

RESTRICTED — Not to be released outside the General Accounting Office except on the basis of specific approval GAO by the Office of Congressional Relations.

United States General Accounting Office
Washington, DC 20548

Human Resources
Division

B-198024

May 20, 1980

The Honorable James R. Jones
House of Representatives

Dear Mr. Jones:

Subject: Poor Management Has Reduced the Effectiveness of Tulsa Human Services Agency Programs (HRD-80-62) ✓

266-04655

This report is in response to your April 28, 1979, letter, requesting that we review the administration of the Tulsa Human Services Agency, the community action agency for Tulsa County, Oklahoma. During our May 30 meeting with you, we agreed to:

- Identify Tulsa Agency managerial problems in general, and specifically in its energy assistance and weatherization programs.
- Recommend ways to correct such problems.

Subsequently, we met with your Tulsa staff to discuss complaints it had received about the Tulsa Agency programs. The staff asked that we explore the feasibility of coordinating the weatherization program with the Tulsa Jaycees' winterizing projects and the activities of local vocational technical schools.

We interviewed headquarters and regional officials of the Community Services Administration, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Energy and officials of the Oklahoma Department of Economic and Community Affairs, the Tulsa City Manpower Planning Division, and the Tulsa County Department of Social Services. Also, we met with current and former board members and staff of the Tulsa Agency. We reviewed and analyzed Tulsa Agency files for the period January 1978 through September 1979, visited selected weatherization projects, and spoke with selected weatherization and energy assistance program applicants.

DL604656



112918

510445

(013944)

We noted that because of poor management some of the Tulsa Agency programs, especially the energy assistance and weatherization programs, have not been as effective as they might have been. Major problems existed in planning, organization, implementation, monitoring and followup, and asset control. We believe corrective actions taken and planned, particularly in the areas of training, procedures development, and staffing, should help improve the effectiveness of the Tulsa Agency's programs. However, more needs to be done to improve management of these programs. The results of our review are discussed in more detail in the enclosures.

As you agreed, we obtained the views of Community Services Administration, Department of Energy, and Tulsa Agency officials concerning the contents of our draft report. Community Services Administration and Department of Energy officials basically agreed with the matters in the report and provided us with additional information. Tulsa Agency officials disagreed with several issues; a major concern was that we had not sufficiently discussed Tulsa Agency accomplishments. Comments made by these agencies are included in the enclosures where appropriate.

As arranged with you, unless you publicly announce its contents earlier, we plan no further distribution of this report for 30 days. At that time, we will send copies to interested parties and make copies available to others on request.

Sincerely yours,



Gregory J. Ahart
Director

Enclosures - 2

C o n t e n t s

	<u>Page</u>
ENCLOSURE	
I REVIEW OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE TULSA HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY	1
Organizations responsible for programs at the Tulsa Human Services Agency	1
Tulsa Agency	1
Community Services Administration	2
Department of Energy and Oklahoma Department of Economic and Community Affairs	3
Department of Labor and Tulsa Manpower Planning Division	3
Tulsa Agency has been managed poorly but improvements are underway	4
CSA critical of Tulsa Agency man- agement	4
Tulsa Agency lacks a needs-based plan for serving Tulsa County residents	5
Tulsa Agency has failed to estab- lish an effective organization to implement Agency programs	7
Tulsa Agency program implementation does not assure county residents' needs are met effectively	12
Tulsa Agency monitoring and followup activities need improvement	15
Tulsa Agency lacks adequate control over assets	16
Recommendations	17
II TULSA HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY FISCAL YEARS 1978-80 BUDGETS	19

ABBREVIATIONS

CAA community action agency
CETA Comprehensive Employment and Training Act
CSA Community Services Administration
DECA Department of Economic and Community Affairs
DOE Department of Energy
GAO General Accounting Office
OCA Office of Community Advocacy

REVIEW OF THE ADMINISTRATION
OF THE TULSA HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY

ORGANIZATIONS RESPONSIBLE
FOR PROGRAMS AT THE TULSA
HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY

Several Federal, State, and local organizations are responsible for programs at the Tulsa Human Services Agency. Basically, their responsibilities are to fund the programs and monitor their implementation.

Tulsa Agency

The Tulsa Agency is a nonprofit community action agency (CAA), established to help eliminate poverty in Tulsa County. The Agency operates several antipoverty programs which are more than 95-percent federally funded. Its budget declined from \$2.9 million in fiscal year 1978 to \$2.3 million in 1979 and 1980. (See enc. II for sources and amounts of funding for these years.)

In addition to the energy assistance, weatherization, and community advocacy activities (including the Indian Emphasis project), the Tulsa Agency has four programs-- Community Food and Nutrition, Tulsa County Head Start, Elderly Nutrition, and Neighborhood Regeneration. We did not review these four programs because your office did not identify them as being the subject of complaints. However, we did discuss overall Tulsa Agency administration and problems with staff members of these programs. An official from the Oklahoma Department of Economic and Community Affairs (DECA) informed us that the Tulsa Agency Head Start program has recently been rated one of the five best Head Start programs in Oklahoma.

The Community Services Administration (CSA) and the Department of Energy (DOE) funded the weatherization program in 1978 and 1979 at about \$170,000 and \$123,000, respectively. The program was to

- improve living standards of low-income homeowners,
- provide necessary home repairs and insulation, and

--provide consumer and educational information and legal assistance when necessary to alleviate high energy costs of the low-income population.

CSA funded the energy assistance program for about \$400,000 during 1978 and 1979, to provide one-time emergency assistance to low-income persons when high energy costs result from extremely cold weather and rising fuel costs.

The Office of Community Advocacy (OCA) at the Tulsa Agency is funded by CSA. OCA budgeted \$298,025 for 1979 and had received a similar amount in 1978 as the Neighborhood Leadership Grant program. OCA was to

--act as an advocate for the low-income community,
--use the community's economic decisionmaking processes to upgrade economic and social environments of low-income persons, and
--program activities to make the low-income community self-sufficient.

The Neighborhood Leadership Grant program and OCA funded the Indian Emphasis project for \$34,695 during each of the years 1978 and 1979. This project was to keep the Agency apprised of Tulsa's Indian community needs. The Indian Emphasis project could not document what was accomplished since 1975, other than publication of a newspaper. The chairman of the Tulsa Agency board told us that the Agency had recommended defunding of this project in the fall of 1978. During June 1979, CSA questioned the project's operation and its success in identifying Indian needs. In July 1979, the Tulsa Agency decreased the project's 1980 budget by one-half to \$17,345. The project is to become self-sufficient during 1980.

The Tulsa Agency board of directors and its appointed officers are responsible for assuring that the Agency programs' objectives are achieved.

Community Services Administration

CSA, as successor to the Office of Economic Opportunity, is the Federal agency responsible for developing, testing, and administering various programs to eliminate poverty in the United States.

CSA programs are administered through about 900 CAAs nationwide. These agencies are locally controlled public or private nonprofit organizations which receive CSA grants to cover basic administrative costs. CAAs administer a wide variety of programs funded by Federal, State, and local agencies in addition to CSA programs.

CSA is responsible for assuring that CAAs fulfill their responsibilities as advocates for the poor and that CSA-funded programs are administered effectively. CSA's Dallas regional office is to see that these responsibilities are met by the Tulsa Agency.

Department of Energy and
Oklahoma Department of
Economic and Community Affairs

DOE grants weatherization funds to States, which re-distribute them to local administering agencies (including CAAs) for program implementation. DECA is the grantee for Oklahoma. DECA redistributes these funds to various agencies including the Tulsa Agency, monitors their activities, and provides them training and technical assistance. DOE's Dallas regional office is responsible for monitoring DECA weatherization activities and has provided seminars on weatherization project demonstration procedures.

Department of Labor and Tulsa
Manpower Planning Division

The Department of Labor, through local prime sponsors, provides Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) workers at no cost to weatherization and other programs. Weatherization programs have required, to the maximum extent practicable, that CETA workers perform the weatherization work. The National Energy Conservation Policy Act requires Labor, CSA, and DOE to work together to secure CETA support for federally assisted weatherization programs. ✓

At Tulsa, CETA's sponsor is the city's Manpower Planning Division, which monitors subgrantees' utilization of CETA workers in a three-county area. The Tulsa Agency is a sub-grantee with 23 CETA worker positions, of which 21 are weatherization program positions.

TULSA AGENCY HAS BEEN MANAGED POORLY
BUT IMPROVEMENTS ARE UNDERWAY

The Tulsa Agency has had significant management deficiencies. Essentially, the Agency has not adequately determined the needs of its Tulsa County citizens or planned programs to effectively meet those needs. Also, it has not established an effective organization to administer its programs. These deficiencies have caused many problems with program implementation, program monitoring and followup, and asset control.

Improvements have been made, or are planned, which should help to alleviate this situation. CSA and DOE are developing training programs for CAA board members and staff; DECA plans to begin providing needs assessment training to Oklahoma CAAs in 1980; and the Tulsa Agency has developed, or plans to develop, improved procedures for its administrative and program functions.

CSA critical of Tulsa
Agency management

CSA has been very critical of Tulsa Agency management. In 1976, CSA reported that management-related problems (inherited by the Agency's new executive director) included delegation of authority, accountability, training of program staff, community image, and determining needs and priorities of the poor.

Three years later, that executive director was criticized for the same problems in a CSA report. CSA requested the Tulsa Agency board of directors to respond within 45 days with a plan for handling the identified management deficiencies. The board of directors submitted a timetable to correct the problems and established a board committee to help resolve the problems. The committee's August 8, 1979, report generally agreed with CSA's findings and recommended immediate corrective action through (1) limiting the executive director's supervisory responsibilities to three managers and (2) working on a wage comparability study. (See pp. 7, 8, and 10.)

CSA officials indicated that close monitoring of Tulsa Agency activities is called for, but CSA does not have sufficient travel funds or staff to do so.

Tulsa Agency lacks a
needs-based plan for serving
Tulsa County residents

The Tulsa Agency does not have a formal, systematic process for determining the needs of the poor in Tulsa County. CSA and Tulsa officials agreed that an ongoing comprehensive needs assessment is necessary to help the Agency develop a plan enabling it to effectively serve as the advocate and service provider for the poor.

The Tulsa Agency executive director and program directors generally agreed that the Agency does not make comprehensive needs assessments. Seemingly, they consider their needs to be those that can be met by existing programs. The Agency's board chairman indicated there was no way to make a comprehensive needs assessment because of a lack of funds to train people to make such assessments. He said, however, that needs assessments are made for the Agency's Head Start and Elderly Nutrition Programs. It appears that the Agency's ability to perform comprehensive needs assessments has been further hindered, in that the planning manager, who would direct such activities, resigned about February 1980.

One CSA headquarters official was concerned that CAAs did not revise their programs to reflect changing needs in the communities. He also indicated that one problem with CAA needs assessments is the outdated 1970 census data used by the Agency and other CAAs. Without knowing current community needs, an agency cannot develop a plan for effectively serving the poor. Without such a plan, the Agency has no assurance that it is serving effectively as an advocate and service provider.

The Tulsa Agency cannot be sure whether its resource allocations are meeting Tulsa County needs. To the extent possible, services should be available to all low-income residents of Tulsa County. However, the Agency tends to provide most of its services to the northern sector of the city.

The Agency's three neighborhood offices are all in north Tulsa within a 3-mile radius of the Agency's central office. We took a random sample of energy assistance program recipients to determine, among other things, the extent to

which they lived in north Tulsa. Eighty-five percent of our sample of 362 were in north Tulsa. Sixty-nine percent of the 72 weatherization projects reported by the Tulsa Agency as completed, also were in north Tulsa. The Agency's executive director said that most of Tulsa County's low-income residents live in that area. The board chairman also indicated this and said that the 1980 census data would show a higher percentage of the poor living in north Tulsa. In response to our comment that the Agency had not documented this, he said that the allocation of services to the north Tulsa area is based on Community Development Block Grant data derived from 1970 census data.

We analyzed the 1970 census data for Tulsa County and determined that only about one-half of the Tulsa County poor and near poor individuals and families lived in north Tulsa as follows:

	<u>Individuals</u>	<u>Families</u>
	(percent)	
Poor (note a)	51	51
Poor and near poor (note b)	52	48

a/100 percent of poverty level.

b/125 percent of poverty level.

Improvements are on the horizon. CSA's fiscal year 1980 funding plan for community action programs has been written to encourage CAAs to make more needs assessments. This will be handled by the CSA regions giving more funds to those CAAs that recognize changing community needs. CSA has developed board of directors' training modules, including one for needs assessment. It is presently training individuals in the regions who will provide training to the boards. Furthermore, DECA is developing a needs assessment seminar for Oklahoma CAA staffs. The seminar is to be presented before July 1, 1980, and include a discussion of needs assessment instruments. It is important that the Tulsa Agency develop a formal, systematic needs assessment using the 1980 census data when they become available.

Tulsa Agency has failed to
establish an effective organization
to implement Agency programs

Tulsa Agency management has not established an effective organization to implement programs for Tulsa County residents. To effectively serve the community, an organization should clearly define the lines of authority and expeditiously assign responsibility for carrying out its mission to a staff that is ready and able to meet community needs. The Tulsa Agency has not

- established clear lines of authority,
- made timely appointments of and retained officials,
- provided adequate program guidelines,
- assured competitive salaries for staff,
- had adequate procedures to determine staff location, or
- actively sought cooperation with local agencies in providing service to Tulsa County residents.

The Agency has a poor management record, and the executive director told us that he needs management training. The failure to establish an efficient organization has reduced the effectiveness of Agency programs.

Agency lines of authority
were unclear or not followed

Lines of authority were unclear or not followed at the Tulsa Agency. Organizations generally operate most effectively when lines of authority and related responsibilities are clearly defined and followed. According to the CSA field representative, the executive director got too involved with individual program management and tried to run the programs himself. Some staff members told us that a supervisor's decision might be overruled by other supervisors not having such authority or by the executive director without discussing the matter with the supervisor making the decision.

These actions apparently caused confusion within the organization and contributed to the staff's ineffective implementation of certain programs, especially energy assistance and weatherization.

An organization chart approved August 15, 1979, better defined Agency lines of authority. Also, the board of directors' management committee counseled the executive director and redefined his role at the Agency. That role is to work with the deputy director, business manager, and planning director, and to be liaison between the board and staff. This is intended to keep the executive director from excessive involvement with program operations, allowing him more time to focus on matters requiring his attention.

Need for timely appointment
and retention of responsible
officials

Some Tulsa Agency activities have operated without directors for extended periods. The 1978 and 1979 weatherization and energy assistance programs, for example, have been overseen part time by the executive and deputy directors. Agency officials said it was difficult to find directors and funds were not always available to hire them. A DECA official told us that DOE had not provided adequate funding to hire a weatherization program director, but it did provide funding for a weatherization supervisor. The Agency did not hire a weatherization supervisor. The Agency's first weatherization program director was appointed in June 1979. The DECA official said that the Agency used CSA funds to pay the director until about February 1980, when it learned it could use DOE funds because the director was being used as a supervisor.

Subsequently, the Tulsa Agency appointed an energy assistance coordinator. The Governor of Oklahoma has chosen the State's Department of Institutions, Social and Rehabilitative Services to administer the 1980 energy assistance program and requested that it coordinate with DECA. The State's Department of Institutions provided some CSA fiscal year 1980 energy assistance funds to all Oklahoma CAAs, to acquire coordinators to provide outreach to those not receiving State aid and to address energy needs the State is unable to address.

A CSA official indicated that the Agency's planning manager recently resigned, and the board has deleted the position. Also, the Director of the Office of Community Advocacy has resigned to take a better position. He believes these vacancies can only compound the Agency's management problems. He said:

"There seems to be a swinging door effect. Employees continue to come and go, especially at the middle-management level, thus retarding any continuity that the agency might have. As new people come on board, there has to be an orientation and training period. By the time they are familiar with what is going on, they are on their way to better jobs."

He also said that the board recognized the problem and contracted for a managerial systems analysis. It received the contractor's report during July 1979, and is using the information to improve its operations.

Staff salaries cause turnover

Low salaries at the Tulsa Agency appear to be causing staff turnover. CSA and DECA officials agree that competitive salaries are necessary to assure the recruitment and retention of highly qualified staff at CAAs. Agency annual salaries for some positions, such as secretary and receptionist, barely surpass the Federal minimum wage standard. In fact, the employees' hourly wages are less than wages paid to CETA workers at the Agency. Many staff members qualify for programs the Agency administers for low-income residents. Most of the Tulsa Agency staff interviewed indicated that low salaries had contributed to high turnover at the Agency. Several of them said they were seeking other employment or would take it if offered.

CSA reported that the executive director at Tulsa was reluctant to hire managers at a reasonable salary level or to increase employee salaries. This occurred, CSA indicated, because of the executive director's response to criticisms of the Agency and his belief that others should be willing to work for lower salaries since he was willing to do so.

Another CSA official stated that CAAs should do wage comparability studies annually, and that recommending salary increases for Agency staff is the executive director's responsibility. The Tulsa Agency board of directors' management committee stated that the present wage scale is sometimes so low that, after a staff member becomes really competent in a job, employment is sought elsewhere. At the time of our review, the committee was conducting a wage comparability study on employee salaries.

Agency staff whereabouts
should be known

Tulsa Agency management does not have an adequate system to assure that employees are on duty. During our review, several Agency staff members, supervisors, and directors were frequently difficult to locate, because the Agency did not have a system to show their locations. We also observed some employees arriving at work an hour late, while some left an hour or more early. Agency staff indicated that employees were generally not charged leave for such absences.

Although a timeclock was prominent inside the front entrance of the Tulsa Agency, few employees used it. One employee was observed using the timeclock for several timecards. CSA officials, when told of such incidents, were concerned that, if timeclock procedures were not followed, employees could be paid for time not worked.

Tulsa Agency officials promised prompt action. They told us that employees would be required to report locations to their unit or to the receptionist when absent from duty stations during regular duty hours, and employees would be notified to follow current timecard requirements. This should help to assure that the Agency pays only for employee services received, and that employees are accessible during duty hours.

Board of directors activities
not adequately documented

Tulsa Agency records from January 1978 through June 1979 were inadequate to document attendance and activities at board meetings. Furthermore, the Agency did not have written procedures for documenting board activities. Minutes were unavailable for regular board meetings in January, May, and June 1978.

Also, quorums at 4 of 15 meetings could not be documented, but voting on issues had occurred. CSA found discrepancies in board attendance records, and recommended that board members sign attendance rosters. CSA officials told us they would consider disallowing costs that a CAA board authorizes in any meeting held without a quorum and would consider such meetings invalid. Tulsa Agency officials said that written procedures for documenting board activities would be developed.

Need to improve cooperation
with local agencies

Tulsa Agency management has not had the effective cooperation of potentially supporting organizations. This cooperation is critical if an agency is to assure that maximum resources are focused on the needs of the poor, and that duplication and overlap of activities and services are minimized. In January 1979, a CSA official reported that the Agency did not have a public relations effort, had no one assigned that duty, and a board of directors' committee was formed to address the matter. The committee suggested that the executive director duties include public relations activities. The board subsequently required the executive director to begin such activities.

We contacted representatives of the Tulsa Jaycees and Tulsa vocational-technical schools, who indicated their willingness to cooperate with the Tulsa Agency weatherization program. The executive director and weatherization program director later stated that they contacted a local vocational-technical school to discuss having the school provide students to work on weatherization projects and also provide training to the Agency's weatherization program staff; however, they had no plans to coordinate with the Tulsa Jaycees on winterizing projects, because earlier attempts had failed.

We believe that the Tulsa Agency should place high priority on getting the cooperation of other organizations that provide services to the poor.

Tulsa Agency program
implementation does not
assure county residents'
needs are met effectively

The Tulsa Agency did not use adequately trained and experienced staff to process and evaluate applications for the energy assistance and weatherization programs. As of September 1979, more than 200 applications had been taken during 1976-79 for the weatherization program, and more than 800 for the 1979 energy assistance program.

CETA employees without sufficient administrative skills were being used by the Tulsa Agency to interview energy assistance and weatherization program applicants and to process their applications. These tasks were performed without the direct supervision, training, and operating procedures needed to assure that program objectives and eligibility requirements were being met. Therefore, applications for the energy assistance and weatherization programs were not completed, recorded, or filed in a manner allowing one to readily determine (1) the status of individual applications, (2) the number of applications taken or processed, or (3) the location of all applications. Also, no priority system was used to process program applications. According to Agency officials, they intend to write appropriate procedures for all administrative and program functions.

During our visit we noted many energy assistance program applications in cardboard file boxes in an unlocked room. Other applications were found in the business office, at an outreach office, and mixed in with weatherization program files. Weatherization program applications were found in several unlocked file cabinets, on top of file cabinets, in another office, on or under desks, in file boxes on the floor, and on the carpet. No one could assure us that all applications taken were still on file for either program.

CSA officials stated that energy assistance was not to be provided on a first-come-first-served basis, rather priority was to be given to the elderly poor. Tulsa Agency officials informed us that applicants for its programs were handled first come, first served. However, we found several applications dated in 1978 processed before others dated in 1977.

Energy assistance program staff had approved benefits for themselves and other Agency staff who applied for the program. Tulsa Agency officials and CSA agreed that such approval should be made by the executive or deputy director.

Weatherization project
work was substandard, delayed,
inadequately inspected, and
few projects were completed,
but improvements are reported

We visited five weatherization projects which were worked on before June 1979. Much of the work observed was substandard or significantly delayed at all five projects, and none had been adequately inspected. We are not experts on home weatherization, but conditions noted were such that the deficient work was obvious. For example, we found the following:

- An interior door was installed in an outside doorway.
- Weatherization materials were delivered to the site in June 1978, but over a year later work was still substantially incomplete.
- Window caulking was applied unsmoothly and excessively.
- Work was started during December 1978, but as of September 1979, only about one-fourth of a roof needing repair had been covered with roofing paper.
- Three missing windows were not replaced before installing storm windows.

Improvements were observed in homes worked on after a weatherization program director was appointed. We believe the lack of close supervision contributed to the poor quality we observed on weatherization projects. CETA workers initially are not expected to be proficient in doing their job, and generally require training to become proficient. Closer supervision could have identified the inadequacies and training needed.

The Agency has improved the rate of weatherizing homes. Agency files and information given to us by the weatherization director indicated that of 72 weatherization

projects started during the period fiscal years 1977 through August 1979, 2 were completed during fiscal year 1977, 5 were completed in fiscal year 1978, and 32 were completed during fiscal year 1979 (through August). Also, during fiscal year 1979 (through August), the remaining 33 homes were completed except for insulation. This work was subsequently completed. Twenty-three homes were shown as completed or completed except for insulation during the 2-month period after the program director was appointed.

The CETA sponsor decided in May 1979 to discontinue providing CETA positions to the Tulsa Agency, based on inadequate supervision of CETA employees. However, the CETA positions were later reinstated when DECA and CSA officials suggested continuance, and the Tulsa Agency promised improvements. The CETA sponsor plans to reevaluate Agency supervision at least every 6 months.

A DECA official informed us that DECA had decided not to give Tulsa weatherization funds for fiscal year 1980, but reversed this decision when the program began to improve under the recently appointed program director. To assure continued progress, a DECA representative increased monitoring and technical assistance visits to the Tulsa Agency's weatherization program from one day each month to one day each week. A November 1979 DECA report indicated that the Tulsa Human Services Agency's weatherization program has significantly increased its services to the poor throughout the Tulsa area. A DECA official said that the quality of workmanship is now excellent and program recordkeeping is improving. It appears that the Agency management's appointment of a program director contributed significantly to the improved quality and increased number of weatherized homes.

DOE officials said DOE has taken steps to improve its weatherization program. Among these steps is development of a training module for training CETA workers in the skills necessary for weatherization programs. Training of individuals who will provide this training has just begun. After DOE makes finalized training modules available to the States, the States are to decide when to provide the training to the programs' CETA workers. Trainers in Oklahoma were trained in early March 1980. DOE is also taking action to strengthen program monitoring by preparing a manual to be used as a guide by States in monitoring CAA activities to achieve program goals.

Tulsa Agency monitoring and followup activities need improvement

Tulsa Agency monitoring and followup activities have been inadequate. Such activities can provide management information for improving program operation. DECA and CETA monitoring efforts have caused improvements in the weatherization program. CSA monitoring, during 1979, has been very critical of Tulsa Agency management.

Complaints to the Agency need to be monitored

Complaints to the Agency have not been adequately monitored. Improved monitoring could help Agency management identify and resolve program problems.

Agency officials admitted that complaints about the Agency and its programs are numerous and frequent, and the Agency is not sure whether complaints are resolved promptly. Officials told us that they would set up a centralized system ensuring that all complaints are identified and resolved satisfactorily. The Agency plans to use this information to provide immediate on-the-job training and improve operating procedures.

Inadequate followup on audit reports

The Tulsa Agency has not adequately followed up on audit deficiencies. This information could be used by management to improve Agency programs and administration.

Before this review, the Agency was included in a GAO nationwide review concerning energy assistance to the poor. Agency officials attempted to correct only deficiencies identified on sampled program applications and ignored the remaining applications. In June 1979, CSA was still waiting for the Tulsa Agency to resolve audit deficiencies identified during certified public accounting firm audits for 1976 and 1977. A CSA representative reported that the Tulsa Agency management showed a "cavalier" attitude toward audit reports and costs disallowed by CSA.

Agency control over
contracts should be improved

The Tulsa Agency indicated that it had entered into 20 contracts during fiscal year 1979. Fifteen of these totaled about \$107,000, and the remainder were open-ended contracts showing no amount. The contracts included a variety of purposes, such as operating a Summer Head Start program, leasing buildings, and identifying ways to improve Agency management.

We noted that the Agency did not have a central list of all contracts to provide information on purpose, products to be delivered, and delivery and use of products. Such a list would be useful to both Agency and CSA management to facilitate the review of the effectiveness of Agency contracting activities. Agency officials agreed that such a list is needed.

Tulsa Agency lacks adequate
control over assets

The Tulsa Agency has not safeguarded its assets adequately. To help assure program effectiveness, it is important that Agency assets are used solely for the respective programs. An audit firm and the Agency's business manager brought the assets control problem to the attention of Agency management during June 1978 and May 1979, respectively. The audit firm reported that 26 items, including typewriters, calculators, tape recorders, and duplicating machines, with a stated value of \$7,335, could not be located. During our review another item, a power mower, could not be located.

Although CSA officials said police reports are required for stolen equipment at CAAs, such reports were not furnished CSA by the Tulsa Agency. We found no inventory control documents for weatherization program materials. According to the Agency's business manager, inventory items disappear frequently; safeguarding such items is difficult, because of inadequate storage facilities; and Agency procedures are needed to safeguard and account for the items.

The Agency's executive and deputy directors told us that procedures will be developed to safeguard and monitor inventory items. DOE officials said that DOE has developed

a training module for fiscal management. As with the training module for CETA workers, the training for trainers has just begun and in Oklahoma, was completed in early March 1980.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that the Director of CSA require that the Tulsa Agency board of directors assure that policies and procedures are developed and implemented for

- making comprehensive needs assessments of Tulsa County's low-income residents using 1980 census data as soon as possible;
- clearly defining lines of authority and related responsibilities;
- appointing program directors promptly;
- providing necessary training for board members and program directors to improve Agency operations;
- providing necessary guidance, training, and supervision for its staff;
- making periodic wage comparability studies so it will know what salary levels need to be paid Agency staff to be competitive with other employers in the area;
- seeking cooperation of local organizations that provide services to the poor and elderly;
- managing its administrative, contracting, and program functions; and
- improving its monitoring and followup of (1) complaints to the Agency and (2) audit report findings.

CSA should expedite its development of training for CAA board members, directors, and staff. Such training could help fulfill CAAs' needs in general, and the Tulsa Agency's needs in particular.

CSA should closely monitor the Tulsa Agency activities to help assure that Agency management continues to improve.

We also recommend that the Secretary of Energy assure continued close monitoring of the Tulsa Agency's weatherization program by DECA so that Tulsa County's low-income residents are served efficiently, effectively, and fairly. Such monitoring should consider the adequacy of training, guidance, and supervision of program employees and CETA workers; control of program supplies; and allocation of program resources.

TULSA HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY FISCAL YEARS 1978-80 BUDGETS

<u>Source of funding</u>	<u>FY 1978</u>		<u>FY 1979</u>		<u>FY 1980</u>	
	<u>Budget amount</u>	<u>Percent of total</u>	<u>Budget amount</u>	<u>Percent of total</u>	<u>Budget amount</u>	<u>Percent of total</u>
Community Services Administration:						
Program Administration	\$ 197,508	6.7	\$ 199,313	8.7	\$ 199,313	8.8
Neighborhood Leadership Grant (note a)	292,468	10.0	-	-	-	-
Office of Community Advocacy (note b)	-	-	298,025	13.0	324,249	14.3
Weatherization Program (note c)	107,513	3.7	d/83,817	3.7	-	-
Energy Assistance Program	171,956	5.9	222,371	9.8	-	-
Community Food and Nutrition	84,301	2.9	52,553	2.3	25,929	1.1
<u>Total (CSA)</u>	<u>853,746</u>	<u>29.2</u>	<u>856,079</u>	<u>37.5</u>	<u>549,491</u>	<u>24.2</u>
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) (note e)	990,588	33.8	973,091	42.6	1,152,447	50.9
Department of Energy (Weatherization Program) (note c)	62,885	2.2	39,475	1.7	109,000	4.8
Community Development Block Grant	823,336	28.1	239,167	10.5	240,000	10.6
Office of Minority Business Enterprise	135,000	4.6	135,000	5.9	200,000	8.8
Oklahoma Department of Economic and Community Affairs	9,266	0.3	8,124	0.4	15,000	0.7
KIBOIS (HEW Handicapped Funds)(note f)	37,137	1.3	14,993	0.7	0	0.0
Tuition (Child Care)	15,160	0.5	15,160	0.7	0	0.0
<u>Total</u>	<u>\$2,927,118</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>\$2,281,089</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>\$2,265,938</u>	<u>100.0</u>

a/Budget amount includes \$34,695 for the Indian Emphasis project.

b/Budget amounts for fiscal years 1979-80 include \$34,695 and \$17,345, respectively, for the Indian Emphasis project.

c/Total CSA and DOE funds available for the weatherization program for fiscal years 1978-79 were \$170,398 and \$123,292, respectively. These amounts include carryovers from the previous years so there is some duplication in the amounts. At the time of our fieldwork, all funds had not been received for fiscal year 1979.

d/Tulsa Agency did not receive weatherization funds from CSA during fiscal years 1979-80; however, as indicated in note c above, CSA funds were carried forward to fiscal years 1978-79.

e/On May 4, 1980, a separate Department of Education was created. The part of HEW providing this funding became the Department of Health and Human Services.

f/The part of HEW providing this funding became the Department of Education. (See note e.)