

# 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  
– Response to Federal Evaluation 04/29/1971,  
Vol. I (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](mailto:reagan.library@nara.gov)

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

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

## INTRODUCTION TO SEOO RESPONSES

### Inconsistencies in Federal Evaluation Report

- I. There are many inconsistencies in the Federal Evaluation Report on the California State Office of Economic Opportunity. These contradictions in both fact and logical analysis cast grave doubts on both the validity and "fairness" of the report as a document of impartial evaluation.
  1. Use of "tenure" beginning on page 5 of the report.

The report does not specify if the tenure is in the job description at the time of the report or tenure with the agency or tenure in the poverty program. For example, at first glance, the tenure in the job of the SEOO appears very short and inexperienced when compared to other positions in the report. However, Mr. Barney Schur, Deputy Director for Technical Assistance with only two months on-the-job tenure has been in the poverty program directly and indirectly since 1964 or for seven years. Mr. Bob Frane who is listed at only one year has been in the poverty program since 1966 or for five years; Mr. Ted Carter is listed at three years on the job but has been in the OEO programs for over five years. Thus, the use of tenure is an analytical or comparative tool is misleading and not relevant to the issues at hand. Some of the CAP Directors listed and Board Chairmen, as well, have been in the program as listed but not in the position for the length of time listed, thus making tenure comparison difficult to parallel.
  2. SEOO Organization and Management:
    1. c. The conclusion of 1-c is inconsistent with OEO Instruction 7501-1, page 1, paragraph 3, which states in part: "OEO recognizes that states differ in . . . organizational patterns and that a Governor needs the flexibility to use various administrative arrangement in the organization and placement of his State Economic Opportunity Office." Nowhere in 7501-1 is such a written agreement required. Basic principles of management provide that public/every organization has its formal basis in law and informal basis in operations.
    3. c. This recommendation, too, is inconsistent with 7501-1, section 9-i, which provides that assignment of staff will conform to basic OEO instruction and that if areas of conflict arise, they will be resolved by written agreement with Regional OEO. Regional OEO was aware of the internal organization of SEOO and having made no objection, it can be assumed that no conflict in organization of the SEOO existed. All CAAs in the state operate on a dual organizational system, one for the formal grant and one to meet the day-to-day needs of the organization and staff ability in the CAP organization.

4. a. 1. The value judgement made in the conclusions that OEO clerical personnel stayed past 5:00 p.m. on the days of the evaluation was inappropriate and uncalled for. A check by the maintenance staff would have revealed that as much as 50% of the on-call staff work up to 6:00 or 9:00 p.m. many days during the month notwithstanding the evaluation period.

4. a. 2. Professionals show good general qualifications but a "pronounced lack of OEO related experience." Nowhere is this an OEO requirement that SEOO personnel have OEO back ground, additionally it is the perpetuation of such background that has created a maze of bureaucratic procedures that inhibit OEO from maintaining its flexibility and innovative qualities. Additionally, OEO suffers from a profusion of social workers, ministers, and other non-administrative or business oriented personnel thus narrowing the sphere of thought, creativity, exposure, and diversity needed in many facets of the program.

Page 14, Section 1, is entirely out of order. No organization is set up to have staff countermand the "boss" or run the organization their way. Additionally, no one has ever been summarily fired for disagreements with the operation of the SEOO. However, CAP directors are expressing pressure to "sumarily fire" CPAs because the CAPs do not agree with their approaches to OEO problems without regard for the employees' rights, etc. This is inconsistent with OEO instruction on personnel. OEO was not created as a permanent agency of government and the Act is designed for renewal not perpetration. All employees have the right of appeal through state channels, FEPC, and the courts if arbitrarily fired without cause or justification. It should also be pointed out that OEDCI staff have found a need to join a labor union to secure their rights and appropriate protection from executive personnel action. Poor people for years have complained bitterly about the rigidity of civil service and how it has protected incompetent staff from being replaced. Thus the whole statement is inconsistent with the attitudes of the poor toward civil service and with the desire of the CAPs to have some voice in the replacement of CPAs or other staff they deem unsatisfactory. Without the exempt classification neither the poor nor the CAPs would have any viable influence over the staffing of the SEOO.

Page 15, Section c, desires more experience on OEO related fields. It should be pointed out that OEO has job development as a primary objective since 1964, yet because of its overall ineffective job in this area, employment development nationwide has been given to Model Cities, concentrated employment program, and OEO programs that were shifted to the Department of Labor. Many OEO program trained people do not possess the background necessary to assist the poor in OEO programs. A survey of the CAL CAP Directors will show most came from social service or ministerial backgrounds without any technical background in housing development, economic development, job development, educational program development, management development, fiscal control including accounting and budgeting. All of which are not necessarily related to OEO problems specifically and can be accomplished by intelligent, creative and adaptive personnel who can learn the OEO acts, regulations and forms but cannot quickly learn the expertise of the area of specialization.

Page 17 - In Section 4a, the SEOO is criticized for not having better qualified personnel, (page 15). A career ladder is suggested in b.2. (page 15). Extensive field reports should be required (page 16 d. 3.) and a proportionate number of minorities should be hired (page 17 b.). If we were under civil service and not exempt, none of the above could be successfully implemented because of the inherent characteristics of civil service, yet the exempt system is attacked in this report. These are inconsistent demands.

The evaluation team desires more poor people on the staff and more minorities. Yet, no CAP in the state reflects minority proportional distribution especially those in civil service with the protection desired on Page 15. OEDCI for example has a staff of almost 70% black with no appreciable representation from the Indian, Filipino, Chinese, Japanese, Samoan, Mexican-American communities. Yet this has been propoed to be a representative organization. No SEOO in the nation can achieve this request.

Page 18 c. 2. The report as related to the newsclipping service points out that this service is ". . . of high cost", yet in section 2. b. it is recommended that all of the clippings be xeroxed for a cross-reference Dewey decimal file. This would double the cost of the clipping service which is already considered by the team to be of a high cost nature. The criticism is incompatible with the recommendation if cost is of concern in this area of critique.

Inconsistencies, recommendations in conflict with the OEO regulations, unrealistic assumptions pervade this report. This is just a few of the many that exist. Thus, the entire report should be viewed not in the context of its expertise (which we feel it lacks) but as a brief for potential areas of change as provided in 7501 and in accord with the special needs of the State of California. Throughout the report, the immense size, diversity, and complexity of California was neglected; as was the size of the State's total program in CAPs and money and number of poor. Because of these oversights and inconsistencies, the report should not be viewed as a document without faults or as a final solution to the organization and administration of the SEOO.

## INTRODUCTION TO SEOO RESPONSES

### Inconsistencies in Federal Evaluation Report

- I. There are many inconsistencies in the Federal Evaluation Report on the California State Office of Economic Opportunity. These contradictions in both fact and logical analysis cast grave doubts on both the validity and "fairness" of the report as a document of impartial evaluation.
  1. Use of "tenure" beginning on page 5 of the report.

The report does not specify if the tenure is in the job description at the time of the report or tenure with the agency or tenure in the poverty program. For example, at first glance, the tenure in the job of the SEOO appears very short and inexperienced when compared to other positions in the report. However, Mr. Barny Schur, Deputy Director for Technical Assistance with only two months on-the-job tenure has been in the poverty program directly and indirectly since 1964 or for seven years. Mr. Bob Frane who is listed at only one year has been in the poverty program since 1966 or for five years; Mr. Ted Carter is listed at three years on the job but has been in the OEO programs for over five years. Thus, the use of tenure is an analytical or comparative tool is misleading and not relevant to the issues at hand. Some of the CAP Directors listed and Board Chairmen, as well, have been in the program as listed but not in the position for the length of time listed, thus making tenure comparison difficult to parallel.
  2. SEOO Organization and Management:
    1. c. The conclusion of 1-c is inconsistent with OEO Instruction 7501-1, page 1, paragraph 3, which states in part: "OEO recognizes that states differ in . . . organizational patterns and that a Governor needs the flexibility to use various administrative arrangement in the organization and placement of his State Economic Opportunity Office." Nowhere in 7501-1 is such a written agreement required. Basic principles of management provide that public/every organization has its formal basis in law and informal basis in operations.
    3. c. This recommendation, too, is inconsistent with 7501-1, section 9-i, which provides that assignment of staff will conform to basic OEO instruction and that if areas of conflict arise, they will be resolved by written agreement with Regional OEO. Regional OEO was aware of the internal organization of SEOO and having made no objection, it can be assumed that no conflict in organization of the SEOO existed. All CAAs in the state operate on a dual organizational system, one for the formal grant and one to meet the day-to-day needs of the organization and staff ability in the CAP organization.



4. a. 1. The value judgement made in the conclusions that OEO clerical personnel stayed past 5:00 p.m. on the days of the evaluation was inappropriate and uncalled for. A check by the maintenance staff would have revealed that as much as 50% of the on-call staff work up to 6:00 or 9:00 p.m. many days during the month notwithstanding the evaluation period.

4. a. 2. Professionals show good general qualifications but a "pronounced lack of OEO related experience." Nowhere is this an OEO requirement that SEOO personnel have OEO back ground, additionally it is the perpetuation of such background that has created a maze of bureaucratic procedures that inhibit OEO from maintaining its flexibility and innovative qualities. Additionally, OEO suffers from a profusion of social workers, ministers, and other non-administrative or business oriented personnel thus narrowing the sphere of thought, creativity, exposure, and diversity needed in many facets of the program.

Page 14, Section 1, is entirely out of order. No organization is set up to have staff countermand the "boss" or run the organization their way. Additionally, no one has ever been summarily fired for disagreements with the operation of the SEOO. However, CAP directors are expressing pressure to "sumarily fire" CPAs because the CAPs do not agree with their approaches to OEO problems without regard for the employees' rights, etc. This is inconsistent with OEO instruction on personnel. OEO was not created as a permanent agency of government and the Act is designed for renewal not perpetration. All employees have the right of appeal through state channels, FEPC, and the courts if arbitrarily fired without cause or justification. It should also be pointed out that OEDCI staff have found a need to join a labor union to secure their rights and appropriate protection from executive personnel action. Poor people for years have complained bitterly about the rigidity of civil service and how it has protected incompetent staff from being replaced. Thus the whole statement is inconsistent with the attitudes of the poor toward civil service and with the desire of the CAPs to have some voice in the replacement of CPAs or other staff they deem unsatisfactory. Without the exempt classification neither the poor nor the CAPs would have any viable influence over the staffing of the SEOO.

Page 15, Section c, desires more experience on OEO related fields. It should be pointed out that OEO has job development as a primary objective since 1964, yet because of its overall ineffective job in this area, employment development nationwide has been given to Model Cities, concentrated employment program, and OEO programs that were shifted to the Department of Labor. Many OEO program trained people do not possess the background necessary to assist the poor in OEO programs. A survey of the CAL CAP Directors will show most came from social service or ministerial backgrounds without any technical background in housing development, economic development, job development, educational program development, management development, fiscal control including accounting and budgeting. All of which are not necessarily related to OEO problems specifically and can be accomplished by intelligent, creative and adaptive personnel who can learn the OEO acts, regulations and forms but cannot quickly learn the expertise of the area of specialization.

Page 17 - In Section 4a, the SEOO is criticized for not having better qualified personnel, (page 15). A career ladder is suggested in b.2. (page 15). Extensive field reports should be required (page 16 d. 3.) and a proportionate number of minorities should be hired (page 17 b.). If we were under civil service and not exempt, none of the above could be successfully implemented because of the inherent characteristics of civil service, yet the exempt system is attacked in this report. These are inconsistent demands.

The evaluation team desires more poor people on the staff and more minorities. Yet, no CAP in the state reflects minority proportional distribution especially those in civil service with the protection desired on Page 15. OEDCI for example has a staff of almost 70% black with no appreciable representation from the Indian, Filipino, Chinese, Japanese, Samoan, Mexican-American communities. Yet this has been purported to be a representative organization. No SEOO in the nation can achieve this request.

Page 18 c. 2. The report as related to the newsclipping service points out that this service is ". . . of high cost", yet in section 2. b. it is recommended that all of the clippings be xeroxed for a cross-reference Dewey decimal file. This would double the cost of the clipping service which is already considered by the team to be of a high cost nature. The criticism is incompatible with the recommendation if cost is of concern in this area of critique.

Inconsistencies, recommendations in conflict with the OEO regulations, unrealistic assumptions pervade this report. This is just a few of the many that exist. Thus, the entire report should be viewed not in the context of its expertise (which we feel it lacks) but as a brief for potential areas of change as provided in 7501 and in accord with the special needs of the State of California. Throughout the report, the immense size, diversity, and complexity of California was neglected; as was the size of the State's total program in CAPs and money and number of poor. Because of these oversights and inconsistencies, the report should not be viewed as a document without faults or as a final solution to the organization and administration of the SEOO.

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.



## PREFACE

The following material is the evaluation of the California State Office of Economic Opportunity by National Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C. Because we believe the reader of this document wishes to be apprised of both the "charge" and the "response", each page of the evaluation is followed by a page containing the appropriate responses to the preceding charges.

The CAP directors, single purpose grantees, delegate agencies and Head Start Programs in California administer federal funds in the amount of 120 million dollars.

It is one of the responsibilities of SEOO to approve the expenditure of these funds.

The following breakdown between July 1, 1970 and April 22, 1971 should demonstrate the work load and positive actions taken by SEOO.

Between July 1, 1970 and April 22, 1971, California State Office of Economic Opportunity has approved a total of 141 grants with total federal funding of \$52,484,957.00. During the same period the State Office of Economic Opportunity allowed 126 projects to lapse with a total federal funding of \$36,834,953.00. However, of the 126 projects lapsed, 70 (55.5%) were lapsed between July and September 30, 1970, a period during which SEOO was grossly understaffed. Of the remaining 56 projects, 28 (50%) were legal programs lapsed due to the continuing inadequate level of staffing in our Legal Section, 9 (16.1%) were Head Start, for which we had only one Early Childhood Development Coordinator to cover the entire state, 12 (21.4%) were versatile funds, which CPAs were unable to evaluate due to heavy work schedules and 7 (12.5%) were miscellaneous (emergency food, comprehensive health, etc.) which we were unable to evaluate either due to lack of expertise, or lack of manpower. During the same period, July 1, 1970 to April 22, 1971, a grand total of 4 projects were vetoed out of 270 total projects (1.5%) and 1 of those vetoes was rescinded following CAA compliance with SEOO considerations. This leaves a total of 3 projects vetoed

out of 270 projects which have come through our office (1.1%) with a total federal funding of \$4,185,841.00. The 270 projects' figure does not include countless proposals and innovative projects which were reviewed by our field men at the "information package" stage, but were not given final consideration by WR/OEO and consequently did not reach our office in the form of an "action package."

In order to properly assess the "reliability of the evidence used", one needs to put the California war on poverty into perspective. The CAP directors in California administer funds in the neighborhood of 120 million dollars. By contrast, the budget of SEOO is approximately \$716,000.00 (roughly 0.6%). SEOO has the responsibility, in addition to providing technical assistance throughout the state, of monitoring this 120 million dollars' worth of programs in order to provide, among other things, information to the Governor's office on the quality of such programs so that the Governor may make enlightened decisions with regard to his authority as outlined in Section 242 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It is significant to note here that there is no other governmental unit in California concerned with and authorized to assess the effectiveness of said programs with regard to the alleviation of poverty in the State of California and their effect on the general welfare of California. Were the CAL-CAP directors to be successful in their campaign to eliminate SEOO, then they would in the future be totally unencumbered by necessity to account to the State of California for the administration of this 120 million dollars.

## 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	



CALIFORNIA STATE

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

EVALUATION REPORT

March 26, 1971

CHARGES

Report Date: March 26, 1971

Field Work Date: March 1-5, 1971

## SEOO ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

### 1. ORGANIZATION:

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

(Page 13)

### 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.

(Page 13)

b. Findings: . . . There are contradictory statements pertaining to Chickering's (STAP) role as General Counsel.

(Page 13)

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

(Page 13)

### 3. STAFFING:

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.

(Page 14)

### 4. QUALIFICATION OF PERSONNEL:

#### a. Facts:

(2) . . . 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 were denied.

(Page 14)

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.

(Page 14)

(2) . . . 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.

(Page 15)

c. Recommendation: . . . 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.

(Page 15)

5. PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT:

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

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

(Page 15)

c. Training:

(2) Recommendation: . . . The SEOO should take fullest possible advantage of Federal and other training opportunities.

(Page 16)

d. Supervision and Evaluation:

(1) Facts: . . . 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.

(Page 16)

(2) Findings: . . . Some monthly reports of field personnel for January were 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.

(Page 16)

(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.

(Page 16)

6. CIVIL RIGHTS:

a. Facts:

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

(Page 17)

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.

(Page 17)

8. FILES:

a. Facts: . . . 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.

(Page 17)

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.

(Page 17)

9. OTHER FILES:

a. Personnel Folders:

(1) Facts:

(b) . . . None of the six files chosen at random contained a position description.

(Page 18)

(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.

c. Newspaper Clipping File:

(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.

(Page 19)

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

(Page 19)

11. GENERAL COMMENTS:

. . . 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.

. . . 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.

(Page 19)



## THE SEOO AND THE GOVERNOR

### 1. FINDINGS:

. . . 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.

(Page 21)

### 2. CONCLUSIONS:

. . . 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.

(Page 21)

. . . It can be summarily stated, however, that the conclusion of the evaluation team was that the attitude of the SEOO was, for the most part, one of antagonism toward the CAAs and the community action program, and that SEOO 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 SEOO representatives had the approval of the SEOO Director and those to whom he reported.

(Page 22)

## THE SEOO AND OTHER STATE AGENCIES

### 1. PERCEPTIONS:

Most of the state officials interviewed knew little of what the SEOO had done.

(Page 24)

### 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.

(Page 24)

. . . It appears that the Regional Office of OEO was neither notified of nor invited to the conference.

(Page 25)

### 3. CONCLUSION:

. . . However, it has not performed this function to the extent that state agencies themselves can report or comment on SEOO activities with their agencies.

(Page 25)

### 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.

(Page 25)

## THE SEOO AND FEDERAL AGENCIES

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.

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, . . . 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."

(Page 26)

### CONCLUSION:

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

(Page 27)

## 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. . . . 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.

(Page 28)

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

(Page 29)

## 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.

(Page 30)

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

(Page 30)

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, 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. . . .

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.

(Page 30)

. . . 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." . . .

(Page 31)

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.

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.

(Page 32)



2. FINDINGS:

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

(Page 32)

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.

(Page 32)

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.

(Page 32)

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

(Page 33)

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.

(Page 33)

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.

(Page 33)

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.

(Page 33)

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

(Page 33)

## SUPPORTIVE FUNCTIONS

### 1. TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE:

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.

(Page 34)

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.

(Page 35)

### 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.

(Page 35)

#### 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.

(Page 35)

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.

(Page 36)

#### 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.

(Page 36)

(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.

(Page 36)

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

(Page 36)

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

(Page 36)

### 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. . . . 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.

(Page 36)

(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.

(Page 37)

b. Conclusion: The SEOO has made little impact on CAAs or other state agencies in the area of program planning.

(Page 37)

### 4. GRANT REVIEW, MONITORING, AND EVALUATION:

#### a. Perception:

(1) . . . 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.

(Page 37)

(2) . . . 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.

(Page 38)

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.

(Page 38)

(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.

(Page 38)

(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.

(Page 38)

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.

(Page 39)

5. ADVOCACY FOR THE POOR:

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.

(Page 40)

(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.

(Page 40)

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.

(Page 40)



## THE SEOO GRANTS

### 1. REGULAR GRANT:

The first goal listed in the CAP 81 . . . 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.

(Page 42)

### Conclusions:

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.

(Page 43)

### 2. STAP GRANT:

#### 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 positions 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.

(Page 44)

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 refunded.

(Page 44)

3. DEMONSTRATION GRANT:

c. Negative Findings:

(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.

(Page 45)

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

(Page 45)

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 specialist (Taylor - Early Childhood Development).

(Page 45)

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.

(Page 45)

## THE SEOO AND THE REGIONAL OFFICE

### 4. RECOMMENDATIONS:

Lines of communication between the State and the Regional Office should be immediately reopened. An agreement of the kind described in OEO Instruction 7501-1, Section 7.f. should be negotiated as soon as possible and in no case should refunding occur without such an agreement in force. Since an obvious impasse exists between WR/OEO and the SEOO, a higher authority both in the Governor's office and OEO should be called upon to assume the responsibility for resolving the impasse.

(Page 51)

## THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND THE SEOO

### 2. FINDINGS:

The regional Office does not consult with the SEOO before committing flexible or other funds. The SEOO is advised of the availability of such funds only as a recipient of the general notice sent to all CAAs. There is one instance, however, when the Plans, Budget, and Evaluation Chief did consult with the SEOO regarding using carry-over funds for innovative programs

The Regional Office did not consult with the SEOO on the 1971 State funding plan, explaining that it was a repeat of the 1970 plan which had been discussed with the SEOO.

(Page 53)

### 5. FINDINGS:

. . . There is no indication that the SEOO has at any time discussed with the Regional Office any problems posed by the federal and state statutory or administrative requirements that impede state level coordination of OEO-related programs.

The Regional Office staff reports that some technical assistance has been provided by the SEOO but rarely in consultation with the Regional Office to determine OEO grantee's needs for technical assistance, despite some attempts by Regional Office field staff to arrange such consultation. . . . Regional Office staff also report that the SEOO has not consulted with the Regional Office with respect to sponsoring or participating in training programs and workshops for CAA staff and board members. . . . The SEOO does not consult with OEO to assist grantees in taking corrective actions recommended by OEO as a result of audit reports but this is because OEO neither shares audit reports with the SEOO nor encourages SEOO involvement.

Monitoring is viewed as at best performed incompetently and usually destructively to CAAs and OEO. Very bitter feelings exist among Regional Office staff concerning the style and methods used by SEOO personnel.

(Page 55)

### 6. CONCLUSIONS:

Given the premise that the State administration's views are not aligned with those held by most of the CAAs and the OEO Regional staff, the SEOO has done poorly in presenting those views in such a way as to at best get respect and at worst still maintain working relationships.

Monitoring as performed by the SEOO is a perversion of the concept of monitoring as it is performed by the staffs of other SEOOs and OEO regions.

(Page 56)

## GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The overall conclusions of the evaluation team are as follows:

1. The SEOO has potentially a very good senior level staff.
2. The SEOO is improving in internal management.
3. The SEOO has accomplished a number of special projects mentioned in the body of the report.
4. The California SEOO has not sufficiently followed the work programs agreed to as specified in its four grants.
5. The SEOO has not acted as an advocate for the poor in keeping with OEO Instruction 7501-1.
6. The SEOO has made little impact on state and federal agencies, private agencies, local government or the general public.
7. The SEOO is perceived to be antagonistic to the CAAs and the poor.
8. The SEOO is using the majority of its staff to perform investigative functions which are interpreted negatively by the CAAs.
9. The majority of the SEOO staff does not have sufficient technical background or experience to deliver quality technical assistance to the CAAs.
10. The Oakland Demonstration Grant # CG-9093-A/1 to deal with intensive management technical assistance has not been implemented in accordance with its terms.
11. An impasse exists between the CAAs, the Regional Office, and the SEOO.

## EVALUATION TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS

### A. Regular Grant

Refunding the regular California SEOO grant should be made contingent upon acceptance by the SEOO of the following conditions:

1. The California SEOO agrees to discontinue the Community Program Analyst (CPA) type of investigations. The California SEOO can discharge its responsibility under Section 242 of the Equal Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, more effectively by concentrating the resources of its office on assisting the CAAs in California by providing meaningful technical assistance, mobilizing federal, state and local resources, and insuring SEOO personnel are properly trained and have knowledge of grantee needs.

2. The SEOO agrees to insure that technical assistance personnel will have qualified backgrounds to allow them to deliver positive and constructive technical assistance to CAAs.

3. The California SEOO agrees to train technical assistance personnel in the proper methods of delivering technical assistance to CAAs.

4. The California SEOO agrees to implement the plan referred to in Lewis K. Uhler's letter of February 8, 1971, addressed to O. Mearl Custer of Elk Grove unified School District (see Attachments), regarding the establishment of an Advisory Council to SEOO, and further agrees that the Advisory Council will include representatives of both the poor and CAAs.

5. The California SEOO agrees to establish and maintain minimum standards for experience and qualifications for staff consistent with the functions of the position.

6. The California SEOO and Region IX, OEO, have negotiated a memorandum of agreement in accordance with OEO Instruction 7501-1, Section 7f.

7. The California SEOO agrees that it will undertake an informational program specifying how it will implement the provisions of the Regional Office/SEOO memorandum of agreement and provisions of OEO Instruction 7501-1.

8. The California SEOO agrees that it will perform its obligation to be an advocate for the poor and specifies the steps it will take to meet this obligation.

B. STAP Grant:

Refunding for the STAP Grant should be made contingent on agreement by the SEOO to immediately comply with existing STAP guidelines with respect to:

1. Selection of Staff
2. Development of a STAP plan
3. Submission of STAP reports
4. Long-term, on-site field assignments.

C. Management Demonstration Grant:

The management demonstration grant should not be refunded. The work program for this grant should be integrated into the regular grant, with qualified specialists transferred to the regular grants technical assistance operations staff.

D. Oakland Demonstration Grant:

- (a) The Oakland grant should be immediately terminated.
- (b) An audit examination of the funds expended under this grant should be conducted as soon as possible.

E. Inter-communication

The California SEOO should jointly develop with the CAAs and Region IX, OEO, a mutually acceptable means of inter-communication that will guarantee that all parties work together on major issues of joint concern.



## SUMMARY

The California SEOO is philosophically opposed to what it believes the community action agencies advocate and practice on behalf of the poor. Generally, the SEOO believes that CAAs subscribe to and foster a "Sol Alinsky" confrontation approach. This approach usually results in embarrassing economic and political pressure being brought to bear on local and state government officials. Further, the SEOO believes that the Western Regional Office of Economic Opportunity does nothing to discourage such an approach by the CAAs and is, therefore, not to be trusted as the CAAs are not to be trusted. (Also, the SEOO believes the CAAs and the Regional Office staff to be ultra liberal and, therefore, antagonistic to the SEOO.) Another contention of the State Office is that current OEO programs are not reaching the poor and that CAA officials are self-styled spokesmen who do not represent the poor people. In essence, they believe that OEO supports a group of highly paid self-appointed leaders whose views diverge widely from the current State administration on key issues affecting the poor.

Mr. Uhler, the Director, stated it is necessary that his staff perform their present role because the Western Regional Office of OEO will not monitor CAAs in a hard nosed, no nonsense, business-like and responsible way and that the end result is the "Sol Alinsky" confrontation model which he and his staff do not favor. Mr. Uhler further stated that until the Regional Office did act more responsibly, he intended to follow the present course of action. He also stated that he would prefer to spend more time on mobilization of resources, innovative approaches to solving the problems of poverty, performing an ombudsman role and in linking public and private agencies, but could not because he had to spend an inordinate amount of time monitoring and investigating OEO programs to discharge the office's Section 242 function under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended. He would prefer that the Western Regional Office of Economic Opportunity perform the monitoring function as the SEOO conceives it.

The CAAs and Regional Office believe that the SEOO is not an advocate for the poor and does not intend to serve in a helpful manner as prescribed in OEO Instruction 7501-1 to alleviate the conditions of poverty in the State of California.

The Regional Office believes its own role to be one of monitoring and guidance when working with CAAs. They further believe that boards of directors are responsible for making their own decision concerning the expenditure of funds with a minimum of dictation by the Regional Office. Overall, the Regional Office perceives its role as monitoring, interpreting guidelines, and providing helpful information to locally controlled non-profit corporations. They also feel that OEO has increased the funds to SEOOs for the purposes outlined in

(Page 60)

OEO Instruction 7501-1 and the money should be used for those purposes. Further, OEO has encouraged governors to place the directors of the SEOOs in a relative position to other social agencies so that an advocacy role might be attained.

(Page 61)

The situation is basically this: The State OEO is funded \$792,636 to perform a number of helpful services on behalf of the poor in partnership as a grantee with the WR/OEO and the CAAs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended. The SEOO accepted the money ostensibly to carry out OEO instructions and guidelines.

Clearly, with the number of staff and the amount of money being spent the guidelines and instructions have not been carried out and the results are negligible.

The evaluation team believes the intent and spirit of the Act to be couched in OEO Instruction 7501-1 which clearly directs and encourages State Offices to serve as a catalyst in support and in behalf of the poor and CAAs in alleviating and eliminating poverty. The California SEOO clearly has not served in this capacity.

The question which must be faced is this: "Should the SEOO be refunded by WR/OEO in view of the fact that,

- a. there has been inadequate performance or compliance with the SEOO grant work programs,
- b. OEO Instruction 7501-1 has not been sufficiently implemented and,
- c. an impasse exists between the Regional Office, the CAAs, and the SEOO."

It is unlikely that the SEOO can fulfill its responsibilities as outlined in OEO Instruction 7501-1 if present attitudes continue to exist. Since the SEOO is a grantee of the WR/OEO it is important that the issues raised in this evaluation be resolved by the WR/OEO by implementing the recommendations offered in this report.

## 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 SEEO 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, SEOO 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
Barny 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 Campiis	"	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	"	Frog. Planning Coord.)	
Carl P. Wallace	LongBeach 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-Wllwbrk	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	Admin Analyst	7 yrs
	Sacramento		
*(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	Ch - Asst Gen Mgr	3 yrs
	of Calif		
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	Director C.E.P.	3 yrs
	Cities		
Cynthia Williams	NCNW ContraCosta		
Mildred J. Germany	Nat'l Cncl of	Representative	
	Negro Women		
Ralph Petry	San Pablo Comm	General Manager	4 yrs
	Change Found.		
Ernest Salwen	Social Welfare	Voc Svcs Supvr	5 yrs
Mary L. Miller	League of Women	Member at Large	3 mos
	Voters		
Clarice Bean	Co Neighborhood	Counselor	3 yrs
	Youth Corp.		
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	Manpwr Admin's Rep	25 yrs
	Calif ES Agency)		
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	Rep to OEC Board	2½ yrs
	Council		
Bernard M. Ruedas	El Rancho - Pico	Member	6 mos
	Rivera Kiwanis		
Joe Romero	Headstart	President	6 mos
	Advisory Cncl		
Fannie M. Leonard	StMartin's Sr.	Chairman	2 yrs
	Citizens		

<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. Neighborhood Cncl	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.



## SEOO ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

### 1. ORGANIZATION:

a. Facts: The California SEOO 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 SEOO is placed within Human Relations Agency under the DHRD for administrative and logistical support, the SEOO's placement does not represent the actual command line. The SEOO 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 SEOO to the Governor and the SEOO 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.

Page 13, Item 1, Paragraph C

Wanda should have a copy of Executive Order #1 signed by Gil Sheffield, Director of HRD, re: Relationships

Page 13, Item 2, Paragraph A

Organizational chart prepared by grant breakdown before we came in - impossible situation, was like 4 agencies - construct internal administrative organizational chart.

Page 13, Item 2, Paragraph B

As far as Lawrence Chickering is concerned, in the community development area, it is important to have legal background.

Page 13, Item 2, Paragraph C

Refer to new refunding package, corrects all mistakes

Page 16 Paragraph C, Subsection 2 - Recommendation:

Memos within the office, either by telephone or in writing directly requesting all announcements of training sessions and conferences.

Page 19, Paragraph C, Subsection 2 - Recommendation:

First paragraph (a)

We have done so in next year's refunding package

paragraph (b)

It is done, not as exactly as they want; grant files. Cost of xeroxing is too costly; not that important a resource to expend that kind of money.

### 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