

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Reagan, Ronald: Gubernatorial Papers,
1966-74: Press Unit

Folder Title: California State Office of Economic Opportunity
– Evaluation Report 03/26/1971 (1 of 7)

Box: P27

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

CALIFORNIA STATE
OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

EVALUATION REPORT

March 26, 1971

Report Date: March 26, 1971

Field Work Date: March 1-5, 1971

Submitted to H. Rodger Betts, Regional Director,
Region IX, OEO, by James L. Young, Deputy Regional
Director, Region X, OEO, for the evaluation team.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
EVALUATION MODEL AND QUESTIONNAIRE	2
INTRODUCTION TO NARRATIVE SECTION	12
SEOO ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT	13
THE SEOO AND THE GOVERNOR	20
THE SEOO AND OTHER STATE AGENCIES	23
THE SEOO AND FEDERAL AGENCIES	26
THE SEOO AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNITY GROUPS	28
THE SEOO AND COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES	30
SUPPORTIVE FUNCTIONS.....	34
Training and Technical Assistance.....	34
Mobilization of Resources	35
Coordination and Planning	36
Grant Review, Monitoring, and Evaluation.....	37
Advocacy for the Poor.....	39
THE SEOO GRANTS	41
Regular Grant	41
STAP Grant.....	43
Demonstration Grant	44
Oakland Grant	45

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
THE SEOO AND THE REGIONAL OFFICE.....	48
THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND THE SEOO.....	52
OVERALL CONCLUSIONS	57
EVALUATION TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS	58
SUMMARY	60
ATTACHMENTS	62
TABULATIONS	
ANALYSIS OF MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE IN ALLOCATION OF STAFF MANPOWER RESOURCES	

INTRODUCTION

H. Rodger Betts, Regional Director, Region IX, OEO, in a letter addressed to Thomas H. Mercer, Regional Director, Region X, OEO, dated January 22, 1971, requested that James L. Young, Deputy Regional Director, Region X, lead an evaluation team to evaluate the California State Office of Economic Opportunity (see Attachments). Mr. Mercer agreed with Mr. Betts' request.

The evaluation was conducted under the authority of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, Section 233, which provides, for "continuing evaluation of programs under this title..." as well as General Grant Condition #9 and OEO Instruction 7501-1. Further, the California State Office of Economic Opportunity was advised of the forthcoming evaluation in H. Rodger Betts' letter to Lewis K. Uhler, California SEOO Director, dated February 1, 1971 (see Attachments). Mr. Uhler offered to cooperate fully with the evaluation team in a telephone call between Mr. Uhler and Mr. Young, leader of the evaluation team.

EVALUATION MODEL AND QUESTIONNAIRE

The evaluation model was based on obtaining personal interviews with persons having or expected to have direct knowledge of the activities of the California State Office of Economic Opportunity. To insure that a valid sampling of qualified opinions would be obtained it was determined that the following groups of persons would be interviewed:

- a. The California SEOO Director and his professional staff
- b. OEO, Region IX, professional staff
- c. As many CAA Executive Directors and Board Chairmen as feasible and practical within the limits of the time and geography
- d. Representatives of local governments and state and federal agencies who are involved in poverty-related matters or whose activities could reasonably be expected to include the need for coordination and planning with the California State Office of Economic Opportunity.
- e. Private local community groups whose activities are related to efforts to eliminate poverty.

A uniform information gathering questionnaire was prepared which could be used for personal interviews as well as for the gathering of information by mail. The questionnaire was based upon OEO Instruction 7501-1 entitled "The Role of the SEOO", the plans and priorities stated by the California SEOO in its most recent CAP Form 81, and the California SEOO work programs prepared following the format set out in CAP Form 7e (see Attachments). OEO Instruction 7501-1 is applicable to all State Offices of Economic Opportunity and is incorporated by reference into the grant as a grant condition by virtue of the preamble to the General Conditions governing the SEOO grant which state that "Program funds expended under authority of this grant are subject to the provisions of ... OEO directives." OEO directives are defined in grant condition 1.(c) as "Statements of policy and procedure published in the OEO publication system, ..." OEO instructions are part of the OEO publication system.

The questionnaire (see Attachments) was divided into eleven sections:

- a. SECTION I The SEOO and the Governor
- b. SECTION II The SEOO and Other State Agencies

- c. SECTION III The SEOO and Community Action Agencies
- d. SECTION IV The SEOO and Other Federal Agencies
- e. SECTION V The SEOO and Local Government
- f. SECTION VI The SEOO and Community Groups, Private Agencies, and General Public
- g. SECTION VII The SEOO and the OEO Regional Office
- h. SECTION VIII The OEO Regional Office and the SEOO
- i. SECTION IX Headquarters/OEO and the SEOO
- j. SECTION X SEOO Organization and Management
- k. SECTION XI SEOO Work Program - California

The evaluation team selected by Mr. Young, Deputy Regional Director, Region X, included the following:

- a. James L. Young, Region X, OEO, Deputy Regional Director
- b. James Coffee, SEOO Director, New Jersey
- c. Robert Tyson, SEOG Director, Iowa
- d. William Walker, former SEOO Director, Arkansas
- e. Michael Zainhofsky, SEOO Director, North Dakota
- f. Anthony Augustine, former CAA Director, Colorado
- g. Raymond Meliza, CAA Director, Oregon
- h. Hector Morales, CAA Director, Arizona
- i. Wallace Webster, II, CAA Director, Washington
- j. Richard White, Region IX, OEO, Chief, Governmental and Private Sector Relations
- k. Robert Bryan, Headquarters, OEO, Office of State and Local Government
- l. John Moller, Headquarters, OEO, Office of Administration, Systems Division
- m. John Kent, Region X, OEO, Regional Counsel

n. Charles Chong, Region X, OEO, District Supervisor, Oregon/
Alaska Field Team

o. Harold Whitehead, Region X, OEO, Senior Field Representative,
Oregon/Alaska Field Team

A methodology and interviewing policy was established for the evaluation. Basically, the evaluation was to be an assessment of performance based on the collective judgment of all members of the evaluation team, relying on their background and experience and applying that background and experience to the results of the numerous interviews which were to be conducted. Greater emphasis was to be placed on accomplishments than was to be placed on projects in process or ideas in the design stage. Good intentions were to be recognized, but measurable results were to be given priority. In addition to the information derived from the interviews through direct exchange between the person interviewed and the evaluation team member, additional information was derived from questionnaires which were sent to all those CAAs in the State of California which were not personally interviewed.

Monday, March 1, 1971, the team met in the San Francisco Regional Office and was given an extensive briefing on its mission by Mr. Young in which it was emphasized the evaluation was to be an objective assessment of performance and not an investigation. An intensive training session followed. Teams were assigned to Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Sacramento. The Sacramento Team was to interview the SEOO staff, CAA Directors and Board Chairmen in the Sacramento and Northern California area, the San Francisco Team was to conduct interviews with the Region IX staff, federal and state agencies, and CAA Directors and Board Chairmen in the San Francisco area, and the Los Angeles Team was to do the same in Southern California. It was emphasized that the following policies were to be observed throughout the evaluation:

a. No one was to be led to believe that their answers could be treated confidentially. No confidential information was desired. All answers, many of which might be statements of opinion, had to be what the interviewee could and would be willing to state publicly.

b. The evaluation would be fair, honest, and helpful.

c. Evaluators were to show the interviewee any notes taken during the interviews.

d. Interviewees were to be asked to review and initial the interview documents to insure accuracy.

Beginning Tuesday, March 2, 1971, and concluding Friday, March 5, 1971, personal interviews with at least 168 persons were conducted.

The complete list of prime respondents include:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>TENURE</u>
<u>SEOO Senior Staff</u>			
Lewis K. Uhler	SEOO-California	Director	8 mos
John G. Sawicki	"	Asst. Director	8 mos
Barney Shur	"	Dep. Director for TA	2 mos
Robert B. Hawkins	"	Asst. Director for Ops	7 mos
Leonard H. Down	"	Staff Asst.-Planning	6 mos
<u>SEOO Field Staff</u>			
Kenneth M. Trigger ✓	SEOO-California	Comm. Prog. Analyst	4 mos
B. L. Carlton	"	Comm. Prog. Analyst	6 mos
D. McKee	"	Asst. Director-Legal	2 mos
John R. Frane	"	STAP Housing Spec.	1 yr
Stephen M. Archer	"	Spec. Project Coord.	6 mos
Theresa McInnes	"	VISTA Coordinator	6 mos
A. Chickering	"	Comm. Dev.-Gen. Counsel	6 mos
T. Carter	"	Econ. Dev. Spec.	3 yrs
B. Taylor ✓	"	Child Dev. Coord.	6 mos
George E. Goff	"	Program Analyst	5 mos
Geoffrey L. Clark	"	CPA	6 mos
John Fattorini	"	Asst. Dir.-Legal Svcs	1 mo
Karen Russo	"	Legal Svcs Staff Asst.	3 mos
Dean McGrath	"	CPA	6 mos
E. M. Peterson	"	Comm. Prog. Analyst	2 yrs
Hubert L. Cunningham	"	Technical Assistant	5 mos
Anthony P. Gurule	"	CPA	1½ yrs
H. Kludjian	"	CPA	6 mos
H. Brown	"	CPA	2½ yrs
Richard W. Thies ✓	"	CPA	6 mos
Charles E. Blaker	"	Spec. TA Counselor	4 mos
Glenn R. Whiteley	"	Systems Evaluator	4 mos
Sal J. Espana	"	Intergov't Coord.	3 yrs
Gil Archuletta	"	✓ Supervisor - CPA's	4 mos
<u>Regional Office Staff</u>			
William L. Smith	OEO, Region IX	Chief PM&S Division	6 yrs
Charles A. Wilson	"	Planning Officer	3 yrs
Joseph Rowell	"	Chief T/PS Branch	7 mos
Carl F. Ehman	"	Chief VISTA	4 yrs

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>TENURE</u>
<u>Regional Office Staff (Continued)</u>			
Paul Katz	OEO Region IX	SEOO Coordinator	5 yrs
Raymond B. Auker	"	Health Svcs Coord.	3 yrs
Naomi Mitchell	"	Gov't Rel. Coord.	4 yrs
Nathan Mitzman	"	Model Cities Coord.	6 yrs
Tom Mack	"	Legal Svcs Director	1½ yrs

Regional Office Field Staff

Richard Morton	OEO Region IX	Field Rep	3 yrs
Calvin Williams	"	Senior Field Rep	4 yrs
Joan Lenihan	"	Field Rep	4 yrs
C. Mack Hall	"	Chief, Fld Ops Div.	3 yrs
Charles Overhalt	"	Field Rep	3 yrs
Barbara Salinas	"	Field Rep	1 mo
Francisco Camplis	"	Field Rep	3 yrs
Gregorio Coronado	"	Field Rep	1 mo
Harry M. Berberian	"	Admin Officer	3 yrs
Frankie W. Jacobs	"	Division Chief	3 yrs
Carlton Dias	"	Field Rep	3 yrs
David Garcia	"	Field Rep	1 mo
Daphne T. Lyckman	"	Field Rep	2 yrs
Sue Oliver	"	Field Rep	3 yrs
Gaylyn N. Boone	"	Field Rep	4½ yrs
Olympio S. Galon	"	Field Rep	3½ yrs
Douglas Peterson	"	Field Rep	2½ yrs
David Cooper	"	Field Rep	2 yrs
Marguerite Mendoza	"	Field Rep	3 yrs
Charles Stone	"	Field Rep	3 yrs
Willie G. Hall	"	Program Officer VISTA	4 yrs
Mike Aguirre	"	Program Officer VISTA	3 mos
Charles J. Tooker	"	Program Manager VISTA	2½ yrs

CAA Directors - Personal Interviews

Dick Brown	Santa Cruz CAA	Executive Director	2 yrs
*(B.L. Minnus	"	Admin Assistant)	
*(R. Shapiro	"	Dir. of Svc Center	2 yrs)
*(D. Alvaugh	"		
Carlos Ramos	Orange Co CAA	Executive Director	1 yr
Philip Wing	PCHNO	Executive Director	4 mos
Harvey Howard	Compton-Willwbk	Deputy Director	3 yrs
Ernie Sprinkles	EYOA	Executive Director	5 yrs
David A. Pollard	Placer Co CAC	Executive Director	2 yrs
Neil Bodine	Stanislaus Co.	Executive Director	2½ yrs
Salvador Velasquez	Rio Hondo AAC	Executive Director	1½ yrs

*Participated in interview

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>TENURE</u>
<u>CAA Directors - (Continued)</u>			
Richard H. Flint	Merced Co CAA	Executive Director	2 yrs
Seale Fuller	EOA of Yolo Co	Executive Director	3½ yrs
Naaman Brown	Sacramento EOC	Executive Director	4 yrs
F. S. Kennedy	DPC SanBernadino	Acting Exec. Director	1½ mos
Donald Handly	Madera Co AC	Acting Exec. Director	2 mos
Mario Guzman	EOC San Diego	Executive Director	4½ yrs
Anthony Gutierrez	CAC San Joaquin	Executive Director	1 yr
* (G. Beyer	"	Prog. Planning Coord.)	
Carl P. Wallace	Long Beach Comm.	Executive Director	4 yrs
Cameron Hendry	EOC Imperial Co	Executive Director	3½ yrs
John Dukes	EOC San Francisco	Executive Director	3½ yrs
George Johnson	Contra Costa Co	Executive Director	1 yr
L. A. Johnson	EOB Riverside	Executive Director	6 yrs
Percy Moore	OEDCI	Executive Director	3 yrs

CAA Directors - (interviewed by mail)

William F. Nicholas	L.A. Reg. Family Planning Cncl	Executive Director	1½ yrs
E. Del Hyde	Butte Co EOC	Executive Director	1½ yrs
Joe Williams	Fresno Co EOC	Executive Director	3 mos
Robert W. Amburn	Eldorado CAA	Executive Director	8 mos
Edward R. Becks	San Mateo EOC	Executive Director	3 yrs
Edward D. Taylor	Kern Co EOC	Executive Director	8 mos
Arthur Collins	Lassen-Modoc-Plumas&Tehaina	Executive Director	9 mos
Roberto Acosta	So. Alameda EOA	Executive Director	3½ yrs
W. Robert Lomax	Marin Co EOC	Executive Director	2 yrs
Nathan Unikel	Tulare Co CAA	Executive Director	
David W. Hermon	Ventura Co CAA	Deputy Director	
Stephen Graham	Napa Co CEO	Executive Director	4 yrs
Bill Gooch	Sonoma Co People Grant Mgr (for the for Econ. Opp. acting director)		

CAA Directors - Not Tabulated, (questionnaires)

Edde Marrufo	EOC S. Luis Obispo	Executive Director	3 yrs
Paul Forbes	Shasta Co CAP	Executive Director	2½ yrs

*Participated in interview

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>TENURE</u>
<u>Board Chairman - (personal interviews)</u>			
Leo Giobetti	Merced Co CAA	Chairman	2½ yrs
Willie R.Hausey	Sacramento EOC	Chairman	5 yrs
O.M. Custer	Sacramento EOC	Vice Chairman	3½ yrs
William Venturi	Madera Co CAC	Chairman	1 yr
L. D. Hines	Placer Co CAC	Chairman	2 yrs
Paul F. Clark	Stanislaus CAC	Chairman	2 yrs
Joseph Bacarro	CAC SanJoaquin	Pres-Bd of Directors	2 yrs
Juanita Morales	EYCA	Chairman	3 yrs
J. J. Thompson	Orange Co CAC	Pres of Board	2 yrs
Audry M. Rhoads	Compton-Wilwbrk	Chairman	3 yrs
Adolpho Hernandez	Rio Hondo AAC	Chairman	2 mos
William H. Moreno	EOC Imperial Co	Chairman	3 yrs
Elizabeth Moore	Long Beach Comm	Chairman	5 yrs
Fred Martinez	EOC San Diego	Chairman	5 yrs
Delfino Segovia	DPC SanBernadino	Acting Achirman	3 yrs
Nick Rodriquez	ContraCosta Co	Chairman	1 yr
Father Williams	CAP Chmn Assoc	Chairman	6 yrs

Board Chairman (interviewed by mail)

Ralph Sanson	CAB Santa Cruz	Chairman	2½ yrs
John V. Albright	Shasta Co CAP	Chairman	2½ yrs
Jose Garcia	So Alameda Co	Chairman	
Gerald Monroe	San Mateo Co	Chairman	3 yrs

State Agencies

Samuel J. Cullers	Governor's Ofc Plnng/Research	Director	5 yrs
John A. Svatini	Public Welfare	Asst. Director	2 mos
Gordon Finley	Dpt of Commerce	Ch-Econ Dev Div	12 yrs
Jack Baker	Dpt of Gen Svcs	Planning Officer	1 mo
* (E. Christensen)	"	Personnel Analyst	
* (R. McDonald)	"	Personnel Officer	
Jeanada Nolan	Dpt of Educ.	Chmn-Comp PreSchool Educ. Programs	4½ yrs
* (R. Reyes)	"	Chmn-CmnSvc-Migrants)	
* (J. Jordan)	"	Follow-Thru Coord.)	
* (L. Lopez)	"	Dir - Comp. Educ)	
* (E. D. Graf)	"	Ch-Prog, Plnng-VE)	
R. A. Bernheimer	State Pers. Bd	Supvr-Career Oppors.	3 yrs
Dr. Louis Hertz	Public Health		6 yrs
John Saulsberry	Dpt of Educ VE/MDT	Asst Reg Supvr	7 yrs
Thomas N. Duffy	Ofc of Lt Gov.	Ch-Intergov't Mgmt	1½ yrs

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>TENURE</u>
<u>Federal Agencies</u>			
F. A. Zimmerman	HEW	Asst.Dir. for Inter- gov't Op & CommAffrs	24 yrs
Earl Singer	HUD	Advisor - Plng, Eval & Public Admin	
Reno Kramer	HUD	Intergov't Rel Ofcr	
Keith Axtell	HUD	Human Res. Advisor	
Andrew Corcoran	HUD	Ofc of Equal Oppor	
Tad Masaoka	HUD	Inter-agency Coord.	
William N. Brown	HUD	Citzns Partic. Advisor	4½ yrs
Arthur Douglas	DOL	Dep Assoc Reg'l Mnpwr Administrator	10 yrs
Robert E. Reynolds	DOL	"	6 yrs
Ruben Avelar	DOL	"	10 yrs
Philip T. Lawton	DOL	Assoc Reg Mnpwr Adm.	8 yrs
Donald McLarnan	SBA	Regional Director	9 yrs
*(C.D.Ryan	"	Ch-Procurement & Mgt)	
*(R.S.Garrett	"	Econ Dev Spec)	
*(R.J.Koester	"	Asst Ch - Finance)	
*(C.P.Blackledge	"	Chmn-Comm Econ Dev)	
*(G.A.Rands	"	Deputy Director)	
*(T.H.Sweeney	"	Ch - Admin Division)	
Hugh Taylor	Dpt of Commerce	Econ Dev Rep	2 yrs
George Monica	HEW	Chief - Operations	1½ yrs
*(G.Stern)			
*(B.O'Hara)			
*(G.Beford)			
*(H.Tharpe)			
<u>Local Government</u>			
Randy W. Harrison	League of Calif Cities		4 yrs
J. P. McBrien	Ofc of Co Admin	Co Administrator	13 yrs
Reveles Cayton	City/Co of San Francisco	DepDir-Social Progs.	3 yrs
Frank Gonzalez	Mayor's Ofc San Bernadino	Dir - Manpower Dev	6 mos
Elmer Keshka	Co of San Diego	Asst to Chairman - Admin Officer	11 yrs
M.Earl Chapin	Probation Dept Riverside	Delinquency Prev Coord	1½ yrs
Emil Lubick	Longbeach CC	Dean of College	3½ yrs
DuBois McGee	City of ElCentro	Rep of Mayor	5 yrs
Elder Gunter	City of Stockton	City Manager	2 yrs

* participated in interview

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>TENURE</u>
<u>Local Government (Continued)</u>			
Clifford Wisdom	San Joaquin Co	Chmn - Bd of Supvrs	8 yrs
Mayor Maclaskey	Rocklin, Calif	Mayor	10 mos
Lee Davies	Modesta, Calif	Mayor	4 yrs
J. B. Poolini	Placer Co	County Supervisor	14 yrs
Felton Mailes	Ofc - Co Exec Sacramento	Admin Analyst	7 yrs
*(G.W.Sparrow	"	Admin Analyst)	
*(E.T.Gualco	"	Chmn - Bd of Supvrs)	
*(C.L.Strauch	"	Admin Asst.)	
Johnnie Ramondini	Merced Co	Chmn - Bd of Supvrs	7 yrs
H. E. Haggan	Co Supvr Assoc of Calif	Ch - Asst Gen Mgr	3 yrs
Lionel B. Cade	City of Compton	Councilman	7 yrs
Ray Villa	Santa Ana City	Councilman	2 yrs
<u>Community Groups</u>			
Ron Rhone	Richmond Model Cities	Director C.E.P.	3 yrs
Cynthia Williams	NCNW ContraCosta		
Mildred J. Germany	Nat'l Cncl of Negro Women	Representative	
Ralph Petry	San Pablo Comm Change Found.	General Manager	4 yrs
Ernest Salwen	Social Welfare	Voc Svcs Supvr	5 yrs
Mary L. Miller	League of Women Voters	Member at Large	3 mos
Clarice Bean	Co Neighborhood Youth Corp.	Counselor	3 yrs
Lillie Mae Jones	Dpt of Educ.	Voc. Specialist	3 yrs
John R. Garside	ContraCosta Coll.	Supvr - MDTA	3 yrs
Richard R. Lower	DOL (On loan fm Calif ES Agency)	Manpwr Admin's Rep	25 yrs
Virtual Murrell	OEDCI (Oakland)	Vice President	1½ yrs
Ben J. Aitemon	SE Poverty Comm	Chairman	2½ yrs
Josephine Marcus	DPC SanBernadino	Board Member	1½ yrs
Jose Casares	Longbeach Comm	Board Member	6 mos
Latarska Graham	SE Anti-Poverty Council	Rep to OEC Board	2½ yrs
Bernard M. Ruedas	El Rancho - Pico Rivera Kiwanis	Member	6 mos
Joe Romero	Headstart Advisory Cncl	President	6 mos
Fannie M. Leonard	StMartin's Sr. Citizens	Chairman	2 yrs

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>TENURE</u>
<u>Community Groups (Continued)</u>			
Lewis W. Perry	Poverty Cncl PCHNO	Chairman	3½ yrs
William Harmel	HRD-Stockton	Manager	10 yrs
Laverne Adams	NE Neighborhood Center	Vice Chmn of Bd	3 yrs
*(C.Marsicano)			
*(B.Wydner)			
David Echols	Dpt of Welfare	Director	7.5 yrs
W. J. Waillett	WRO	President	6 yrs
J. Creason	Airport Dist. NeighborhoodCncl	Chairman	3 mos
Joe Sanders	Neighborhood Cncl Sacramento	Chairman	3 yrs
Virginia Darling	PCAC - Rocklin	Vice Chairman	4 yrs
Janet McGrew	Ofc - Headstart Parents Adv Cncl		
Gilbert Macias	Merced Co Coop	President	1 yr
*(E.Casiam)			
*(A.D.Gardner)			
<u>Other</u>			
Pat Vogel	Madera Co AC	Admin Officer	2½ yrs
Robert L. Minnus	Santa Cruz CoCAA	Admin Asst.	2 yrs
Kermit G. Bailer	Social Dynamics	Vice Pres-Prog Admin	8 mos
Gerald Wilson	Control Systems Research	Regional Manager	1 yr
Steven Levine	Westinghouse Learning Corp	T/A Coordinator	1 yr
Albert Kennefick	American Tech Asst Corp	Manager	
Chris Latham	Peat,Marwick & Mitchell	Consultant in Mgmt	6 mos
Robert Shapiro	Santa Cruz CoCAA	Svc Center Director	2 yrs
Alfred G. Edmonds	Marin Co EOC	Admin Director	9 mos

INTRODUCTION TO NARRATIVE SECTION

The Narrative Section is divided into four parts. The first part deals with the SEOO organization and internal management. The second part deals with the SEOO in its relationship with various entities such as state agencies, community action agencies, and federal agencies. The third part deals with the SEOO's performance of certain functions such as resource mobilization, coordination and planning, advocacy for the poor, etc. The final section deals with the SEOO's performance under the four grants which it has received from the Office of Economic Opportunity which are: (1) its regular Grant # CG-0364-E/2/4 in the amount of \$488,564, (2) a STAP Grant # CG-0364-E for the provision of special technical assistance to rural community action agencies in California in the amount of \$114,184, (3) a special Demonstration Grant # CG-9093-A/2 to provide "administrative technical assistance" in the amount of \$162,170, and (4) the "Oakland" Demonstration Grant # CG-9093-A/1 in the amount of \$27,718 which allowed the SEOO to place a special technical assistance consultant in Oakland Economic Development Council, Inc.

The Narrative Section represents the best efforts of the evaluation team to achieve a consensus and provide a collective assessment of how the California SEOO was perceived by the persons interviewed. Each Narrative Section is divided according to findings, conclusions, and where appropriate, recommendations.

SECO ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

1. ORGANIZATION:

a. Facts: The California SECO is part of the Department of Human Resource Development (DHRD) which in turn is part of the Human Relations Agency headed by a Secretary who is a member of the Governor's Cabinet.

b. Findings: Although the SECO is placed within Human Relations Agency under the DHRD for administrative and logistical support, the SECO's placement does not represent the actual command line. The SECO has direct contact and access to the Governor's Executive Assistant. This appears to be a verbal agreement for no documentation for it could be found.

c. Recommendation: The relationship of the SECO to the Governor and the SECO to the Director of DHRD should be made a matter of written record (formal Delegation of Authority, etc.).

2. INTERNAL ORGANIZATION:

a. Facts: An organization chart prepared in mid-February 1971 is in existence (see Attachments). It is partially obsolete and confusing since many key personnel "wear two hats". The chart also does not agree with the grant breakdown shown on the personnel roster.

b. Findings: While apparently still in a state of flux, the internal organization seems to have moved toward the principle of division into Operations and Administration, with a special staff (General Counsel, Planning, Finance/Budget, and Program Analysis). Special staff functions are dual and additional, but not necessarily secondary functions of Line Supervisors (Sawicki, McKee, Hawkins, Downs, and Schur). There are contradictory statements pertaining to Chickering's (STAP) role as General Counsel.

c. Recommendation: The organization chart should be simplified and should show the Operations/Administration breakdown, with boxes for Special Staff.

3. STAFFING:

a. Facts: Including the Director, the office consists of 29 professionals and 14 clerical support persons, for a total of 43 personnel. Professionals are exempt from Civil Service requirements, although a small number who transferred into SEOO from other state agencies have permanent State Civil Service status. Clerical personnel are under State Civil Service.

b. Findings: The staff appears adequate to perform the work program. Utilization of individual professionals is usually according to plan, but there are exceptions (e.g., Chickering). Clerical staff will probably be more than adequate (one for each two professionals) when they have caught up with the current backlog.

c. Recommendation: Performance of responsibilities for which individuals were approved should be given precedence over additional special staff duties and task force assignments which should be held to a minimum for STAP personnel.

4. QUALIFICATION OF PERSONNEL:

a. Facts:

(1) Clerical personnel are well qualified; speed, quality, and appearance of work, cooperativeness, etc., compare favorably with normal standards. Phones are answered promptly and politely. Appearance is neat. They are punctual in the morning, and there appeared (at least while the evaluation team was present) to be no rush to get out of the office at quitting time.

(2) Professionals show good general qualifications such as education, intelligence, supervisory abilities, etc., but there is in many cases a pronounced lack of special qualifications for the job for which they were hired, such as exposure to and experience in OEO-related subjects. Many of the recently hired personnel have some investigative experience. Access to Sawicki's and Uhler's resumes was denied.

b. Findings:

(1) Some of the professionals interviewed, e.g., McKee, Fattorini, Schur, and Downs, appeared to be genuinely motivated and in sympathy with OEO philosophy and goals. In others there seemed to be more of a desire to get the job done as ordered. It must not be forgotten, however, that there is no job protection, no status, no "bumping" rights, etc., and anybody who displeases the "boss" can be summarily fired.

(2) Although newly assigned personnel are given pre-service and on-the-job training, the lack of experience in OEO-related

subjects necessarily tends to make them ineffective during the first several months, even under ideal conditions of proper motivation, good instruction, etc. Given the actual situation and SEOO philosophy which places so much emphasis on the evaluation aspects of field work, it is doubtful whether the Community Program Analysts can ever be as helpful to the grantees as OEO Instruction 7501-1 envisions.

c. Recommendation: More emphasis should be placed on the hiring of professionals based on actual experience and personal involvement in OEO-related activities. The special conditions pertaining to accessions, e.g., approval of candidate by selection panels on which regional and national OEO are represented (as specified, for example, in the STAP grants) should be scrupulously observed.

5. PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT:

a. Recruitment, Selection, and Hiring:

(1) Facts:

(a) Clerical personnel fall under State Civil Service requirements. Positions must be advertised, and applicants are selected from those adjudged best qualified by the State Personnel Board.

(b) Professional personnel are, upon selection by SEOO, appointed officially by the DHRD Personnel Section (Management Services Division).

(2) Recommendation: None.

b. Pay, Fringe Benefits, Leave, Career Development and Civil Rights:

(1) Facts: Clerical personnel, being under State Civil Service, enjoy automatic benefits and protection. The same provisions are applied to the exempt Civil Service professionals except job protection. A quasi-career development or career ladder is provided by the opportunity to advance if a vacancy occurs from Community Program Analyst to Technical Assistance Specialist or supervisor, or transfer into a STAP slot.

(2) Recommendation: The possibility of a career ladder plan for professionals should be considered.

c. Training:

(1) Facts: Both Sawicki and Hawkins acknowledged the need for additional training, particularly for field personnel, and

stated interest in participating in Federal training conferences, seminars, etc.

(2) Recommendation: The Region should provide the SEOO with a schedule of training activities and encourage SEOO participation. The SEOO should take fullest possible advantage of Federal and other training opportunities.

d. Supervision and Evaluation:

(1) Facts: Clerical personnel in the office work under direct supervision. State Civil Service annual evaluation requirements appear to be fulfilled. Field personnel have definite assignments (see Attachments). An itinerary of field trips is filed with the supervisor for one month in advance (this procedure was initiated in February, 1971). Trip reports are on a new form (since January) made for each trip; however, they are held by the Community Program Analyst or the Technical Assistance Specialist until the end of the month when an activity report is prepared (see Attachments). Field personnel are on the "honor" system; two work out of their homes. There is no formal evaluation of professionals. They are judged by the results of their labor.

(2) Findings: The SEOO has made an effort to provide better and clearer instructions to field personnel by designing check lists for evaluation (see attachments) of Legal Services and CAA compliance. They have also designed a form entitled "Information Package Review" which the Community Program Analysts are responsible for completing and updating. This form is kept in the grant folder (see Attachments). Some monthly reports of field personnel for January were made available to the evaluation team. Some field reports were considered CONFIDENTIAL in order to protect information sources and were not, therefore, made available to the evaluation team. Due to high workloads during December and January, reports for this period have not yet been prepared. A single report, covering December, January, and February is now under preparation.

(3) Recommendation: Field personnel should be required to file trip reports with their supervisors immediately upon returning from a field trip rather than at the end of the month. These reports should indicate the actual time spent and the exact subjects discussed with each grantee or person visited.

6. CIVIL RIGHTS:

a. Facts:

(1) Of the professional staff (those exempt from Civil Service) 23 are listed as Caucasian, one as Eurasian, two as Mexican-American, and three as Negro. Of the staff covered by Civil Service

13 are listed as Caucasian, and one as Negro. Therefore, the total staff breakdown is:

Caucasians	36
Negroes	4
Mexican-American	2
Eurasian	1

(2) No affirmative action plan as required by CAP Form 11 has been implemented.

b. Recommendation: An affirmative action plan in accordance with CAP Form 11 should be implemented. Attention should be given to whether the minority composition of the staff fairly reflects the proportions of minority persons in the State of California and, particularly, among the poverty population of the State.

7. ACCOUNTING AND FINANCE:

a. Facts: These activities are handled by the Fiscal Section of the Management Services Division. They prepare the monthly CAP 15s for Mr. Uhler's signature.

b. Findings: Internal controls have been set up. Leonard Downs keeps tabs on expenditures and Miss Pearson checks travel vouchers, mileage claims, etc., against the activity reports of the individual concerned. Downs checks CAP 15s as prepared by DHRD against his records, and initials them before sending them to the SEOO Director for signature. Downs is also preparing the budget for the next year. In absence of a funding guidance he is using the present budget as a starting point.

c. Recommendation: None.

8. FILES:

a. Facts: Files inherited from the previous SEOO staff (pre-July 1, 1970) were very inadequate. Subject headings were used for filing, and there was no cross-referencing. Downs requested help from General Services, who trained his file clerk to set up a duo-decimal system. Most of the files have been integrated into the new system. There is a chronological reading file maintained by the SEOO's secretary for all correspondence emanating from the entire office. There is a complete set of OEO instructions and CAP directives which was recently received from OEO Headquarters. There is a library of publications, which is in a state of disarray.

b. Recommendation: Memoranda for record should be added to correspondence in the chronological reading file to explain the nature of correspondence. The library should be inventoried, obsolete material discarded, and obsolete files retired or destroyed.

9. OTHER FILES:

a. Personnel Folders:

(1) Facts:

(a) The SEOO maintains a convenience file of Personnel Folders; the official files are kept by the DHRD Personnel Section and State Personnel Board (computerized file of all State employees).

(b) The convenience files are not uniform in content; some contain job applications or resumes; most hold transcripts of driving records and social security information on previous employment (used to check salary statements). Regarding driving records, the SEOO has requested pertinent State offices (State Police and Motor Vehicle Bureau) to notify the office of all driving violations committed by SEOO personnel. None of the six files chosen at random contained a position description.

(2) Recommendation: All personnel files should contain resumes of qualifications as well as position description for which employee is hired. Folders should also contain name, address, and telephone number of persons to be notified in case of emergency, and home telephone numbers should be prominently displayed for emergency contact of employee. Further, CAP Memo 23A requires that biographies of key personnel be submitted to the Regional Office within seven days after appointment.

b. Telephone Message File:

(1) Facts: Telephone message pads are provided with carbon, so that messages are automatically made out in duplicate, the original going to the addressee and the copy remaining with the secretary.

(2) Recommendation: None.

c. Newspaper Clipping File:

(1) Facts: A contract is let through State procurement channels for a newspaper clipping service. Clippings are received daily; office personnel fasten them to letter-sized backings, and file them in a Pendaflex-type hanging file. The file is used for background information on individual grantees or subjects of OEO concern and to keep SEOO personnel advised of latest developments. Cost of clipping service varies with volume, but averages \$250.00 per month according to the Budget Officer. In an attempt to lower costs, requirements for Headstart information were eliminated last December; increased publicity on CRLA and Oakland during the last few months have kept costs at relatively the same levels despite dropping the Headstart requirement. Downs hopes, however, that now

U
volume will decrease and the price of the service will level at approximately \$100.00 per month.

(2) Recommendation:

(a) In view of high cost of the clipping service, it should be evaluated as to relative cost-effectiveness and, if maintained, should be shown as a specific item in the budget.

(b) Clippings should be xeroxed for cross-references, and copies filed in the duo-decimal file grantee folders.

10. MANPOWER ALLOCATION:

See "Analysis of Management Performance in Allocation of Staff Manpower Resources" for an assessment of the performance of the SEOO in the control and application of staff manpower resources.

11. GENERAL COMMENTS:

Overall internal management of SEOO Office procedures to date has been good. There have been very apparent recent improvements in the management of the office, in controls instituted over personnel, in the provision of checklists for Community Program Analysts and in the design of forms and the requirements for periodic reports. A duo-decimal file system has been installed. These improvements have been instituted during the last few months, and can be expected to show tangible results in the foreseeable future. However, shortcomings in the qualifications of professionals, particularly lack of experience and previous exposure to the problems they are expected to solve or give advice on solving, have had a deleterious effect on the quality of their work and their effectiveness in the field. Coupled with what is perceived as a completely opposite philosophical outlook, this further undermines whatever remaining confidence grantees may have in the SEOO.

There still is no affirmative action plan in accordance with CAP Form 11; work goals and priorities are not quantified; there has been no self-evaluation report. Assurances have been made that these shortcomings will be eliminated prior to the submission of the next program year's application.

At least eight CAAs reported they had never received a CAP form 76. The grant document showed eight CAP 76s; two contained adverse comments. Although they were the subject of discussions in the office, no rebuttal was attempted. Plans and priorities as well as refunding requests were, according to Regional and Headquarters personnel, submitted late last year. This was prior to the appointment of the present SEOO administration. A new budget for the next program year is under preparation and assurances have been made that all necessary documents will be submitted to Region IX on time, including a self-evaluation report.

THE SEOO AND THE GOVERNOR

1. FINDINGS:

The SEOO has provided the Governor with information and advice with respect to the policy and programs of OEO and other anti-poverty resources. This information and advice is ordinarily channeled through the Governor's Executive Assistant, Edwin Meese, III. Lewis Uhler, Director of the California SEOO, stated that "The Governor has delegated his Section 242 (EOA of 1964, as amended) responsibilities to his Executive Assistant, Edwin Meese, III, who has the power to approve or disapprove funding grants. We have direct and regular access to Mr. Meese, as well as periodic access to the Governor himself. For organizational symmetry and logistical support, our office has been placed in the Department of Human Resources Development." On especially serious matters, information and advice have been provided directly to the Governor by the SEOO Director as in the case of the veto of the California Rural Legal Assistance program. Lewis Uhler cited the following occasions during the past three months when advice was provided directly to the Governor:

"In December, 1971, we briefed the Governor on information we had received on California Rural Legal Assistance (CRLA). In January, 1971, we met with the Governor to discuss the design of the alternative program to CRLA-- Ajudicare. In February, 1971, we met with the Governor to discuss the status of legal services generally, as well as the progress of the private funding of an Ajudicare alternative, plus discussion of various community action agencies."

Uhler also cited the following instances when grants and contracts have been disapproved by the Governor in the recent past. "Grants disapproved by the Governor since July 1, 1970, California Rural Legal Assistance; Oakland Economic Development Council, Inc.; Santa Cruz (which was a conditional veto); and the Mafundi Institute. (We have approved, or allowed to lapse, approximately 140 programs since July 1, 1970.)"

A recent example of an effort to develop information on the conditions of poverty within the State took place in Oakland. Uhler reported that "We have run on a contract basis with a well qualified, independent contractor a motivational research study about the City of Oakland, with specific reference to OEDCI, to determine its effectiveness as a deliverer of services and advocate for the poor,

as well as to determine its relationship to the community at large. (The cost was approximately \$8,000 - \$10,000.)"

There is no question that the SEOO Director has direct input to the Governor of California and is in almost daily contact with the Governor's Executive Assistant. This relationship exists in spite of the fact that in the formal table of organization the California SEOO is several structural layers below the Governor's Office. It is obvious, also, that the Governor holds the staff of the California SEOO in high esteem and has relied to a substantial degree on the information and recommendations which the SEOO staff has made in determining whether to veto, to approve, or to allow the time period to approve or veto a grant to elapse.

Although the SEOO has not heretofore provided an annual written analysis to the Governor highlighting the principal problems and causes of poverty in the State and including recommended priorities and types of programs to meet those problems, the SEOO, in response to instructions from H. Rodger Betts, Regional Director, Region IX, is now in the process of preparing such a written analysis. Assurances have been made that an annual report of the type described in OEO Instruction 7501-1, 6a, will be submitted to the Governor and to Region IX, OEO, prior to the end of the current program year.

While the Governor reportedly has not exercised his authority to request the termination of assignments of VISTA Volunteers, under Section 810 (b) of the EOA of 1964, as amended, the SEOO has informed the Governor of VISTA activities within the State. John Sawicki, Uhler's Administrative Assistant, reported that "concentrated VISTA reviews" had taken place with respect to the following VISTA programs: Shasta, Oakland, Lawyers Committee, Santa Clara County, and Berkeley VISTA. The SEOO in a letter to Carl Ehmman, Region IX, VISTA Chief, dated February 1, 1971, recommended a reduction in the number of lawyers to be assigned to the Legal Aid Society of Santa Clara County (see Attachments).

2. CONCLUSIONS:

The SEOO plays a significant role in advising the Governor, usually through Edwin Meese, III, the Governor's Executive Assistant, on matters affecting poverty programs and poverty program grantees within the State of California. The apparent low-ranking status of the SEOO when viewed from a table of organization point of view is counter-balanced by the direct line of communication which exists from the SEOO Director to the Governor's Executive Assistant.

The quality of advice given to the Governor is a question which is influenced by what the CAAs and WR/OEO staff believe the SEOO's philosophy to be. This philosophy, while not articulated in any specific document or statement is exemplified by the style of the actions taken by the SEOO with respect to various OEO grantees

since July 1, 1970. The section of this report dealing with the SECO and the CAAs best illustrates the attitude revealed by this style. It can be summarily stated, however, that the conclusion of the evaluation team was that the attitude of the SECO was, for the most part, one of antagonism toward the CAAs and the community action program, and that SECO personnel assigned to assist CAAs acted more investigative than helpful, more as observers than as active participants assigned the job of aiding the CAAs in program development and providing technical assistance. Presumably, the attitudes displayed by the SECO representatives had the approval of the SECO Director and those to whom he reported.

THE SEOO AND OTHER STATE AGENCIES

State Agency Directors, or their designees, were interviewed from ten agencies of the State of California. Staff present to advise them in regard to their answers were an additional eight persons, for a total of 18 state officials interviewed outside the SEOO staff itself.

Representatives of the following agencies were interviewed:

- a. Human Resources Development Department
- b. Department of Social Welfare
- c. Department of Commerce
- d. Office of Intergovernmental Relations (Lieutenant Governor)
- e. State Personnel Board
- f. General Services Department
- g. Department of Education
- h. State Planning Office
- i. Department of Public Health

Also interviewed was a member of the staff of the California Legislative Analyst who supplied a copy of the recent budget analysis of the SEOO which is prepared for the California Legislature.

The officials interviewed were asked to report, to the best of their knowledge, on the SEOO's performance of the following functions in connection with other state agencies:

- a. Representing the Governor on matters related to the poor.
- b. Providing information on matters related to the poor and poverty.
- c. Mobilizing and coordinating state agency resources on behalf of the poor.
- d. Acting as a special advocate for the poor within state government.

1. PERCEPTIONS:

Most of the state officials interviewed knew little of what the SEOO had done. Items mentioned by some of the officials responding in relationship to the functions referred above are as follows:

a. The SEOO sponsored a meeting in December, 1970, to which were invited many state agency heads and rural CAA Executive Directors. State agency programs and resources were explained.

b. A written agreement was signed February 3, 1971, by SEOO Director Lewis K. Uhler and Thomas Duffy, Office of Intergovernmental Relations (Lieutenant Governor) agreeing to carry out joint studies leading to the pilot merging of one or more CAAs (e.g., Fresno) with Model Cities agencies (see Attachments).

c. In early 1971, the subject of welfare reform was discussed between Mr. Uhler and ten Welfare Department representatives.

d. The California Air National Guard, State Wildlife and Fisheries Department, and State Department of Forestry were contacted to see whether volunteer dentists could be flown into isolated Indian communities and be given special hunting and fishing privileges as an incentive to provide dental care for the Indians.

e. Lewis Uhler, California SEOO Director, described one example of the efforts of the SEOO to expedite state agency certification procedures as follows:

"We have had significant coordination with the Business and Transportation Agency and their Department of Housing and Community Development, placing them in contact with Dukor Modular Systems, Inc., to help expedite the certification process for this factory-built housing company that is meeting the low and moderate income housing needs in the State. The RESULTS were that within one week a certification came through which involved a process within the Department of Housing and Community Development whereby, once certified, Dukor is seemed to have met all local building codes or standards."

2. FINDINGS:

The State Interagency Conference for rural CAAs was seen as excellent and useful by most participants; however, follow up was apparently left to two STAP consultants, one of whom left the SEOO soon thereafter. As a result, there was very little follow up. The Farmers Home Administration apprenticeship ("intern") program discussed

elsewhere in this report was a product of the December conference. It appears that the Regional Office of OEO was neither notified of nor invited to the conference.

The dentist project mentioned above reportedly fell through later because regulations did not permit the Air National Guard to transport the dentists as planned. (The California Private Pilots' Association was then contacted in effort to provide transportation for the dentists to the reservation.)

The California Legislative Analyst is withholding a recommendation for an increase in funding to the SEOO pending a review of the "review reports" rendered (by the SEOO) on these diverse local projects ...to determine whether the reports are accurate and whether the projects are effective." (See attached Budget Analysis.)

3. CONCLUSION:

The SEOO has done some work with state agencies, more than is apparently known by CAAs and the OEO Regional office. However, it has not performed this function to the extent that state agencies themselves can report or comment on SEOO activities with their agencies.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS:

The SEOO should place major emphasis on its role with state agencies. Even minimal accomplishments in this role will do much to gain respect for its performance.

The Regional Office and other OEO grantees should establish a formal system for requesting SEOO assistance with other state agencies. This system should be structured to evaluate follow-up performance.

THE SEOO AND FEDERAL AGENCIES

Federal Agency Regional Directors, or their designees, were interviewed at five federal agencies in addition to the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The agencies contacted were: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Department of Housing and Urban Development; Small Business Administration; Economic Development Administration; and Department of Labor. Primary respondents and their advisors who participated in completion of the questionnaire totaled 24 federal officials.

Three questions were asked to elicit information on the performance of the SEOO with respect to:

- a. Representation of the Governor with respect to federal agencies.
- b. Development by the SEOO of federal resources to assist CAAs and other anti-poverty efforts.
- c. Helping OEO overcome problems at the state level caused by federal and state requirements.

Only one of the 14 non-OEO federal officials interviewed felt he had seen enough of the SEOO to have sufficient knowledge to take a position on how well the SEOO had represented the Governor to federal agencies. He felt that the SEOO had done a poor job of representing the Governor to federal agencies. The others replied "don't know".

With respect to the second question, the respondents at two agencies said "poor", and at the other three agencies the answer was "don't know". In all cases, the reason offered was that the SEOO had not had any contact with them or their agencies in the past year dealing with resource development or coordination.

With respect to the third question, two agencies said that the SEOO had not assisted OEO with reference to problems covered by their regulations, and three answered "don't know".

At the national level the SEOO has used the influence of its office in the following efforts as described by Lewis K. Uhler, California SEOO Director:

- a. "I have personally coordinated with Dr. Aguirre's assistant as required to make sure that they have full confidence that their Department of Labor

monies are being spent effectively wherever some concern has been raised (for example, OEDCI). We sought for a long time to obtain the right to audit DOL-funded programs in OEDCI. Our requests went right to the Secretary of Labor, himself. Subsequent to the appointment of Dr. Aguirre, this authority was given to our office so that they could have and have had on-going assurances that at least from our viewpoint we will take pains to assure them that their funds are being well spent.

- b. "With the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we have become directly involved in the cut in Headstart funds. We interceded on behalf of the San Joaquin Headstart program (and through them all of the others), suggesting that a review be made and if cuts were absolutely necessary, that they be made not on the basis of an across-the-board cut, but on the basis that the less effective programs could be eliminated entirely, leaving the good programs to function with sufficient funds.
- c. "We became embroiled in the issue of three alleged migrant health centers in the State, worked with Robert Coop (Director of HEW) and sent a message to HEW in Washington in coordination with the State Department of Public Health and the Migrant Labor Services that function under DHRD's Farm Labor Services. We became concerned that there was not adequate thought or planning given in the location of the migrant health clinics--that they were not placed in the area of greatest need for the health of migrant workers. We were successful in getting HEW to review the matter. As a result of our involvement, Mr. Coop indicated that he recognized the need in the future for the coordination with appropriate migrant health services in the State and with the communities where such facilities might be initiated."

CONCLUSION:

The SEOO has done very little with respect to non-OEO federal agencies insofar as supporting poverty-related programs.

THE SEOO AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNITY GROUPS

1. FINDINGS:

a. Local government representatives and representatives of neighborhood councils and social service agencies were aware that the SEOO existed. However, most local government representatives had no direct contact with the SEOO. A few had seen a representative of the SEOO on one or two occasions--usually at a CAA board meeting where the SEOO representative merely observed and seldom offered comment.

b. Most of the individuals interviewed were unaware of the functions of the SEOO from any first hand knowledge but had the impression that the SEOO is an investigating office.

c. No visible attempt to mobilize resources around local problems or needs was reported by any of the groups interviewed.

d. The provision of information and statistics to local governments on problems of the poor and programs and efforts to overcome poverty within the State of California is almost non-existent.

e. None of the community groups interviewed were aware of the technical assistance that they can request from the SEOO. More recently, the SEOO has supplied information to the CAAs on poverty-related subjects. For example, recent welfare statistics were mailed to the CAAs. On request for information about the National Council of Aging, the State prepared its first "Golden Opportunities Bulletin" and circularized a fund raising informational statement. Most of these items were mailed out during the month of February. One CAA Board Chairman, Paul F. Clark of the SCCAC, Inc, stated, "It is significant that not until the SEOO knew that they were being evaluated did any information come out of the SEOO." Mr. Clark stated that the bulletins received were the first since he had been on the board, which had been two years.

2. CONCLUSION:

a. Local government and community groups have had very little contact with the California SEOO.

b. The groups interviewed had no knowledge of any efforts by the SEOO to ascertain the problems or needs of the poor in local areas.

c. There is no indication that any efforts had been made to identify or mobilize local government resources in support of CAAs.

d. Very little information has been disseminated to local governments and community groups by the SEOO.

THE SEOO AND COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

1. PERCEPTION OF CAA BOARD CHAIRMEN AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS:

The answers given by CAA Board Chairmen and Executive Directors in response to the SEOO Evaluation Questionnaire were generally willingly given with a minimal amount of "hedging". Where the interviewees were sure of their ground, the response was strong. This may indicate that certain opinions had crystallized over a long period of time. The views expressed revealed the way in which CAAs treat their relationship with the SEOO.

Two basic factors emerged from the interviews:

a. CAAs are limited in their knowledge of the scope of SEOO activities.

b. With few exceptions, CAAs regard the California SEOO as their "enemy" or "adversary" and are very guarded in their dealings with SEOO personnel.

Board Chairmen and Executive Directors consistently rated many questions with "don't know". Board Chairmen, particularly, were unaware of many services that the SEOO can be requested to deliver. It was evident that Executive Directors in many CAAs had ceased to be interested in utilizing SEOO services and were not aware of the role of the SEOO as set out in OEO Instruction 7501-1.

The only contact with the SEOO that almost all CAAs shared was during pre-review sessions. Even in these contacts, the majority of interviewees stated that SEOO representatives participated only as observers. They seldom entered into discussions during meetings, offered little worthwhile advice and few recommendations, usually declined to answer questions asked by other participants, and on some occasions were not present when the memo of agreement was drafted and signed.

Sometimes contact by SEOO staff with CAA staff and program participants has reportedly occurred at odd hours. One Board Chairman, Mrs. Moore, Long Beach, stated that although SEOO representatives remained silent at the pre-review session, they visited her at her home until after midnight.

There is a strong feeling among many Executive Directors that the SEOO is attempting to discredit or, at least, reduce the effectiveness of CAAs.

The following are examples of comments made by some CAA Executive Directors interviewed. At the Sacramento Area EOC, the Executive Director reported that the State representative "walked out on board members during one session--There was extensive use of tape recorders. Ted Carter's questioning at (one) point seemed to be aimed at trying to develop a rift between the Chicanos and the board." The SEOO's monitoring activity was characterized as follows: "I have never known the SEOO to do any monitoring. It has continuously done work of an investigative nature." On the subject of monitoring, Mr. Acosta of the SACEOA reported that "the Oakland CAA has received daily monitoring --a special office was apparently opened to monitor one CAA. The Community Program Analyst assigned there is also assigned to SACEOA. Although it is less than 15 minutes drive from the Oakland CAA to our Hayward office, it was impossible for the SEOO man to attend our pre-review, (which was held at our Hayward office). We find it hard to understand why the SEOO is permitted to put all of its efforts into investigation ("monitoring") of one CAA and provides no effort in technical assistance or in any supportive activity." Mr. Acosta further noted that "it appears to us that the (SEOO) staff is hired because they have investigative backgrounds or because they are political appointees." In discussing the pre-review, Mr. Acosta supplied the following information: "Not only did we personally invite the Community Program Analyst to attend our pre-review--once by telephone to his secretary, once by telephone to Mr. Espana himself, and once in person, but we also mailed him, registered mail, a full schedule of the pre-review at least two weeks in advance. We also understand that our WR/OEO field representative invited him. Nevertheless, he failed to appear at any time during those two weeks. Sometime later (December or January) after program submission, Mr. Espana did visit and perfunctorily asked if we had any technical assistance needs. However, no further contact or follow up was done by him or anyone else at the SEOO office."

Dick Brown of the Santa Cruz CAA said that the SEOO's "monitoring was more like spying or police work--no real offers to help but just building up evidence for an eventual veto." Mr. Brown further described his relationship with the State representative, Anthony Gurule', as follows: he "visited us in September 1970 for a few days (I saw him only once--he failed to keep a second appointment). He asked me to drop by his motel one evening, which I did. I requested a review of our programs, but he kept insisting we had no problems and he could easily answer all the required questions. He insisted on discussing his experiences in other CAAs (e.g., Oakland). We parted with a firm appointment for the next day which he failed to keep. Gov. Reagan vetoed our program a few weeks later."

Similar observations were made in connection with the Napa Valley CAA in a report supplied by Barney Schur of the SEOO staff wherein it was stated that the "State is working county against city to oppose the Napa program. Napa given veto and no constructive suggestions made on program improvement." Other reports supplied by Mr.

Schur contain the following comments. In Tulare County the Schur report described this situation: "SEOO fails to contact CAP before coming into area, operates quietly behind the scenes then appears before the Board of CAP Supervisors to provide advocacy to create CAP under Board of Supervisors in accord with Green Amendments--prefers to have this out in the open." In Solano County a problem was reported involving the elimination of "the 'behind-the-back' surveillance of CAPs by State OEO, have representatives inform CAP when in the area." In another report supplied by Mr. Schur dealing with the Fresno area it was stated that there was "no continuity of field representatives in federal or state so that working relationships and confidence can be achieved. Inadequate follow-through on State and Federal representatives' recommendations, program objectives, or evaluations. Sometimes, no communications in these areas. Application decision should be concurrent with Regional sign-off so that State veto is not at the last minute. Equal distribution of all communications and technical assistance, grant materials to rural as well as urban CAPs. San Joaquin area economic development is poor." (See Attachment)

Reports were received of SEOO requests for lists of volunteers and staff people together with their personnel files, payroll records, and resumes. Monitoring functions such as review and evaluation have been referred to in correspondence as "investigations" by the SEOO office. (See Attachment)

These activities and tactics reflect an investigative attitude on the part of the SEOO and have resulted in a mutual feeling of distrust and suspicion.

Technical assistance to CAAs by the SEOO has been very limited, and even in some of these instances, the CAAs have interpreted this as merely a subterfuge to investigate. Some CAAs refuse to request technical assistance because of this.

2. FINDINGS:

a. The SEOO has apparently limited its contact with CAAs to pre-review sessions and investigations.

b. The identity and reputation that the SEOO has established with CAAs is negative.

c. There is little knowledge on the part of the CAA Executive Directors interviewed of the use and purpose of CAP Checkpoint Forms 76 and 77.

d. The CAAs perceive the role of the SEOO as self-imposed and limited to advising the Governor on best methods for reducing community action program impact in the State.

e. The technical assistance delivery system seems grossly ineffective and in some respects non-existent.

f. Many of the CAAs feel that the present situation is irreversible, that is, the SEOO has lost all credibility as a constructive force in anti-poverty efforts.

3. CONCLUSIONS:

a. The majority of CAA Executive Directors believe the California SEOO has failed to produce results in four major functional areas:

- (1) Mobilization of state resources.
- (2) Coordination of state agencies.
- (3) Advocacy for the poor.
- (4) Delivery of technical assistance.

b. The SEOO has alienated the majority of the CAA Executive Directors by using their staff as investigators rather than as deliverers of technical assistance.

c. The SEOO has not approached the majority of CAAs in a helpful manner.

4. RECOMMENDATION:

The SEOO should immediately reorganize staff to fulfill major functional responsibilities, i.e. mobilization of resources, coordination of state agencies, advocacy of the poor, and the delivery of technical assistance.

An immediate attempt should be made to heal the breach between the SEOO and the CAAs.

SUPPORTIVE FUNCTIONS

1. TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE:

a. Perception:

(1) The overriding attitude toward the SEOO among most CAAs was one of hostility and distrust. Most of those who had dealt directly with the California SEOO expressed some form of extreme irritation toward that office. This feeling was expressed by CAA Executive Directors as they related their frustrations "at being investigated rather than assisted." Phil Wing of Pasadena Committee on Human Need and Opportunity (PCHNO) said the state was interested in doing a "weed out" and that the state was not "sincere". CAA Board Chairmen were confused as to the real responsibilities of the SEOO and usually were surprised to realize the scope of SEOO responsibilities, due to the non-performance of those functions. Neighborhood council chairmen and members usually were totally unaware of the SEOO and its Training and Technical Assistance responsibilities to local and regional programs. Elected officials and their representatives were equally unaware of the appropriate Training and Technical Assistance role of the SEOO.

(2) According to most persons interviewed, the California SEOO provides little training and technical assistance to the CAAs in California. Instead, under the shelter of that term, it uses available opportunities to "investigate" CAA efforts and programs. It seems to the CAAs that the SEOO does not recognize training and technical assistance as a priority function of the SEOO, but rather sees its prime responsibility as that of "bird dogging" CAA fiscal and program activities. In response to questions dealing with the training and technical assistance function, 69% of the CAAs responding felt that the SEOO was not performing specific tasks relating to this function. Furthermore, 77% of the CAAs felt the SEOO was doing poorly in this area (See Tabulation Section).

b. Findings: CAAs feel a constant threat from the SEOO and, instead of welcoming the assistance of a helping hand when needed, the local CAA would often rather avoid proffered assistance -- even at the risk of becoming less effective in order to avoid contact with what was referred to by some as "the enemy."

c. Conclusions: The relationship between the SEOO and the CAAs is not healthy. Little or no communication exists between the SEOO and CAAs relative to available training and technical assistance resources and how to procure them. Communications have deteriorated so completely and trust has become so non-existent that reconstruction of the training and technical assistance role may be beyond reach.

d. Recommendations: All Training and Technical Assistance activities of the SEOO should be reviewed for the purpose of opening adequate channels of communication leading to the provision of realistic responses to the Training and Technical Assistance needs of the CAAs in an atmosphere of mutual trust.

2. MOBILIZATION OF RESOURCES:

a. Perception: CAAs, federal agencies and local governmental agencies had very little knowledge of the activities of the California SEOO in the area of resource mobilization. CAAs perceived the SEOO merely as an investigative agency that didn't place a high priority on the mobilization of resources. Federal agencies and local governmental agencies had either no concept of or very little knowledge of the activities of the California SEOO. On the other hand, the California SEOO viewed itself as having done a good job of developing state resources for rural communities.

b. Findings:

(1) It appears that the SEOO has not given priority to the mobilization and coordination of anti-poverty resources, particularly at the state level. Only 11% of state personnel interviewed answered in the affirmative concerning this question, 22% replied negatively, and 67% said they didn't know.

(2) The California SEOO, with the assistance of the American Technical Assistance Corporation (A.T.A.C.) conducted a two day workshop in December on mobilization of state resources for rural CAAs. Many state agencies participated and conducted sessions concerning resources available within state government. The SEOO distributed a resource book dealing with state agency resources to some CAAs. *The response from most of the participating CAAs was that they thought that this was a good workshop and were encouraged by the offer of assistance from state agencies. Although this was a good conference, the results will be determined by the delivery system that will be established and the willingness of state agencies to respond to CAA requests.

The SEOO also was able to enlist the support of the California National Guard in two airlifts -- one to deliver food and toys to Indian reservations at Christmas time, the other to deliver dental equipment to Indian reservations.

*State Services for Local Government, prepared by Council on Intergovernmental Relations.

(3) Finally, many CAAs probably will not request assistance from the California SEOO or state agencies since they are reluctant to have contact with these agencies.

c. Conclusions: The SEOO has not been sufficiently effective in the mobilization and coordination of state anti-poverty related resources nor have they developed and assisted in the development of state resources to the degree necessary to gain the respect of the CAAs. The December Resource Mobilization Conference for rural CAAs and the Air National Guard "air lifts" are their best efforts to date. At the present time, there are not any significant measurable results as to the actual mobilization of state resources following the December conference.

d. Recommendations:

(1) Since the SEOO has direct lines of communication to the Governor, the agency should be able to influence policy and the delivery of state anti-poverty related resources. The agency should make a concentrated effort to mobilize and coordinate state resources in order to meet the needs of low-income persons and CAAs.

(2) Intensive follow-up on the Resource Mobilization Conference should be made to insure the rendering of technical assistance and other services from the state agencies that participated.

(3) A delivery mechanism should be established to insure availability and follow-up on available state resources.

(4) A workshop for urban CAAs similar to the one held for rural CAAs should be conducted.

(5) CAAs should be encouraged to request assistance from the SEOO in gaining access to available state resources.

3. COORDINATION AND PLANNING:

a. Findings:

(1) The SEOO considers planning for activities that affect the poor to be a function of other agencies of state government. This attitude is consistent with their perception of their role as advocates of the poor. While the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, emphasizes participation of the poor in planning processes, there was little evidence that the SEOO shares this view or has taken steps to involve the poor in any planning processes. This attitude has resulted in a conflict between SEOO, CAAs and the Regional Office regarding the steps to be taken to achieve involvement of the poor in the planning process.

(2) Coordination of activities with state agencies whose activities affect the poor is recognized as desirable by the SEOO, but has not been emphasized as a priority objective. The priority which appears to be recognized by the SEOO which overrides coordination with other governmental units is its commitment that poverty programs would be better conducted and administered if they were placed under the control of local government.

(3) There is evidence that the SEOO has initiated some coordination activities with state agencies whose activities affect the poor. However, lack of proper follow-up by the SEOO has restricted the effectiveness of these coordination activities.

(4) There was no evidence that the SEOO has provided information to the state planning agency and/or CAAs to assist them in vertical or horizontal planning.

b. Conclusion: The SEOO has made little impact on CAAs or other state agencies in the area of program planning. It appears that helping CAAs to better plan programmatically is not a priority.

c. Recommendation: Training should be provided to SEOO Technical Assistance personnel on:

(1) Planning and Federal Grant Programs:

- (a) Role of state and local government
- (b) Role of CAAs
- (c) Role of CAMPs

(2) BOB Circular A-95.

4. GRANT REVIEW, MONITORING, AND EVALUATION:

a. Perception:

(1) The perception of the performance of the California State Office of Economic Opportunity in the area of grant review, monitoring, and evaluation is pivotal in terms of the office's commitment to meet its obligations, as stated in the EOA of 1964, as amended, and OEO Instruction 7501-1, to OEO funded agencies in the State of California. There is a wide divergence between the undertaking of the SEOO, as stated in its own work program and grant application and its perceived and actual performance in this functional area.

(2) The function of an SEOO is generally viewed as a supportive one wherein information gathered by a Technical Assistance Specialist or "Community Program Analyst" should be used not only to measure the agency's performance but for the purpose of suggesting possible steps to improve the agency and suggesting available resources to implement improvements. The SEOO's stated view of this function is consistent with its grant refunding application and work program. However, a new twist of an investigative nature, with little or no analyses and technical assistance follow up was perceived by many of the CAAs interviewed. The qualifications and background as set forth in resumes of a significant number of individuals employed as Community Program Analyst would also seem to support this perception inasmuch as a large number of the Community Program Analysts on the SEOO staff have had prior experience in law enforcement, as investigators or insurance adjusters. Information obtained from some of the CAAs interviewed would indicate a heavy emphasis on investigation with little or no on-site help or technical assistance follow up.

b. Findings:

(1) Consistent with OEO Instruction 7501-1, 7(c) and (g), Regional OEO invited appropriate SEOO staff members to participate in some evaluations and pre-reviews. In at least two instances as to the former, SEOO staff members invited did respond affirmatively (Berkeley and Oakland CAAs). However, with respect to the evaluation of Oakland, the SEOO staff member reportedly withdrew prematurely. As to pre-reviews, SEOO staff members were consistently involved but usually purely on a silent basis with little or no assistance being offered.

(2) Considering grant review, monitoring, and evaluation functions as perceived by the SEOO, the reports received by the evaluation team from respondents showed that the SEOO was extremely active in this area. However, the CAA Directors interviewed indicated that these functions were not performed in a positive or constructive manner. In a number of situations, actions by the SEOO were clearly aimed at gathering information to discredit the programs of the very agencies being subjected to grant review, monitoring or evaluation. There was very little follow up in terms of analyses of problems, sharing the analyses with the agency under scrutiny, or suggesting steps to remedy the problems discovered.

(3) Broadly speaking, as a result of the investigative emphasis placed by the SEOO on the grant review, monitoring, and evaluation function, the SEOO's activity has a demoralizing effect on OEO funded agencies in the State. Such demoralization gave way to increased alienation and an isolationist attitude by the CAAs to the point that the SEOO is no longer viewed as their advocate or as a provider of meaningful technical assistance.

c. Conclusion: The performance of the grant review, monitoring, and evaluation function by the California SEOO is looked on by CAAs as investigative which in its context is neither positive nor constructive, as originally intended, and is interpreted as punitive.

d. Recommendation:

(1) The SEOO should employ Technical Assistants and Community Program Analysts, if that title is retained, who have knowledge of a CAA's functions and purposes and who are prepared to and committed to carrying out those functions and purposes.

(2) Grant review, monitoring, and evaluation activities should be followed up with in depth technical assistance.

5. ADVOCACY FOR THE POOR:

a. Perception: Most SEOO staff members that were interviewed indicated by their responses to the questionnaire that they did not consider advocacy for the poor a significant function of the SEOO. The results of tabulating the questionnaire responses by SEOO personnel concerning the SEOO's role as advocate for the poor revealed the following results: Only 27% of the SEOO staff felt it had performed specific tasks related to the advocacy function, 59% did not know, and 14% said it had not. Only 2% of the CAAs responding felt the SEOO performed specific tasks related to this function--84% said no (see Tabulation Section). Often the SEOO staff members interviewed stated that they did not know of any instances where the SEOO had attempted to make state-poverty-related programs more responsive to the needs and desires of the poor and had no knowledge of any attempts to assess state administrative procedures nor of any efforts to make them more responsive to the needs and desires of the poor. Further, they had no knowledge of any attempts to develop career opportunities for the poor within other state agencies and had no knowledge of the SEOO consulting regularly with local CAAs and other representatives of the poor on legislation that they felt should be recommended to the Governor or the state legislature. In fact, the Senior Staff of the SEOO generally agreed that in the allocation of its staff resources advocacy for the poor received a low priority. One Senior Staff member estimated that only 2% of the SEOO's staff resources were allocated to advocacy for the poor while other Senior Staff members estimated the allocation in the 10% range.

b. Findings: Of the non-SEOO persons interviewed, few had any knowledge of the SEOO performing any advocacy role for the poor.

The prevailing opinion was that the SEOO had not demonstrated by any of its actions that it felt any responsibility for the advocate role. No poor persons were reported to have been appointed to any State boards or commissions. It is not felt that the SEOO would advocate making such appointments.

c. Conclusion:

(1) No evidence was discovered which would point to the SEOO as an advocate for the poor.

(2) The SEOO could not show any state administration changes directly attributable to the SEOO which would benefit the poor.

(3) There was no evidence that career opportunities have been made available in other state agencies as the result of the efforts of the SEOO.

(4) With perhaps one minor exception, the SEOO has not yet found it possible to hire poor persons within its own office.

(5) In short, the California SEOO has not fulfilled its role and responsibility of being an advocate for the poor.

d. Recommendation: Future grants to the SEOO should contain a special condition wherein the California SEOO specifically recognizes and accepts its role as an advocate for the poor. No future work programs from the California SEOO should be accepted unless it spells out in detail specific objectives relating to its advocacy role together with a detailed strategy of achieving the objectives stated.

THE SEOO GRANTS

The parts of the Narrative Section that follow depart in some instances from the format of the earlier parts of the Narrative Section which discussed the SEOO's performance in relation to other agencies and with respect to its priority functions. For the most part the parts that follow deal briefly with the plans and priorities established by the SEOO and more specifically with the quality of the work programs submitted and with the SEOO's performance of those programs.

1. REGULAR GRANT:

This section of the Evaluation Report addresses itself largely to the CAP 81 and the work program submitted by the California SEOO. Both documents are quite general in nature.

The CAP 81 contemplated improvement in information about local needs and grantee capabilities through an expanded, outstationed and better trained field analyst staff. The SEOO has expanded its staff and has outstationed personnel in Southern California.

The plans and priorities also expected substantially increased capacity to the SEOO to create "a poverty information module" for SEOO, grantee, and legislative use in assessing needs, assigning priorities, and allocating resources to decrease poverty. There is no evidence that this has been achieved. Also, it does not appear that the SEOO has been able to provide other state agencies with comprehensive and current data on poverty "to assure a coherent and unified multi-agency approach to interpretation and use of information on poverty and anti-poverty resources."

SEOO priorities listed in the CAP 81 are: (1) to increase the scope, accuracy, and reliability of information on conditions of poverty and on the availability and use of all anti-poverty resources in California, for state and local planning, funding, coordinative, and legislative use, as well as in projects to stimulate public awareness of the conditions of poverty, (2) to provide, or arrange and coordinate the provision by other sources of, greatly improved multi-speciality technical assistance to grantees and other appropriate agents in the California anti-poverty effort, (3) to encourage both the already indicated trend of California governmental officials toward more involvement in anti-poverty programs and their increasing interest in the efficient, well-coordinated application of state governmental and private resources to the problems of poverty in California, and (4) to gain the capacity to mobilize business, volunteer, and foundation resources of a systematic consequential way to promote economic opportunity.

While it appears that the SEOO has made a start on these priorities, progress has been slow. Other state agencies have not yet felt the coordination efforts of the SEOO. It should be noted, however, that the resources conference of last December referred to elsewhere in this report does represent a major effort on the part of the SEOO.

The first goal listed in the CAP 81 is "to provide review of and assistance to grantees in greater depth by an increased and better trained analyst staff, with the object of providing sufficient intensity and continuity of State-CAA relationships to resolve as many areas as possible of mutual concern about programs prior to the refunding-review stage." The SEOO apparently has been unable to establish a meaningful relationship with many of the CAAs. Their review of CAAs may be designed to resolve areas of mutual concern about programs prior to refunding but it has not reached this goal in the view of many of the CAAs.

The third goal for the year starting July 1, 1970, was to develop assistance and demonstration projects in the use of volunteer services, excess property, and community college resources; in programs of technical aid to Indians, disadvantaged youth, and Headstart-Day Care projects. Little was learned about what the office has done regarding the use of volunteer services.

Little information was available on the other two goals for the year: completion of a systematic approach to SEOO planning and management by objectives and creation of an information module in conjunction with DHRD to enable comprehensive and systematic collection, compilation, storage, retrieval, and dissemination of data on poverty and anti-poverty resources in California.

The work program is extremely vague. The office was able to increase its staff substantially, through the demonstration and STAP grants.

Conclusions:

1. The SEOO has attempted to follow its vaguely-defined work program. In addition to adding the personnel provided by increased funding, it has also filled other positions indicated in the work program. The addition of the Community Program Analysts was designed to satisfy the assistance and review requirements of the grantees in California. It appears that the emphasis has been on the review rather than on assistance.

2. The SEOO has also, as called for in the work program, out-stationed Community Program Analysts. It also appears that there has been some improvement in management of the office since last July.

3. The improved working relationships with Regional representatives, including participation in grantee pre-review, apparently

has been spotty, although the office has been participating to an extent in pre-reviews.

4. Only one poor person has been employed by the SEOO in a non-professional position as a kind of "girl Friday". The work plan indicates that "the opportunity to employ poor people on the SEOO staff does not exist. This is an area which State OEO expects to explore." John Sawicki stated, "This office has not undertaken to hire 'poor people' for one main reason, that nobody has ever applied, nor have we made a concentrated effort to recruit 'poor people'."

5. The work program also indicates that the increase in staff will enable the SEOO to gain the capacity to encourage the actual employment of poor people by other agencies and to participate in the development, implementation, and review of programs which serve them. If this capacity has been realized, the results apparently have been minimal. The same is true with the development of career opportunities for the poor in other state agencies.

6. While it is not clearly spelled out, the work program indicates worthwhile objectives in the area of technical assistance to grantees, mobilization of resources, and career development opportunities for poor people in state government. During the eight months this grant has been in force, it appears that adequate results have not yet been obtained.

7. The principal achievement has been in the area of review of grantees in order to help the Governor carry out his responsibilities under Section 242 of the Economic Opportunity Act.

2. STAP GRANT:

a. Facts: Effective May 1, 1970, OEO, Region IX, approved a STAP grant for \$114,184 which authorized the California SEOO to hire four specialists (management, low-cost housing, economic development, and community development) to provide long-range, on-site expert technical assistance to rural CAAs and poverty communities. The SEOO agreed as a special condition to the grant to operate within the provisions of the STAP guidelines and to use an advisory panel--with OEO representation--to review the qualifications of all candidates for positions under this grant.

b. Positive Findings: One of the most constructive, valuable activities of the SEOO in the past seven/eight months has been the performance of their STAP specialists where they have had the opportunity to work with a few rural CAAs. The STAP specialists were largely instrumental in organizing the successful State Resources Mobilization Conference in Sacramento in December, 1970. Valuable assistance, especially in the fields of management (Throne) and housing (Frane), was cited by several rural CAAs. In addition, the STAP housing specialist organized five housing workshops throughout the

state to tap the resources of the Farmers' Home Administration loan program. He also developed a promising intern training program of para-professionals in rural housing. The economic development specialist (Archer) has developed a Rural Transportation Cooperative (Placer County), has worked with minority contractors to develop a profit-making corporation, and has helped create "Indians Campground, Inc." to help low-income Indians use their reservation lands as commercial camping facilities.

c. Negative Findings:

(1) Three vacancies in the four STAP positions have occurred since September, 1970 (one by firing, one left to work for another SEOO, and one was just recently transferred to another grant (Demonstration) of the California SEOO). These vacancies were immediately filled by the SEOO Director without the use of an advisory panel which is a violation of the grant conditions.

(2) There is serious reservation on the part of the evaluation team that two of the three STAP replacements meet the qualifications of their job descriptions (Carter and Chickering).

(3) Two of the new people hired to fill STAP slots are not performing STAP functions (according to STAP guidelines) for much of their time, but are being used for such SEOO staff position as General Counsel (Chickering) and Technical Assistance Chief and "Deputy Director for Program Analysis" (Schur). The evaluation team observed that these two people appear to be quite capable but that STAP personnel are not meant to be used for SEOO staff assignments.

d. Results: The STAP program began in California with well-qualified people and the opportunity to provide valuable, needed technical assistance to rural poverty communities. Some useful technical assistance and resource mobilization has taken place, but the STAP program has not met its full potential because the STAP guidelines have not been followed.

e. Conclusion: Unless the SEOO uses qualified personnel for STAP and has them out in the rural communities to provide long-range, on-site technical assistance according to the STAP guidelines, the STAP program in California will be a failure and should not be re-funded.

3. DEMONSTRATION GRANT:

a. Facts: Effective August 15, 1970, WR/OEO approved a demonstration grant for \$162,170 for a 10.5 month funding to allow the California SEOO to hire professionals (plus two clerical personnel) to provide special technical assistance to OEO grantees in management speciality areas, in child development, and to develop and coordinate programs for low-income Indians.

b. Positive Findings: Some of the professionals eventually hired for these positions appear to be reasonably well-qualified. Some useful technical assistance was provided by the Early Childhood Development Specialist.

c. Negative Findings:

(1) The SEOO has not used this grant, and most of the professionals hired by the grant, to carry out the demonstration goals and work program. Some of the professionals hired under the grant have instead been used (see attached analysis section on manpower allocation on Blaker, Clark, Cunningham, Taylor, and Whitely) as Community Program Analysts (CPAs) for monitoring, investigating, and performing grant review functions for the greatest majority of their time. Even the latest organization chart of the SEOO (approved by Director Lewis K. Uhler about mid-February, 1971) shows that one professional (Clark - personnel management) is performing a CPA-type (investigative) function.

(2) As with the STAP grant, there has been no apparent attempt to isolate the functions of personnel under this grant from the regular SEOO grant thus making it difficult to assess the effectiveness of the program as a demonstration.

(3) The position of SEOO Indian (or "Special Programs") Coordinator was only filled on February 12, 1971, (six months after effective date of grant) and then by transferring a STAP Economic Development Specialist (Archer) to this position.

(4) Reports from grantee interviews show almost no positive reports on useful technical assistance provided by the specialists hired under this demonstration grant.

d. Results: While there was a great need for the services--on the part of OEO grantees--and the specialists hired seemed fairly well-qualified, this demonstration has been a failure as the technical assistance has not, in fact, been delivered except for a significant portion of the time of one specialists (Taylor - Early Childhood Development).

e. Conclusion: The demonstration grant should not be refunded. The most qualified specialists could be used by the SEOO in place of the less qualified CPAs in the regular program.

4. OAKLAND GRANT:

a. Perception: Although Oakland demonstration grant was written primarily to "support a technical assistance consultant to effect extensive improvement in the management of OEDCI and to review compliance with OEO regulations and special conditions," many believe the