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Utah
The Perils of Pioneering
R. Thayne Robson
University of Utah

Utah’s experiences served as a model in the design of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. Today, however, the state is a backwater in the CETA mainstream. Perhaps that fate is a penalty of pioneering. Utah established a statewide manpower planning council in 1969 by gubernatorial initiative and legislative act. From then until 1972, Utah was a manpower mecca beckoning visitors from around the country. In 1972, the same governor who initiated centralized manpower planning chose to decentralize it among nine multicounty associations of government. That pattern persisted into 1981 with Utah listed with the Labor Department as a single statewide consortium which consists in actuality of nine relatively autonomous planning and operating units. At the close of 1980, when two of the larger counties indicated they were withdrawing from the statewide consortium to become prime sponsors, the director of the Utah CETA consortium advised and the subsequent governor agreed to disband the consortium. Utah’s innovative period actually ended before CETA became law. For CETA as a whole, the state offers little to write about. But there are useful lessons for a study of training.

The Utah Setting

Utah, relatively large in territory and small in population, is surprisingly urbanized. Approximately 80 percent of its nearly 1.5 million people live in what is essentially one metropolitan area 15 miles wide and 80 miles long. As Ogden, Salt Lake City, and Provo and their overlapping
suburbs are plastered onto the lower slopes of the Wasatch Mountains (the westernmost range of the Rockies), the metropolitan area is informally known as the Wasatch Front.

Demographically, Utah's major claims to distinction are the nation's highest birthrate (30 per 1,000 or about double the national average) and one of the lowest minority percentages (7 percent divided among Hispanics, blacks, Native Americans, and Asians in that order). The state has the nation's highest median years of school (12.8) and the second largest proportion of college graduates (17.5 percent). In addition, 37 percent of Utah's population is under age 18, compared with a national figure of 29 percent.

Without an industrial base, Utah was hard hit by the depression of the 1930s. The Second World War brought a defense-based prosperity but a postwar vulnerability which kept Utah's unemployment rates well above national levels until the 1960s. Then a gradual growth of diversified manufacturing, followed by resurgence of its mineral wealth (coal, uranium, oil, oil shale, and tar sands, in addition to the longer exploited copper and allied metals), reversed that relationship so that Utah's unemployment rate is now about 2 percentage points below the national level. The State Office of Labor and Training estimated CETA eligibility to be 52,000 during 1979, of whom 41,000 had been unemployed 15 weeks or more. Nearly 8,000 persons were registered for Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).

Politically, Utah shows the general conservatism of the mountain west. Its entire congressional delegation (two congressmen and two senators) all classify themselves as conservative Republicans. Yet the state is just beginning its fifth 4-year term of being led by two conservative moderate Democratic governors. With brief exceptions, the legislature has been Republican since the end of the Roosevelt era. While the rhetoric in Utah is persistently anti-federal, every
available federal dollar is aggressively pursued and federally funded programs are generally well-administered, in part because of an oversupply of well-trained administrators.

**Utah as a CETA Pioneer**

Utah’s pioneer position in CETA was part of a drive by its 1965-76 Governor, Calvin Rampton, to strengthen the Governor's office by consolidating state activities. During his first 4-year term, he had learned that the governor was largely a figurehead with power vested in the relatively autonomous merit system-protected department heads. Many of these departments operated with federal funds and were somewhat autonomous of the legislature as well as the executive branch of state government. Rampton resolved to corral these independent operations by consolidating them into cabinet departments headed by his own appointees.

The Johnson-Goldwater presidential race produced the first Democratic legislature since the Roosevelt years and made that consolidation possible. The Republicans swept back into control of the legislature two years later, but the governor chose the most able of those 2-year Democratic freshmen as his appointees to head the new departments supported by new funds.

By 1968 Rampton was chairman of a National Governors’ Association subcommittee with responsibility for employment and training programs. He found that other governors shared his concern that federally funded manpower programs operated through state agencies without any control from the governor’s office. Hearing national discussion about the need to decentralize and decategorize manpower programs, Rampton resolved to add that effort to his own consolidation drive. In 1969, he persuaded the state legislature to establish a state Manpower Planning Council,
composed of all state agencies involved in employment and training, and authorizing the council to direct and coordinate all such activities within the limits of federal law. Thus while the Congress was debating the CETA legislation from 1969 to 1973, Utah was operating a significant pilot program for all to see. In what would later emerge as CETA language, Utah was operating a statewide prime sponsorship.

In another vagary of personality politics, Rampton, upon being elected to an unprecedented third term in 1972, suddenly moved from consolidation to decentralization as the thrust of the manpower policy of his final term. As CETA was being shaped with the Utah experience as a major model, the Utah statewide system was being, in effect, split up and delegated to nine local associations of government (AOG) which had originally emerged around reclamation and natural resource issues.

The State Manpower Planning Council, as a statutory body, continued to exist but became meaningless insofar as CETA was concerned. The original chairman, a Rampton-appointed university professor, and the executive director who was also state planning coordinator, resigned. The deputy director, a nationally experienced manpower expert, became director but soon found the position to have little clout and moved on to take over the public employment service of a neighboring state. A State Office of Labor and Training (SOLT) was established, primarily to collect federal funds and disperse them largely autonomous to multicounty associations of government on the same formula by which they are allocated from the federal government to the state. As of 1980, Utah had six entities eligible to be CETA prime sponsors—Salt Lake County, Salt Lake City, Weber County, Davis County, Utah County, and a 25-county balance-of-state. Because each had the autonomy of individual prime sponsors and had won additional concessions from the state,
the eligible jurisdictions, all of them strung along the Wasatch Front, agreed to remain within the official statewide prime sponsorship.

CETA in Utah appears on the Department of Labor’s map as a single prime sponsor, but funding is immediately divided among the nine state associations of government. Funds for fiscal year 1979 were divided among those units in the pattern shown by Table 1. Each planning district prepares its own annual plan and these are merely consolidated for the state plan.

**Administering CETA in Utah**

"Don’t rock the boat" seemed to be the operating slogan of Utah’s CETA program, but the program did not lack sound administration. Utah’s high levels of education compared with its relatively small size and its economy’s orientation to the basic industry, have generally provided an ample supply of high quality public administrators. Despite the antifederal rhetoric heard in Utah political campaigns, the state has long had a reputation among federal agencies for outstanding conduct of federally funded programs. Competency is high and turnover low at both the state and AOG levels in CETA. Each of the small AOGs have from two to five CETA staff positions and often share staff with related activities. Those eligible for independent prime sponsorship have staffs ranging from 5 to 43, whereas the state office employs a staff of 30. Most at all levels are college graduates and a high percentage have specialized advanced degrees in human resource management.

These are the people who make the CETA decisions. The elected officials of the multijurisdiction planning units are mostly part-time politicians and have very little involvement. The state office does not try to tell the AOG professionals what to do except "obey the law." The statutory statewide
Table 1. CETA Expenditures in Utah, Fiscal 1979\textsuperscript{a}, by Planning District and CETA Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning districts</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>II-B, C</th>
<th>II-D</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>$24,813,611</td>
<td>$6,085,910</td>
<td>$3,855,978</td>
<td>$4,950,903</td>
<td>$9,920,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake/Tooele Counties</td>
<td>9,506,395</td>
<td>2,227,774</td>
<td>1,541,692</td>
<td>1,771,137</td>
<td>3,965,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber/Morgan</td>
<td>4,098,016</td>
<td>896,378</td>
<td>708,465</td>
<td>883,153</td>
<td>1,610,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountainlands</td>
<td>3,717,231</td>
<td>1,101,015</td>
<td>493,034</td>
<td>723,456</td>
<td>1,399,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis County</td>
<td>1,601,484</td>
<td>431,372</td>
<td>233,450</td>
<td>264,365</td>
<td>672,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear River</td>
<td>1,669,753</td>
<td>426,688</td>
<td>207,399</td>
<td>369,136</td>
<td>666,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>1,438,370</td>
<td>305,295</td>
<td>277,069</td>
<td>257,262</td>
<td>598,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>863,482</td>
<td>268,635</td>
<td>108,023</td>
<td>189,913</td>
<td>296,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>1,074,150</td>
<td>258,662</td>
<td>214,079</td>
<td>193,511</td>
<td>407,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uintah</td>
<td>529,587</td>
<td>124,252</td>
<td>72,767</td>
<td>101,195</td>
<td>231,373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a.} These figures are prior to final accounting adjustments and do not include special projects or the Governor's grants.
Manpower Planning Council has lapsed into disuse. A state Employment and Training Council has been created, but it can get no handle on the decentralized system. Each AOG has an advisory council, but few really give advice. CETA in Utah is a local staff responsibility.

A favorable economy, a small minority population, and a waiting list of relatively homogeneous CETA-eligible applicants simplify decisionmaking and administration. Whatever CETA funds are not earmarked for other purposes go into classroom and on-the-job training, primarily the former. Until the 1980 recession, which slowed but did not reverse economic growth, job opportunities were plentiful and obvious. CETA’s task in Utah has been to prepare the disadvantaged for jobs. The eligible populations were sufficiently homogeneous to allow first-come, first-served policies to distribute the available slots except in the metropolitan Salt Lake City and Ogden areas and in the Uintah Basin, and Southeastern planning districts which include major Indian reservations.

The CETA planning process consists of (1) getting an estimate of available funds from the State Office of Labor and Training, (2) contracting with the one public postsecondary training institution in the planning district for provision of classroom training (only two districts have more than one such institution), and (3) contracting with the state Job Service for promotion of on-the-job training and for intake, determination of eligibility and placement. With these processes established, neither planning nor administration is difficult. The State Office of Labor and Training makes no attempt to shape or influence local decisions but offers technical assistance. The only complexities in CETA administration are those imposed by federal legislation and regulation.
The minority populations of Salt Lake City and Ogden are sufficient to place the local CETA staffs under some political pressure. In response, in Salt Lake County particularly, the CETA staff has chosen to allocate funds to community based organizations for orientation, adult basic education, English as a second language, and similar nonskill training activities, as well as a minimum number of on-the-job training slots. Having purchased peace at that price, the staff allocates most of the remainder of the budget to the skill center at the local public technical college and to Job Service, as in the other planning districts. As followup and evaluation have been largely ignored by the planning districts and have not been pushed by the state office, the administrative assignment of the planning districts consists of getting the contracts negotiated and the money out. In the rural districts the CETA director knows personally everyone involved in the delivery of CETA services and often every individual enrollee, so formal evaluation does not seem essential. For Job Service, the assignment consists of identifying CETA eligibles, adding them to a waiting list, and peeling them off for referral to on-the-job and classroom training. Employer contact representatives maintain established relationships with employers and continue to negotiate on-the-job training contracts with a limited number of establishments. New on-the-job training employers enter the system primarily at their own initiative. The system has been a simple one, with never a taint of scandal. At one end, complexities are added by federal requirements, but these are blunted by the state offices which maintain all federal contacts and act as an intermediary vis-a-vis the planning district. At the other end, an internal squabble between the State Board of Vocational Education and the state Board of Regents about who should control postsecondary vocational education in the state adds the only touches of complexity confronting state and local CETA administrators.
The Quality of Training

How good is the training under Utah's decentralized CETA system? The simplest generalization is "very good." CETA classroom training occurs in two technical colleges, one university, two 4-year colleges, three 2-year colleges, and four area vocational schools. One technical college and one 4-year college operate separate skill centers maintained for CETA and other disadvantaged clients. All other classroom training follows the individual referral model, with all CETA enrollees included in the same classroom groups as the non-subsidized student body. Utah's educational institutions enjoy high rankings and these institutions are among the state's best. The major issue, leaving aside for the moment the two skill centers, is whether the training needs of the CETA clientele are adequately met by immersion in mainstream training situations.

With the exception of the Indian population near the reservations and the minority populations where the skill centers exist, the answer appears to be yes. Statewide, blacks constitute 3 percent, Hispanics 14 percent, and Indians 4 percent of the CETA population—in each case, about three times their overall population proportion. Only in counties containing skill centers do blacks exceed 5 percent of the CETA population. Hispanics exceed 10 percent only in the Wasatch Front and the mining-oriented southeast. American Indians exceed 6 percent of CETA enrollment only in the planning district which contains part of the Navajo reservation. Only 60 percent of CETA enrollees have high school educations, although only 13 percent of Utah's high school students leave before graduating.

At any rate, no planning district has any difficulty finding CETA eligible people capable of competing successfully with the non-CETA enrollees in the available training institu-
tions. In fact, there are waiting lists of such people needing only tuition and training allowances to make training as attractive as possible. Once enrolled, trainees are not identifiable among other students in the same classrooms. Exception in Wasatch Front North and South (Ogden and Salt Lake City and their environs), those who cannot compete in the classroom are relegated to work experience (if youth) or left out of CETA entirely, because they are unlikely to be acceptable to employers, public or private, hosting public service employment or on-the-job training. CETA enrollees who enter these training institutions with CETA stipends get excellent training, and the vast majority (generally over 80 percent) get jobs. Those not placed are typically women who withdraw from the labor market or youth who are not yet ready to settle into it.

The Salt Lake and Ogden residents and CETA system are more typical of national patterns. CETA enrollees in the Ogden area (Weber-Morgan planning district) are approximately 9 percent black and 20 percent Hispanic. The Salt Lake County area (Wasatch Front South) enrolls 5 percent blacks, 22 percent Hispanics, 4 percent urban Indians, and 5 percent Asians. Davis County, between the two districts geographically, enrolls 11 percent Hispanic but hardly any other minorities. These minority populations are large enough to have their own ethnic organizations. There is also a noticeable women's movement in this metropolitan setting. As a result of the larger number of minorities enrolled in these counties, the training institutions there have been designed to handle a more disadvantaged population, and CETA planners have responded with a more diversified mix of programs. One can be less confident of the quality of training offered, but more assured that the disadvantaged are being served.

The Wasatch Front South district has allocated 74 percent of its II-B funds to classroom training and 19 percent to on-
the-job training. Of the classroom training funds, 45 percent go to Skill Center South, administratively attached to the Utah Technical College at Salt Lake City; 45 percent for orientation, adult basic education, English as a second language, and similar employability related but nonskill training; and 10 percent to a nonprofit organization that assists women who wish to break into nontraditional jobs. Except for a few slots at the women's organization, the on-the-job training is managed by the Utah Job Service.

The quality of the training provided by the community-based organizations (CBOs) is doubtful at best, but may still be worthwhile. These CBOs lack both staff and facilities for quality training, but do provide access routes for the small groups of minorities who might otherwise be left out of the CETA action entirely. CBO support does not depend on large minority populations, but occurs wherever ethnic groups feel the need to organize. The CETA contracts offer the only significant funding source for the struggling CBOs. Funding them not only increases the visibility of minority populations but also offers a visible source for employers wishing to meet affirmative action requirements. In addition, significant portions of their enrollees then enter the skill centers.

The women in the nontraditional occupations program have a tough assignment in a traditional community. The program's success rate is low and it spends more effort on raising the level of consciousness and assertiveness among its enrollees than on providing skills or persuading employers. Its enrollment is small, its placement rate ranges from 33 percent to 50 percent, and many of these jobs are not far from being traditional. However, many of its completers then enter the skill center for occupational training (in the traditional occupations). The effort is probably best thought of as a pilot project which should be tried without expecting quantitative success.
The Salt Lake Skill Center suffers the same limitations as many similar institutions. It offers quality training to a disadvantaged population in a second class facility. Although the skill center's instructors have the same training, experience, and credentials as those on the technical college campus, its equipment and buildings are only marginally adequate. The curriculum is limited to clerical, auto mechanics, and welding programs.

The primary problem at the skills center is one of stigma. The skill center is clearly second-class when compared with the technical college programs. The trainee in a 26-week CETA course may get as much training of equal quality hour for hour at the skill center as the enrollee in a 1- or 2-year program at the technical college. But in both the students' self-assessments and the employers' assessments, those who can claim technical college credentials are way ahead.

The same problem exists for Skill Center North at Ogden. It is administratively attached to Weber State College, a 4-year academic institution with a substantial on-campus 2-year technical offering. The skill center is housed in an abandoned high school closer to the central city, which nevertheless is fully adequate; its instructors are fully qualified; and its equipment is more nearly adequate than at the Salt Lake Skill Center, because the whole operation is of more recent date. Skill Center North has its own curriculum development unit, a good library, and its own day care center. Its course offerings are broader, ranging over bench and service trades, building trades, clerical, health services, and metal trades, and supported by adult basic education, and English as a second language. Objectively, it maintains an excellent program. But still, the stigma is there. The short scope of the courses and the disadvantaged backgrounds of those eligible give some objectivity to those negative judgments, but there is probably a significant stigmatic component from the facility itself. Providing CETA-sponsored
courses on one or both of the two campuses would be an interesting and worthwhile experiment in public relations.

Nevertheless, a placement rate averaging over 80 percent at a cost of only $1,650 per placement should remove any doubt that the current program is worthwhile. Education in the State of Utah is in a financial bind, squeezed between a taxpayer revolt and an extraordinarily high birth rate. What little state moneys have gone into training the adult disadvantaged are likely to disappear. Federal training moneys available in Utah are on the decline. The waiting list of eligible applicants is already six months long and growing. The economy remains promising despite the 1980 slowdown. Facilities, equipment, and instructors are available for a doubling of enrollments. The only missing element is the inevitable one—budgets.

Conclusions

Prior to CETA, Utah was a national pioneer and innovator in employment and training activities. But the pioneer often experiments, shows the way, and then gets locked into some mode while those who followed pass it by. In Utah’s current CETA stance, nothing is worthy of special notice and emulation. There is no significant labor market planning and no innovation. Nevertheless, there is in place a solid program resting upon service delivery by efficient and effective Job Service and vocational education systems. Federal statutory provisions, regulations, guidelines, and policies are given a scripture-like sanctity and followed to the letter. The system is a conservative one, seeking always to avoid conflict. Moneys are carefully accounted for, with never a breath of scandal. Most important, eligible enrollees get, for the most part, high quality training and jobs. This study has not examined nontraining services, but training is clearly the preference of nearly all actors in the system.
The common thread throughout the entire history of employment and training programs in Utah has been the prominent role played by the Utah Job Service and the State Office of Vocational Education. Most of the area councils of government have obtained the services of well-educated and competent CETA planners and administrators. While the programs differ considerably from one AOG to another, there are few if any serious problems relating to improper management, misuse of funds, or failure to implement the programs in a timely fashion. Utah has managed to spend CETA funds as they became available.

The relationship between the Utah CETA administrators and the federal Department of Labor Officials has been both friendly and supportive. Utah has given little cause for federal monitors to be concerned. The regulations have been followed, and the State Office of Labor and Training has served to keep some distance between the federal representatives and the program operation levels. On the other hand, federal representatives have had no influence on the nature or quality of the programs.

Elected officials have not played a strong role in the Utah CETA system. In the rural areas, many elected officials serve only part time and generally lack interest and time to follow programs such as CETA, and policy is made by the CETA planner/administrator, with participation by representatives of the Job Service and educational agencies. In metropolitan areas, the elected officials have been more involved in planning because of the competition for funds and programs, but their involvement has usually been confined to an annual review of funding allocations. During the period when PSE was operating at its peak level, the elected officials became involved in the allocation of funds among departments wanting PSE slots, but their activity in PSE did not carry over into other CETA programs.
The decentralization of Utah's CETA system to the nine subgrantees changed the relationship between the federal program managers and the program operating levels by placing the state in the role of middleman, translator, and buffer. It would be difficult, however, to identify any specific programmatic impact of this role. Indeed, the Utah CETA program operates under an umbrella at the local level without either a strong federal or state role. The State Office of Labor and Training can legitimately claim to be carrying out some functions which the federal managers would carry out if each of the eligible prime sponsors operated independently, so the "feds" may miss the Utah consortium more than anyone else. On the other hand, the new prime sponsors may learn for the first time how onerous federal regulations can be.

The work of the State Office of Labor and Training cannot be separated from the general acknowledgement that the Utah Job Service is among the best in the country by all DOL rating schemes. The state's educational agencies likewise rate well in comparison with others throughout the country. Furthermore, the local AOGs through 1980 had jealously protected their autonomy (there had not been time at the conclusion of this study for them to react to the governor's announcement). In short, the Utah CETA system is very much a product of the institutions, traditions, and general level of public service in the state.

**Organization, Management and Policy**

The most important conclusion of this case study is the recognition that the present system seemed satisfactory to almost all of the actors. There was little or no pressure for change within the system itself, although Salt Lake County, Davis County, Utah County, and Salt Lake City had threatened to withdraw from the consortium. Each time an
eligible prime sponsor threatened to pull out, the governor intervened to encourage a continuation of the system. The primary benefits of the consortium are increased overall funding and better services in the rural areas. The prospective urban prime sponsors have been told that a breakup of the consortium might endanger the cordiality of overall urban-rural relationships. In addition, the governor had resolved some non-CETA issues during discussions about the preservation of the consortium.

During 1980 the Mountainlands AOG, or more particularly Utah County within that AOG, went on record as intending to pull out of the consortium the following year. This county has grown somewhat faster than the state as a whole and has claimed that it is being underfunded. The claim, while probably true, would not affect funding until allocation formulas are revised to conform with the 1980 census data. Present policy about using federal formulas to allocate funds among the subgrantees gives the state little flexibility in handing out money. In fact, the whole system has been remarkably free from controversy over fund allocations. In the midst of this apparent stability, the governor's announcement of intent to disband the consortium was a complete surprise to all of the actors, except apparently the SOLT director who gave his advice concurrent with his resignation.

An important question is, "What can be done to restore some managerial and policy initiatives to employment and training programs in Utah?" The answer must begin with the simplification of the federal statute, a reduction in the number of separate programs that it entails, and more flexibility for local decisionmaking. The local actors are somewhat intimidated by the system, but at the same time, they seem pleased with their ability and success in accommodating to it.
A second change at the state level would require strong leadership from the governor's office and some attempt to focus on broader labor market aspects beyond the local AOGs. With the spread of large coal-fired power plants, the advent of the synthetic fuels program and other energy developments, and the possible deployment of the Air Force MX Missile system, the state appears to be on the verge of massive and perhaps disruptive development. In the years ahead, there is likely to be stronger support for more statewide planning. The governor could have chosen to use the statewide consortium as a vehicle for much of the labor market aspect of that planning. On the other hand, the metropolitan areas will be affected only indirectly by the pending energy and defense developments. A strong balance-of-state system dominated from the governor's office might be better able to shift CETA resources from one part of the state to another in accordance with need than could the present system which assures each area of the state of its proportion of limited CETA funds. Whatever happens, the pace of development makes clear the need for training and promises jobs for those trained.

**Training Policy and Practice**

Probably the single most important impact of Utah CETA and its predecessor and related programs has been to broaden the base of state funding for classroom training for high school dropouts. MDTA programs were coordinated in the larger cities by creating the two skill centers and providing more counseling and other support services, thus underscoring the needs of people who had dropped out before completing high school. The State Board of Education first requested the legislature to raise the upper age limit at which the state educational program could pay for high school completion from 18 to 21. It then abolished the upper age limit completely, thereby making all area vocational
centers, skill centers, and adult education programs of the various school districts eligible for regular state support to provide high school completion to dropouts regardless of age. These resources were utilized most effectively by those institutions which, because of their federal CETA, WIN, and related programs, were serving significant numbers of persons who had left school without a diploma.

A third step in the process occurred when the Board of Regents strengthened their claim over the governance of the two skill centers by obtaining from the state legislature a small but significant line item of support from state funds. As federal funding has declined appreciably, the existence of the high school completion support funds and the general appropriation have kept the two skill centers alive. The decline in federal CETA and WIN funds clearly will alter the nature of the institutions and the clientele they serve. The federal programs provide funds and disadvantaged enrollees and when federal funding declines, the state support will shift to enrollees who are less likely to be disadvantaged.

For the most part, the training in Utah is of high quality with institutions, curriculums, instruction, and facilities operating within the general framework of postsecondary public education. Except for the Salt Lake and Ogden areas, individual referrals to existing programs dominate classroom training. In the Ogden area, all training is done at the skill center except for a small project for the handicapped. In Salt Lake, the skill center is the largest training institution, but five CBOs also have relatively small programs.

Funding CBOs appears motivated as much by perceptions about the institutional identification and support for ethnic groups as by the need to provide high quality training. The criteria to be applied in funding allocations for CBOs and for the skill center are not, and probably cannot be, the same. The recognition of this fact seems to enforce the need
to preserve local options and flexibility, but the forces that must be dealt with go far beyond any geographic area. The CBO is to the ethnic group or to the feminist movement in the modern city what the national grange movement and the national cooperative movement were to the farmers 50 years ago. CETA and its predecessor programs have been the one consistent source of funding sustaining these institutional developments. The CBOs in Utah provide opportunities for identification and self-realization to the groups involved—both for the administrators and the clients served. Utah is an interesting setting from which to observe the CBOs because its minority population is less than 7 percent of the total. CBO support does not depend upon a large minority population any more than the success of the farm cooperative movement hinged on the size of a state's agriculture. The "movement" goes well wherever the setting creates an environment in which the ethnic groups feel the need to develop organizational and social support.

The skill centers are caught accidentally in the issue of governance between the State Board of Vocational Education and the Board of Regents. It is over who should govern postsecondary vocational education and would exist if there were no skill centers. It does complicate the lives of the skill centers, however. The funding and autonomy issues impact the centers more directly. Educational administrators dislike depending on funding from programs not under the control of the educational establishment. Education in Utah cherishes its autonomy and does not like the CETA funding process or the evaluation and monitoring from outsiders. Whether to maintain separate identities for the skill centers, absorb them into their parent institutions or, in the case of Skill Center North, transform it into an Area Vocational School, all are options centrally related to the issue of control.
Those directly teaching or administering the training programs, however, are not concerned about these issues. They understand that CETA is a source of enrollees as well as funds, and the skill center staffs are generally committed to serving the enrollees referred under the CETA program. They are comforted by the fact that every study has praised their effectiveness. There are people whose need for training is very great and these same people achieve significant success: between 6 and 8 of every 10 people served gain a substantial boost in income, employment, and self-image, although the immediate success rate declines during recession years.

The portion of Title II-B funds going into classroom and OJT training has risen in recent years from two-thirds to approximately four-fifths. There are waiting lists of persons who want to be enrolled but who cannot be served because programs are operating at capacity. In some cases prospective enrollees have waited from six months to a year to enter a program.

Among the most important conclusions of this study of CETA classroom training in Utah is that the present classroom training system could be doubled or even quadrupled without reaching all CETA-eligible clients. The training facilities can accommodate more students, and many eligible enrollees are not now being served or must wait too long for service. The long run promise is also for a rapid growth of jobs which can be met only by training or by importing labor. Equally important, CETA has served to identify and refer to training significant numbers of disadvantaged people who would not receive training were it not for the CETA linkages between jobs, training, and income maintenance. While some progress is being made in educational circles to obtain more state funds for the disadvantaged, it is also clear that if CETA were to disappear, the disad-
vantaged would be the first to be dropped from educational services.

If CETA is to continue as a major funding source for classroom training and for on-the-job training, the system should greatly expand efforts to develop curriculums and more importantly to finance training equipment and supplies. Indeed, it may be appropriate to require state and local matching funds in defraying training costs to make possible the better funding of curriculum development and training equipment and facilities. Finally, institutions providing classroom training are not immune from the ravages of inflation, and when increasing costs are incurred during a period of declining funding, the entire system is subjected to a serious strain that threatens not only quantity but quality of training as well. There is little in CETA funding and administration that reflects an awareness of, or an effort to meet, the rising costs which inflation thrusts upon the program operators.

**Major Conclusions**

Looking to what now exists, the important conclusions of this case study are:

1. Very little real planning is being done in Utah CETA, and the planning that is taking place is short term—usually confined to the next fiscal year.

2. CETA staff members defend their work but show little real enthusiasm for the system within which they operate. The Utah vocational education establishment divides almost equally between those who think CETA and similar programs will eventually disappear, and those who think that CETA, or something which accomplishes much the same objectives, will continue indefinitely.
3. State and local advisory councils play a very limited role in Utah CETA. They meet infrequently, show poor attendance, and function mainly to ratify CETA staff actions worked out in advance with the Job Service and education authorities.

4. The entire system seems to be conservative and oriented toward avoiding risk and conflict. In achieving this goal, the system rates high marks.

5. One advantage of a CETA organization which delegates program responsibility to the local area councils of government is the coordination of CETA with other social programs in the rural areas. Here, staff positions are sometimes shared, the problems are small, the number of clients few, and the linkages well established.

6. Only in the Salt Lake/Tooele Wasatch Front South area does CETA take on the attributes of a system generally associated with larger cities. It is the only case in Utah where CBOs have contracts to provide services and where there is any degree of competition for the roles which Job Service and the public education agencies perform elsewhere in the state.

7. The CETA system has made a great contribution to the current acceptance and strength of the Associations of Government (AOGs) by providing staff and program money to give these relatively new governmental entities a strong role in their respective areas. Undoubtedly, this potential dominated the decision to decentralize the CETA system in 1972. To this extent, the current organization of CETA in Utah may be an accident of history—even so, it will not be easy to change.
8. The statutory Utah Manpower Planning Council, created by the state legislature in 1969 with a mandate to coordinate all federally funded manpower programs within the state, has fallen into almost total disuse, even though it still exists on paper.

9. It is difficult to determine just what the State Office of Labor and Training staff might have done differently given the diffusion of power and the decentralization or fragmentation of the system. The expertise of the state staff has been available to the local subgrantees, and its role in compiling reports, plans, and in establishing standards and interpreting regulations and guidelines has been substantial. It would be too easy to reach a wrong conclusion and blame the SOLT staff for the demise of the once-strong state role in employment and training programs. The key decisions were made in the office of the governor, and any effective state-level impact on the administration of CETA would require the governor’s power to coordinate the state’s three major CETA actors; namely, the Job Service, the educational agencies, and the SOLT staff with local counterparts.

10. Through it all, eligible participants have received sound training and the preponderance of them have obtained jobs. That is the bottom line.