions held in other states and include your total cost of each and a statement on the nature of the training provided). 	330	3
C. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by State of Colorado agencies.	1,844	47
D. Other Training Costs (specify)		
i. Supplies	410	-0-
ii. Organization Development Consulting	1,400	
111.		

Costs reflected in IA, B, C, and D reflect Department of Personnel costs for the training of its staff.

			Dollars	# of Trainees
E.	gran	ect Operational costs of Training pr as operated directly by your departm directly contracted for by the depa c).	ent	
		For your department's employees For employees of other Colorado departments		1,900
TOTAL	TRAIN	ING COSTS	\$88,134	
** F.		these costs how much was expended each of the following items?		
	Pers	sonal Services TE	62,545	
	Cont Oper Trav	tractual Services rating	740 23,845 830 179	
G.	much	the training costs listed above how n was purchased from the Department Personnel?	**The Department of Perso training program. Abov the General Fund and th Institute for the Depar	e costs reflect the e Public Service
Н.		much was financed thorough non- eral Funds?	<u> </u>	
1.	tra	the dollars expended and people ined what percentage was directed narily towards:	% of Dollars	% of Trainees
	i.	Skills to allow advance in job status:		
	11.	Skills to allow better performance in existing job status:	100%	100%
		Changes in existing processes or procedures (forms, reports, etc.) requiring retraining of employees:	10 2	
	iv.	Personal enrichment of the indivi- dual and indirect benefit to the State:		5
				е 2

-137-

Department Administration

Prepared By Iona Dionigi/Bill Archambault

- 1. In 1977-78 how much did your department spend on:
 - A. Tuition waivers, reimbursements or other payments to or for State employees for attending college or taking college courses at:

			Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
	i. ii. iii.	Colorado State Institutions Colorado Private Institutions Institutions in Other States	<u>425</u> -0- -0-	- <u>-</u> 0- -0-
Β.	Sta: spor	tion and Travel expenses for sending te employees to training sessions nsored by NON-State of Colorado ncies in:		
	1.	Colorado	-0-	-0-
	11.	listing of the training sessions	812*	66
	held in other states and include your total cost of each and a statement on the nature of the training provided).	National Association of A Agents. Energy Conservation skil	_	
С.		tion and Travel expenses for sending		
		te employees to training sessions nsored by State of Colorado agencies.	135	5
D.	Oth	er Training Costs (specify)		
	i.	Communications Seminar	1,500	15
	ii.			
	iii		18	

	Dollars	# of Trainees
E. Direct Operational costs of Training pro- grams operated directly by your department (or directly contracted for by the depart- ment).		
 For your department's employees ii. For employees of other Colorado departments 	240*	<u> 258 </u> -0-
TOTAL TRAINING COSTS	\$3,112*	285
F. Of these costs how much was expended in each of the following items?		
Personal Services FTE Contractual Services Operating Travel Capital Outlay	1,500 812* 800*	<u>13</u> 267 6
G. Of the training costs listed above how much was purchased from the Department of Personnel?	135	5
H. How much was financed thorough non- General Funds?	-0-	-0-
I. Of the dollars expended and people trained what percentage was directed primarily towards:	% of Dollars	% of Trainees
i. Skills to allow advance in job status:		5%
ii. Skills to allow better performance in existing job status:	93%	85%
iii. Changes in existing processes or procedures (forms, reports, etc.) requiring retraining of employees:	5%	12%
iv. Personal enrichment of the indivi- dual and indirect benefit to the State:	2%	2.5%

-1

Department Secretary of State

Prepared By Karen McClain

The following questions are to be answered based on actual expenditures in 1977-78. Where actual data is not available estimates are to be used and all estimates are to be marked with an asterisk(*).

EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR STAFF IN 1977-78

1. In 1977-78 how much did your department spend on:

En Enstructer run

A. Tuition waivers, reimbursements or other payments to or for State employees for attending college or taking college courses at:

			Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
	11.	Colorado State Institutions Colorado Private Institutions Institutions in Other States	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Β.	Sta spo	tion and Travel expenses for sending te employees to training sessions nsored by NON-State of Colorado ncies in:		
		Colorado Other States (provide a separate listing of the training sessions held in other states and include your total cost of each and a statement on the nature of the training provided).	240 National Association o trators training sessi Orleans, Louisiana 376	
C.	Sta	tion and Travel expenses for sending te employees to training sessions nsored by State of Colorado agencies.	20	2
D.	0th	er Training Costs (specify)		
	ī.		-	
	ii.	•	57) 	
	İII		and the part of the state of th	

			Dollars	# of Trainees
E.	gran	ect Operational costs of Training pro- ns operated directly by your department directly contracted for by the depart- t).		
		For your department's employees For employees of other Colorado departments	-0	-0-
TOTAL -	TRAIN	ING COSTS	\$1,030	88
* F.		these costs how much was expended each of the following items?		
	F	sonal Services FE tractual Services	689	8
	Contractual Services Operating Travel Capital Outlay		341	
G.	mucl	the training costs listed above how n was purchased from the Department Personnel?	20	2
Н.		much was financed thorough non-	-0-	-0-
١.	tra	the dollars expended and people ined what percentage was directed marily towards:	% of Dollars	% of Trainees
	i.	Skills to allow advance in job status:	59%	38%
	ii.	Skills to allow better performance in existing job status:	41%	75%
		Changes in existing processes or procedures (forms, reports, etc.) requiring retraining of employees:	-0-	-0-
	iv.	Personal enrichment of the indivi- dual and indirect benefit to the State:	-0-	-0-

LAN LINE FOR TO TOTAL TRUTTING AND ON

EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR STAFF IN 1977-78

Department Labor and Employment

Prepared By Gary Pon

The following questions are to be answered based on actual expenditures in 1977-78. Where actual data is not available estimates are to be used and all estimates are to be marked with an asterisk(*).

- 1. In 1977-78 how much did your department spend on:
 - A. Tuition waivers, reimbursements or other payments to or for State employees for attending college or taking college courses at:

	Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
 Colorado State Institutions Colorado Private Institutions Institutions in Other States 	50	2
B. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by NON-State of Colorado Agencies in:	197	
i. Colorado	13]
ii. Other States (provide a separate listing of the training sessions held in other states and include your total cost of each and a statement on the nature of the training provided).	742 <u>/1</u> 463 <u>/2</u>	1
C. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending		
State employees to training sessions sponsored by State of Colorado agencies.	195	5
D. Other Training Costs (specify)		
i. N/A		
	•	-
		10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 -
iii	P222 ¹¹ 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2	

<u>/1</u> Workmen's Compensation Administration - California: In-depth training on how to administer a state level workmen's compensation program.

<u>/2</u> Oil Inspection - New Mexico: Weights & Measures Seminar; metering technology and codes utilization.

				Dollars	# of Trainees
E.	gran	ect Operational costs of Training pro- ns operated directly by your department directly contracted for by the depart- .).			
	i. ii.	For your department's employees For employees of other Colorado departments		3,204	54
TOTAL T	RAIN	NG COSTS		\$4,657	68
F.		chese costs how much was expended each of the following items?			n de _{an} n
	FT	sonal Services E ractual Services		268	8
	Oper Trav	ating	5	4,399	60
G.	much	the training costs listed above how was purchased from the Department Personnel?		195	5
Н.		much was financed thorough non- eral Funds?		1,303	25
1.	trai	the dollars expended and people ined what percentage was directed marily towards:	-2	of Dollars	% of Trainees
	i.	Skills to allow advance in job status:		5%	8%
	ii.	Skills to allow better performance in existing job status:		75%	45%
ī	11.	Changes in existing processes or procedures (forms, reports, etc.) requiring retraining of employees:		15%	45%
	i∨.	Personal enrichment of the indivi- dual and indirect benefit to the State:		5%	2%

CALCULATIONED FOR FIRITING AND ON

EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR STAFF IN 1977-78

Department Institutions

Prepared By Tim Smith

- 1. In 1977-78 how much did your department spend on:
 - A. Tuition waivers, reimbursements or other payments to or for State employees for attending college or taking college courses at:

	Dollars	<pre># of Trainees</pre>
i. Colorado State Institutions ii. Colorado Private Institutions iii. Institutions in Other States	1,175	2
B. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by NON-State of Colorado Agencies in:		
 Colorado Other States (provide a separate listing of the training sessions held in other states and include your total cost of each and a statement on the nature of the 	20,985	5
training provided). C. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by State of Colorado agencies.	8,124	282
D. Other Training Costs (specify)		
i.		
111.		<u>.</u>

			Dollars	# of Trainees
grams	Operational costs of Training pro- operated directly by your department irectly contracted for by the depart-			
ii. Fo	or your department's employees or employees of other Colorado epartments		<u>592,583</u> 703	<u>16,616</u> 27
TOTAL TRAINING	G COSTS	\$	624,587	17,214
	ese costs how much was expended ch of the following items?			· · · · · · · · · · · · ·
FTE Contra Operat Trave	-		459,256 112,802 29,786 18,790 3,953	
much v	e training costs listed above how was purchased from the Department rsonnel?		<u></u>	
	uch was financed thorough non- al Funds?		255,346	
traine	e dollars expended and people ed what percentage was directed rily towards:	<u>*</u> c	of Dollars	% of Trainees
	kills to allow advance in job tatus:			<u></u>
	kills to allow better performance n existing job status:			
p	hanges in existing processes or rocedures (forms, reports, etc.) equiring retraining of employees:			
d	ersonal enrichment of the indivi- ual and indirect benefit to the tate:	_		

APPENDIX D

SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

APPENDIX D-1

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- 1. What group of employees needs training the most (ask for specifics)?
 - a. Clerical

15

- b. Labor, Trade, Maintenance
- c. Professional
- d. Supervisory
- 2. What area needs training the most (ask for specifics)?
 - a. General Job Skills
 - b. Specific Job Skills
 - c. Career Development
- 3. Approximately what percentage of your department's budget is dedicated to training now?
- 4. What is the relative overall priority of training in your department?
- 5. Do you currently use centralized training (e.g., PSI)?
- 6. What is your opinion of providing a centralized training facility for the more generic training needs of your department?
- 7. Would you be willing to use some of your Departments training dollars to help fund such a facility?
- 8. Commitment:
 - a. Would you be willing to authorize work time for training?
 - b. Are there other programs that might be reduced to increase training funds (specify)?
- 9. What changes would you make if training funds for your department rose 5%?
 - a. Rose 10%?
 - b. Decreased 5%?
 - c. Decreased 10%?

APPENDIX D-2

TRAINING NEEDS SURVEY

IMPORTANT NOTE: DO NOT ATTEMPT TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE WITHOUT FIRST READING THE INSTRUCTIONS!!!

Questionnaires are being administered to three separate groups:

- First-level Supervisors Includes Supervisory positions below pay grade 63.
- Mid-level Managers Includes Administrative and Supervisory positions from pay grade 63 up to and including pay grade 75. Positions supervise other positions at or above pay grade 45.
- 3. Upper-level Managers Includes Administrative and Supervisory positions above pay grade 75. Positions supervise Mid-level Managers.

According to our records your job falls within the category of <u>First-level Supervisor</u>. If this is correct, please continue. If not, <u>immediately</u> call Mr. John Olson, State Department of Personnel, 1313 Sherman Street, Denver, CO., 839-2478.

As a First-level Supervisor, we are interested in your perception of the training needs of your employees. When completing this questionnaire, consider <u>all</u> of the employees you supervise directly (i.e., those for whom you make assignments, complete performance reviews, and approve leave).

The term TRAINING, unless otherwise specified, refers to any organized activity designed to improve an employee's job performance, prepare an employee for advancement in the organization, and/or increase an employee's ability to adapt to his or her work environment. Training, in this sense, includes specific job skills training, general job skill training, and career development. Training, in this sense, may include inhouse courses, formal academic training, seminars, formalized on-the-job training programs, etc.

Background Information

The following general items are essential to our analysis of training needs data. Please read each statement carefully and record your answer in the box to the right of the statement.

- 1. None
- 2. One
- 3. Two
- 4. Three or more

If you speak two foreign languages, you would put a "3" in the box as indicated.

Please note that the small numbers to the right of the response boxes are for data processing purposes only.

1. Male

2. Female

4. What is the highest level of education you have attained? . . /_/ 10

1. 11th grade or less

2. Graduated from high school or received G.E.D.

3. 1 to 4 years college

4. Bachelor's degree

5. Some graduate work

6. Graduate degree (M. A., Ph. D., L.L.B., etc.)

5. How many subordinates* do you have? Indicate total in box . . / 11-12

13

14

15

6. On the average, how much time per subordinate is spent in

training in a one year period?

- 1. Less than one week
- 2. One to two weeks
- 3. Two to three weeks
- 4. Three to four weeks
- 5. Four weeks or more
- 7. On the average, how much time per subordinate do you think should be spent in training per year?
 - 1. Less than one week
 - 2. One to two weeks
 - 3. Two to three weeks
 - 4. Three to four weeks
 - 5. Four weeks or more
- 8. Of the money (including personal services, operating, travel, and capital outlay) allocated to your work unit, division or organization, how much is currently spent on training? . . .
 - 1. Less than 0.5%
 - 2. 0.5% up to 1%
 - 3. 1% up to 3%
 - 4. 3% up to 6%
 - 5. 6% or more
 - *Reminder: <u>Subordinates</u> throughout the questionnaire refers to all employees you supervise directly (i.e., for whom you make assignments, complete performance reviews, approve leave).

9. HOW MUCH OI LINE MONEY ALLOCATES -- J ---

or organization should be spent on training?

- 1. Less than 0.5%
- 2. 0.5% up to 1%
- 3. 1% up to 3%
- 4. 3% up to 6%
- 5. 6% or more

> Specific Job Skills -- training in highly specific areas, unique to the job your subordinates perform, which permit the employee to perform at a satisfactory level. (For example, computer languages for a Computer Programmer; use of accounting machines for an Accounting Technician; job counseling for handicapped workers for a Rehabilitation Counselor, etc.).

116

- 2. General Job Skills -- training in general areas appropriate to a variety of jobs and designed to improve overall performance (e.g., effective report writing, speed reading, supervisory and/or management training, etc.).
- 3. Career Development -- training designed to allow employees to increase their career skills and knowledges for purposes of advancement or general job enrichment (e.g., seminar on professional ethics for Psychologists; coursework leading to a Bachelor's degree in Criminology for a Correctional Officer; conventions, etc.).

-152-

11. Below are some factors which may influence the training needs of year

subordinates. Using the five point scale described, indicate the extent to which each factor has created training needs over the past fiscal year (FY 77-78). Record your response in the box to the right of the statement.

	5 = To a very large extent; 4 = To a large extent;
	3 = To some extent;
	2 = To a little extent; 1 = To a very little or no extent.
a)	Technological change (e.g., introduction of a new piece
	of equipment; improvement in computer systems, etc.)
)	Legal requirements (e.g., legislation or court rulings
	which modify the method in which candidates may be tested
	for employment; new OSHA requirements, etc.)
c)	Social attitudes (e.g., expectation of society that govern-
	ment be responsible for regulating a given practice
d)	Economic situation (e.g., a tax cut which reduces the work
	force, making it necessary to get increased productivity
	from the resources available)
e)	Promotion (e.g., a worker is promoted to a supervisory posi-
	tion who has had no supervisory training)
f)	Selection Procedures (e.g., employment tests are too easy,
	permitting marginally and/or unqualified employees to be
	placed on eligible lists)

-153-

of training. Based on observations of your subordinates, please rate each factor using the scale below. Record your response in the box to the right of the factor.

- 5 = Completely adequate;4 = Generally adequate;3 = Marginal;2 = Generally inadequate;
- 6 = Completely inadequate; 0 = Insufficient information to rate.

In some cases, you may not have been able to observe how a particular factor has affected your subordinates training. When this occurs, place a "0" in the box. Please use this response only when absolutely necessary.

a)	Amount of training available to my subordinates	24
b)	Quality of instructors in training classes attended	
	by my subordinates	7 25
c)	Commitment by top management in seeing that my	
	subordinates receive necessary training	26
d)	Amount of money alloted to training my subordinates	// 27
e)	Identification of the training needs of my subor-	
	dinates	28
f)	Interest expressed by my subordinates in receiving	
	training	7 29
g)	Location of training facilities	

-154-

. TA ARUP OURS

dinates' work performance?

- 1. To a very little extent
- 2. To a little extent
- 3. To some extent
- 4. To a great extent
- 5. To a very great extent
- 14. Is participation in training by your subordinates a factor

31

33

34

35

- in your appraisal of their performance?
 - 1. Yes
 - 2. No
- 15. At what time do you feel job skill training (see item 10 for definition of skill training) should typically be given? . . .
 - 1. During regular working hours
 - 2. After work, weekdays
 - 3. Weekends (during non-working hours)
- - - 1. During regular work hours
 - 2. After work, week days
 - 3. Weekends (during non-working hours)
- 17. Would you typically be willing to grant your subordinates time

off work (paid) to attend relevant job skill training (i.e.,

training in knowledge or skill areas directly related to job

performance)?. . .

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

Below are some conditions which may affect your subordinates willingness to attend training courses or programs. Based on your opinion, indicate whether or not your subordinates would attend training, given the condition specified.

Select one of the following three responses which best reflects your opinion. Record the number in the box to the right of the statement.

 $\sqrt{1}$ = Probably would be willing $\sqrt{2}$ = Uncertain $\sqrt{3}$ = Probably would NOT be willing

EXAMPLE:	Drive 50 miles at own expense to receive career development	
	training which is paid for by your department	/1/
	If, in your opinion, your subordinates would probably be willing to make the drive indicated in the state- ment, given the qualifications, you would mark a "1", as shown.	

19. Attend tob skill training (general and specific) after work

	uccourd les putte craturue (Seucrar aue phoetrie) argen wardt	
	weekdays	37
20.	Attend job skill training (general and specific) on weekends	
	(during non-working hours)	38
21.	Attend career development training after work, weekdays	39
22.	Attend career development training on weekends (during non-	
	working hours)	40
23.	Attend job skill training at their own expense	ft.

25.	Attend job skill training where part is at their own expense	/_/ 43
26.	Attend career development training where part is at their own	÷
	expense	<u> </u>
27.	How would you describe your organization in terms of availability	
	of training?	45

- Training is readily available (e.g., universities or colleges are nearby, in-house training regularly offered, etc.)
- 2. Some training is available (e.g., on-the-job training available, but some limitations in terms of formal classroom training, seminars, etc.)
- 3. Training is generally unavailable (e.g., employees must travel long distances to receive training; few, if any, training programs offered in organization or nearby).
- 28. How often have your employees received training from the Department of Personnel (Public Service Institute)?
 - Frequently whenever an appropriate course is available and there is sufficient need.
 - Occasionally subordinates typically attend agency sponsored courses; although one or more have attended at least one PSI course.
 - 3. Infrequently or never.

-157-

29. If you answered <u>occasionally</u> (2) or <u>infrequently or never</u> (3) to item 28, which reason <u>best</u> explains why your subordinates do not use the Public Service Institute (PSI) more frequently . . . /

1 47

- 0. I answered "1" (frequently).
- 1. I am not aware of the courses offered by PSI.
- The courses offered do not meet the training needs of my subordinates.
- Training offered by my agency makes that offered by PSI unnecessary.
- The cost of PSI courses exceeds my training budget.
- 5. I have generally been dissatisfied with the training provided by PSI.
- The location of courses offered by PSI has prevented use by my employees.

IMPORTANT NOTE: PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING INSTRUCTIONS CAREFULLY!

Part II is a list of areas in which your subordinates may have a need for training. These areas are organized under broad categories (e.g., "Safety Training") to aid in the rating process discussed below. While some categories such as "Clerical Skills" may at first appear inappropriate, it is important that you read through the entire list to insure no oversights are made. In addition, note that Management Training has been separated into three categories: (A) "Fiscal Management," (B) "Personnel Management," and (C) "Supervisory Skills." Other aspects of management training are included under some of the other general categories such as "Human Relations" and "Communications".

We realize the list of Training Areas may not be totally exhaustive. An additional category, therefore, has been added at the end of the inventory, labeled "Other Areas". Please add any additional training areas where a need exists for your subordinates. Rate these areas in the same manner as that described in Steps 1, 2 and 3 below.

STEP 1: Relevancy of Training Area

A training area is relevant if it can be shown to bear a meaningful relationship to an assignment held by one or more of your subordinates. It is important that all relevant training areas are identified, regardless of the adequacy of current training efforts or the competency of your employees in that area.

To indicate a relevant area, place a " $\sqrt{10}$ " in the box to the right of the statement. If an area is irrelevant, make no marks, and skip steps 2, 3, and 4.

STEP 2: Extent of Training Need

A training need exists when there is a discrepancy between the level of knowledge, skill, ability or personal characteristics <u>currently possessed</u> by your subordinates in some area and the level necessary to meet program objectives and the mission of the organization (i.e., effective performance). Generally, the greater the discrepancy, the greater the training need.

To rate <u>Extent of Training Need</u>, carefully consider the work of your subordinates and any discrepancies between the actual level of knowledge, skill, ability, or personal characteristic and the desired level. Place a "5" (to a very great extent) in the second box to the right of the statement if there is a major discrepancy, a "3" if moderate, and so on. A "0" should be recorded if there is no perceived discrepancy.

STEP 3: Relative Priority of Training

This rating is aimed at determining where future training efforts should be directed. In making this rating, consider the priority this particular area has relative to all other areas. Factors which may influence this rating include the number of your subordinates which could benefit from such training, the contribution training could be expected to have in terms of improving performance, and the adequacy of current training efforts. This rating represents a complex judgment and probably involves more than one factor. It is important that an attempt be made to use all points on the scale, so that some ranking of priorities in the State system may be developed (i.e.,

do not rate everything "5" or "4").

After determining the relative priority of the area to overall training efforts, record the number of the response which best identifies the priority in the third box to the right of the statement.

-160-

EXAMPLE:

You supervise four clerical employees. Such employees must understand work unit rules, regulations, and procedures to perform effectively. One of your subordinates is experiencing serious difficulty in this area, which is affecting the overall productivity of the unit. Since knowledge of work unit rules, regulations and procedures is relevant to your subordinates work a ", " should be made in the first box to the right of the statement (Step 1 - Relevance). Since a major discrepancy appears to exist between the actual performance of one of your subordinates and the desired level, it is likely a need for training is very great; hence you would record a "5" in the second box to the right of the statement (Step 2 - Extent of Training Need). The Relative Priority of Training, however, may be only moderate, given the need for other training in which all your subordinates exhibit deficiencies. Therefore, a "3" would be recorded in the third box to the right of the statement (Step 3 - Relative Priority). The above ratings would be recorded on the questionnaire as follows:

		Extent of Training Need	Relative Priority
Training Area	If Relevant	0. None 1. Very Little 2. Little 3. Moderate 4. Great 5. Very Great	 Very Low Low Moderate High Very High
 Work Unit Rules, Regula- tions and Procedures	V	5	3

				Extent of Training Need	Relative Priority
n A	2	Training Área	If Relevant	O. None 1. Very Little 2. Little 3. Moderate 4. Great 5. Very Great	 Very Low Low Moderate High Very High
	Α.	Fiscal Management			
		1. Techniques of Budget Analysis			
		2. Budget Preparation			
		3. Cost/Benefit Analysis		·	
		4. Management-by-Objectives (MBO)			
		5. Zero Base Budgeting (ZBB)			
÷		6. Program Planning & Budget System (PPBS)			1
		7. Contracting Procedures			
		8. Grant Administration			
		9. Procurement			
		10. Inventory Control			
		11. Estimating Resource Requirements (Resource Identification)			
		12. Cost Accounting		·	
		13. Accounting Systems (including State system)			
		14. Internal Auditing Procedures			
		15. <u>Records Systems (includes management</u> information systems)			

	· · · · · ·	Extent of Training Need	Relative Priority	
Training Area	If Relevant	0. None 1. Very Little 2. Little 3. Moderate 4. Great 5. Very Great	 Very Low Low Moderate High Very High 	L
B. <u>Personnel Management</u>				
1. Administering Corrective and Disciplinary Actions		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		1
2. Salary Administration		/		2
3. Job Classification				2
4. Employee Selection	· · · ·			
5. Grievance and Appeal Procedures				+
6. Pre-retirement Counseling				+
7. Labor/Management Relations				-
8. Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action				ť
9. Career Planning and Counseling of Subordinates			1	+
10. Organizational Development (Diagnosing Prob- lems, Intervention Strategies, etc.)				
 Developing Staffing Patterns (Organizational Charts, Identifying Staffing Needs, etc.) 		·		
12. Selection Interviewing				_
13. Exit Interviewing				\downarrow
14. Leave Procedures, Rules, and Regulations)	4
15. Formulating Personnel Policies				

-163-

	1			Extent of Training Need	Relative Priority
•	2	Training Area	If Relevant	0. None 1. Very Little 2. Little 3. Moderate 4. Great 5. Very Great	 Very Low Low Moderate High Very High
c.	Sup	ervisory Skills	*	- ga diğ ar ga	
	1.	Techniques of delegation			
2 2	2.	Work Planning (Work Flow, Organization of Work, etc.)			
	3.	Leadership Styles			
	4.	Learning Theory			
	. 5.	Techniques of Instruction			
	6.	Team Building			
	7.	Disciplining Employees			
					_
D.	Hum	an Relations			
	1.	Motivation			
	2.	Management of Conflict			
	3.	Group Dynamics (i.e., role theory; group development; group effectiveness, etc.)			
	4.	Management of Stress			~
	5.	Job Satisfaction and Morale Factors			
	6.	Assertiveness			. 🔪

•

		Extent of Training Need	Relative Priority
	If	0. None 1. Very Little 2. Little 3. Moderate 4. Great	1. Very Low 2. Low 3. Moderate 4. High
Training Area	Relevant	5. Very Great	5. Very High
. <u>Human Relations</u> (Cont'd)		501 au 50. 50	
7. Racial Awareness			
8. Sex Role Awareness			
. Communications		20 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40	
1. Barriers to Communication			
2. Non-verbal Communication			
3. Phone Use			
4. Report Writing			
5. Public Speaking		-	
6. Report Presentation (oral)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
7. Transactional Analysis		1	
8. Preparation of Business Correspondence			
9. Effective Listening		4	, - ¹ - 1 - 2 ²
10. Techniques of Negotiation and Persuasion			
11. Technical Writing			
12. Communication Structures			

- 65-

к ...

	Training Área	If Relevant	Extent of Training Need O. None 1. Very Little 2. Little 3. Moderate 4. Great 5. Very Great	Relative Priority 1. Very Low 2. Low 3. Moderate 4. High 5. Very High
F.	Safety			
	1. Safety Rules and Regulations (OSHA, etc.)			
	2. First Aid (including CPR)			
	3. Civil Defense			
	4. Environmental Safety (Procedures for operating equipment safely)			
	5. Fire Protection			
	6. Security Procedures			
	7. Handling Hazardous Materials			
	8. Defensive Driving		21	
				1
G.	Job Orientation		5 C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	
	1. Organization of State Government			
	2. Work Unit Rules, Regulations, Procedures			
	3. Organizational Mission and Objectives			
	4. Personnel Rules			
	5. Fringe Benefits			

-166-

•

		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		Extent of Training Need O. None	Relative Priority	*
ŝ		Training Area	If Relevant	1. Very Little 2. Little 3. Moderate 4. Great 5. Very Great	 Very Low Low Moderate High Very High 	
Ι.	Job	Skills (general)	40 40 40 H			
	1.	Basic Arithmetic				40-12
	2.	Computer Programming	I	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		43-
	3.	Computer Use				46-4
	4.	Research Methods (including data gathering techniques)				49-5
	5.	Statistical Analysis				52-5
	6.	Techniques of Decision Making (Problem solving)				55-5
	7.	Work Planning				58-6
	8.	Speed Reading and Reading Comprehension				61-6
	9.	Problem Identification				64-6
1	10.	General Accounting Theory			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	67-6
]	11.	Federal, State and Local Laws Affecting Work				70-7
]	12.	Legal, Medical, or Scientific Terminology				73-7
1	13.	Use of Audio Visual Equipment				4-6
		Calculator Use				7-9

-167-

		Extent of Training Need	Relative Priority
Training Area	If Relevant	0. None 1. Very Little 2. Little 3. Moderate 4. Great 5. Very Great	1. Very Low 2. Low 3. Moderate 4. High 5. Very High
<u>Clerical Skills</u>			
1. Typing		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
2. Filing			
3. Stenography		•	
4. Grammar		a.	
5. Punctuation			
6. Filing Systems		•	
7. Vocabulary			
8. Use of Office Equipment			
9. Use of Word Processing Equipment		· · · · · · · · · · · ·	
10. Retention and Recall of Information			
11. Office Management			

Training Area	If Relevant	Extent of Training Need O. None 1. Very Little 2. Little 3. Moderate 4. Great 5. Very Great	Relative Priority 1. Very Low 2. Low 3. Moderate 4. High 5. Very High	· · J.
J. Career Development	an an an			
1. Coursework Leading to G.E.D. (High School Diploma)				43-45
2. Coursework Leading to an Associate of Arts Degree				46-48
3. Coursework Leading to a Bachelor's Degree				49-51
 Coursework Leading to an Advanced Degree (M.S., Ph.D., L.L.B., etc) 				52-51
5. Continuing Education (Academic Coursework in Career Field)				55-57
6. Seminars on Pertinent Issues in Career Field			· - · · · · · ·	58-60
7. Professional Ethics				61-63
8. Mobility Assignments (Limited Assignment to Other Jobs)				64-6(
9. Resume and Job Application Methods				67 -6!
10. Test Taking Techniques				70-7:

-169

Training Area	If Relevant	Extent of Training Need O. None 1. Very Little 2. Little 3. Moderate 4. Great 5. Very Great	Relative Priority 1. Very Low 2. Low 3. Moderate 4. High 5. Very High
K. Other Areas (include specific job skill areas and additions to previous sections).	an (6 co co		an an an an
· · · ·			
		~~~~~	

e.

That's all! Thanks for your help. Please place the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope and return to:

11

Mr. John Olson Personnel Research Unit State Department of Personnel 1313 Sherman Street Denver, Colorado 80203 Three forms were developed, each containing the same items. The only modification was in terms of the rating instructions, where supervisors in Stratum I (First-line Supervisors) were advised to rate all of their subordinates, supervisors in Stratum II (Mid-Level Managers) were asked to rate non-supervisory professionals and administrators and firstline supervisors at or above pay grade 45, and Stratum III (Upper-level Managers) were requested to rate mid-level managers at or above pay grade 63. Only Form A, given to Stratum I supervisors, is included.

# APPENDIX D-3

# EXPENDITURES FOR TRAINING OR

# EDUCATION PROGRAMS SURVEY



OFFICE OF STATE PLANNING AND BUDGETING 102 State Capitol Building

> Denver, Colorado 80203 (303) 839-3386

September 11, 1978

Budgeting 839-3317

Planning 839-3386

State Buildings 839-2626 617 State Services Bldg. 1525 Sherman Street

Richard D. Lamm Governor David L. Foote Executive Director

## MEMORANDUM

- TO: Departmental Budget Officers FROM: Stephen M. Jordan
- Principal Policy/Budget Analyst Staff Development Study Team

SUBJECT: Staff Development - Footnote 26 Study

The Governor has established as a high priority the improvement of training and education programs for staff development of State employees. In keeping with this priority the Joint Budget Committee has asked the Departments of Personnel, State Planning and Budgeting and Higher Education to jointly conduct an assessment of training needs of State employees and the resources currently being used to meet these needs. A report is to be provided to the JBC by December 1, 1978.

You are being asked to complete the attached fiscal questionnaire on training and staff development for your department. The questions are to be answered based upon actual expenditures in 1977-78. Where actual data is not available, estimates are to be used and all estimates are to be marked with an asterisk. In some cases, the actual dollars spent may be available but the number of trainees affected will be an estimate. Be sure to distinguish between the actual and the estimate figures. You may wish to request the various agencies or institutions within your department to assist in filling out the questions and then prepare a consolidated report for your department.

Training for purposes of this report shall be limited to training and/or education of staff positions covered by the State Personnel system. It shall be limited to training paid for directly by the State. If employees on their own time and at their own expense are involved in training and/or education, such costs should not be included. Expenses related to conferences, meetings, etc., which may involve some training but whose primary purpose was not training, should not be included.

Please return your answers to me by no later than September 19. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at 839-3317.

SMJ:mt

Attachment

EXILNDITURES FOR TRAINING AND FOR EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR STAFF IN 1977-78

Department

Prepared	BV		

The following questions are to be answered based on actual expenditures in 1977-78. Where actual data is not available estimates are to be used and all estimates are to be marked with an asterisk(*).

- 1. In 1977-78 how much did your department spend on:
  - A. Tuition waivers, reimbursements or other payments to or for State employees for attending college or taking college courses at:

	Dollars	# of Trainees
i. Colorado State Institutions ii. Colorado Private Institutions iii. Institutions in Other States		
B. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by NON-State of Colorado Agencies in:		
<ul> <li>Colorado</li> <li>Other States (provide a separate listing of the training sessions held in other states and include your total cost of each and a statement on the nature of the training provided).</li> </ul>	gan generalisen in en see generalisen generalisen generalisen generalisen generalisen generalisen generalisen g	
C. Tuition and Travel expenses for sending State employees to training sessions sponsored by State of Colorado agencies.		
D. Other Training Costs (specify)		
i.	- -	
ii.	0-1-2	
iii.		
RECEIVED		<ul> <li>An and a state of the state of</li></ul>

		2271222	Dollars	# of Trainees
Ë.	gran	ect Operational costs of Training pro- as operated directly by your department directly contracted for by the depart- c).		
		For your department's employees For employees of other Colorado departments		
TOTAL T	RAIN	NG COSTS		
F.		these costs how much was expended each of the following items?	in si in the addition	
	Pers	sonal Services		
	Cont Oper Trav	ractual Services		
G.	mucł	the training costs listed above how n was purchased from the Department Personnel?		
Н.		much was financed thorough non- eral Funds?		
Ι.	tra	the dollars expended and people ined what percentage was directed narily towards:	% of Dollars	% of Trainees
	i.	Skills to allow advance in job status:		
	ii.	Skills to allow better performance in existing job status:		
	iii.	Changes in existing processes or procedures (forms, reports, etc.) requiring retraining of employees:		1
	iv.	Personal enrichment of the indivi- dual and indirect benefit to the State:		· · · ·
			RECEI	VED

JUN 0 5 1995 STATE PUBLICATIONS Colorado State Library