

# 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 (2 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/>

funds under this grant were used to support an investigation and to find reasons to close OEDCI and were not used to assist OEDCI with training and technical assistance.

b. Findings:

(1) The Executive Director reported that neither he nor the OEDCI board were apprised of plans to fund this demonstration nor were they sent a CAP Form 76 for comment at the time the application was submitted or funded.

(2) The Region IX, OEDCI field representative, Rick Morada, stated to an interviewer that he was not aware that the Oakland demonstration grant existed. Therefore, he could not comment on it. Morada said that the only thing he perceived the SEOO doing in OEDCI was investigation.

(3) There has been very little meaningful coordination between the appropriate Regional Office staff (field representative), the CAA or the special technical assistance consultant funded under this grant.

(4) The special technical assistance consultant has not regularly attended OEDCI Board and Executive Committee meetings. It was reported that the consultant attended only one such meeting.

(5) No quarterly diagnostic reports have been submitted to the WR/OEO or OEDCI. Since August 1, 1970, there should have been two quarterly reports submitted.

(6) The resume submitted for the person hired as the special technical assistance consultant under the grant does not meet the qualifications described in the grant.

(7) Mr. Espana, the special technical assistance consultant hired, was not approved by Region IX, OEO, as required by the grant.

(8) There was no evidence that the SEOO had attempted to administer or implement this grant as written at the Oakland CAA. To date, there has been no meaningful technical assistance provided to OEDCI staff, board, or low-income groups.

c. Conclusion:

(1) The SEOO has not performed the terms and conditions of the grant.

(2) WR/OEO and SEOO both have neglected to fulfill their responsibility to inform the parties involved of the demonstration grant.

(3) There was not proper monitoring of this grant to insure that the conditions, goals, and objectives were being met by the SSOO.

d. Recommendation:

(1) The grant should be terminated.

(2) An audit examination of the funds expended under this grant should be conducted as soon as possible.

## THE SEOO AND THE REGIONAL OFFICE

### 1. PERCEPTIONS:

The California SEOO perceives its relationship with Regional OEO to be at best ambivalent and at worst founded on distrust and permeated by mutual indifference. While the State and the Region got off to a good start in their relationship, the situation rapidly deteriorated until regular communication between the State and the Region became almost non-existent.

The State has complained, among other things, of the following matters:

a. The state is not routinely invited to participate in the pre-reviews of all CAAs in the State. When the Region does extend an invitation, it is often too late to allow the State to make the necessary scheduling adjustments to enable their personnel to be in attendance. Moreover, the State has also complained that once pre-review dates have been set by the Region and the CAAs, these dates are changed at the last moment producing a disruptive effect on the deployment of State personnel.

b. The State complains that the Region is unwilling to supply it with audit reports on the CAAs and that the State has been required, therefore, to seek out alternate sources to obtain such reports and other financial information on the CAAs.

c. The State has not been brought into meaningful participation in evaluations conducted by the Region on community action agencies. Robert Hawkins, Director of Operations for the SEOO, described the situation as follows:

- (1) "The State Office of Economic Opportunity has participated in a joint evaluation and review of OEDCI. However, the outcome of this evaluation was most unsatisfactory, due to duplicity on the part of the Regional Office.
- (2) "We have also participated in a Task Force Evaluation with WR/OEO on the Berkeley Community Action Agency. However, the State Office has withdrawn from this Task Force, and has sent a letter to Regional OEO requesting written guarantees that the powers enumerated in OEO Instruction 7501-1 will be guaranteed to the State Office (see Attachments). This action



was taken in light of the behavior of the Regional Office in the Oakland area.

- (3) "Simply stated, the State Office no longer trusts the verbal agreements reached with Regional OEO, feeling that whenever it is to their advantage, they will double-cross the State Office."

d. In the area of training and technical assistance, John Sawicki reported that "This office has never been invited by Region IX to participate in any contract formation or technical assistance planning."

e. An illustrative example of the breakdown of communication between SEOO and the Regional Office, as perceived by Robert Hawkins, deals with a demonstration grant involving the concept of volunteer action. It appears that a proposal by the State for the funding of a demonstration grant was signed off by the Region but thereafter the funds were not released. Hawkins described the situation as follows:

- (1) "The funds for the demonstration program have not been received by our office. The ostensible reasons given by WR/OEO is that the work program is unsatisfactory. However, in discussion with Joe Maldonado in Washington, D. C., in December, 1970, it was ascertained that National OEO was moving away from volunteerism.
- (2) "It appears to me that the real reason why the volunteer grant has not been approved, stems from differences between our office and the Western Regional Office. The reasons for the volunteer grant not being funded by Regional OEO to the State Office of Economic Opportunity are not known to us. The following chain of events took place regarding this grant:"
  - (a) "Rodger Betts formally signed the CAP 14 with the original work program.
  - (b) "Approximately two to three weeks later, Rodger Betts, on the advice of the Western Region staff, put a freeze on releasing the monies to us until we redesigned the work program. It was his contention

that the work program did not fulfill the conditions of the grant.

- (c) "It was then suggested by Mr. Betts that Mr. Uhler and Mr. Sawicki redesign the work program, working with the Region staff. Mr. Uhler said he would do this, but unless Mr. Betts committed to release monies after the redesigning, Mr. Uhler felt it would be a waste of time.
- (d) "Mr. Uhler and Mr. Sawicki went to WR/OEO after the commitment was given to Mr. Uhler by Mr. Betts that the monies would be released after the redesigning of the work program had been accomplished by the Region staff.
- (e) "Mr. Uhler and Mr. Sawicki spent eight hours at Regional OEO designing everything the way Region staff suggested. We then returned to Sacramento and wrote it according to their terms.
- (f) "Approximately a week later, the new work program was sent to WR/OEO, and to this day, as far as I know, there has been absolutely no word from Rodger Betts as to why the money has not been released.
- (g) "Mr. Uhler has talked with Mr. Betts on several occasions regarding this grant, and also has communicated several times with Joe Casillas. The last word we have from Mr. Cassillas is that this grant is on ice until our relationship with Regional OEO is improved."

The State reports that to date no training work programs or workshops have been developed by the Regional OEO and the State to strengthen the State's staff capabilities. It appears that the State and Local Government Division, Headquarters, OEO, has recently interceded with a request that such training programs and workshops take place. Reportedly, John Crutcher, Director, State and Local Government Division, made a phone call to the California SEOO around the first of March urging that such training programs and workshops be initiated.

The State reports that the Region Office has not informed the State of the Region's funding plans for the State.

## 2. FINDINGS:

As far as the California SEOO is concerned, they believe that the Regional Office has deliberately ignored them, has withheld information which they believe they are entitled to have, has failed to invite the State to participate jointly in such areas as evaluations and development of the State funding plans, and have failed to insure that the State has an adequate opportunity to attend pre-reviews. There is a deep feeling of mistrust and a sense by the State that they had been "double-crossed" and treated in a manner suggesting duplicity.

## 3. CONCLUSIONS:

Whether the State's reaction to its relationship with the Region is misplaced or justifiable was difficult to determine in the light of the charges and counter-charges which have been made. The fact remains, however, that somehow the situation has been allowed to deteriorate far beyond the point where it can be easily corrected. Lines of communication have broken down; the effects of unproductive confrontations have not been mended; the situation has fed upon itself; doubt and mistrust have been generated out of proportion.

## 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.



## THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND THE SEOO

### 1. PERCEPTIONS:

Regional Office field teams believe they have expended sufficient effort in their attempts to include SEOO staff in discussions and activities relating to grantees, but report they have been turned down by an unresponsive SEOO staff who either did not answer or failed to appear at pre-arranged meetings. A District Supervisor provided letters sent to the SEOO asking for meetings, one of which was held on December 10, 1971. Another District Supervisor reported that his attempts to arrange joint meetings were frustrating, e.g. it took five months to get a roster of SEOO personnel working in his area.

The Regional Office field teams and other Regional Office staff perceive Regional Office performance in supporting the SEOO as a difficult job, particularly in light of their belief that much of what is being decided is a result of unilateral decisions made by someone else, higher-up in the Region or in OEO/Washington.

Failures by the Regional Office to work closely with the SEOO are also explained by:

- a. The belief that the SEOO lacks interest in working on anything but investigating CAAs which disturb the status quo.
- b. The acceptance by Regional Office staff of the SEOO as "the enemy". Hence, the staff's unwillingness to provide support, share confidences, or make agreements which they do not expect will be kept.
- c. The perception of lack of competence in the SEOO staff.
- d. The WR/OEO has not developed a clear-cut operational policy toward the SEOO which is understood by all staff.

By not immediately obtaining resolution of SEOO complaints about OEO staff, and vice versa, the Regional Office has left neither SEOO nor Regional Office staff satisfied with working relationships. There is the case where a Regional Office field representative was publicly criticized by the SEOO, unfairly and inaccurately in her view, with a resulting investigation of the field representative by the Regional



Office and the dropping of the case. The issues were apparently not resolved. The SEOO still considers this case as an example of Regional Office staff undermining the SEOO.

## 2. FINDINGS:

Regional Office staff can document some efforts to include SEOO staff in joint planning with regard to grantees. (See especially letters from Frankie Jacobs, District Supervisor.) Regional Office staff can document their notices and invitations to the SEOO regarding pre-reviews, with adequate advance notice and with at least one instance when dates were changed to accommodate the SEOO.

The Regional Office Grant Application Process does provide for applications to be sent to the SEOO and with written notice of Regional Office receipt (by a carbon copy of the letter to the grantee acknowledging receipt).

The Regional Office included the SEOO in two out of the three CAA evaluations it conducted, viz. in Berkeley and Oakland, but not in San Bernardino.

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.

While the Regional Office did write for SEOO comments on the Regional training and technical assistance plan and did receive a reply (considered not very helpful), it doesn't appear that SEOO involvement was really encouraged.

There are no joint written agreements between the Regional Office and SEOO concerning activities which may overlap.

The Regional Office does deal directly with some state agencies without a by-pass agreement with the SEOO, e.g. with State Health and with Model Cities Coordinator in the Human Resources Department.

Key Regional Office staff who should relate to the SEOO and should know what is going on concerning the SEOO are more often than not left in the dark. The Planning Officer, the Training and Technical Assistance Chief, the SEOO Coordinator, and District Supervisors are not aware of what is transpiring beyond their own specific relations with the SEOO. The field representatives also don't know what is being done with the SEOO except in their direct concerns with grantee pre-reviews and through newspaper reports.

### 3. CONCLUSIONS:

Since top officials of OEO/Washington and the Regional Office have assumed some degree of responsibility for OEO relations with the California SEOO, very little Regional Office staff support for the SEOO was initiated, directed or supported. The exceptions are in field team planning, pre-reviews, and application processing, and while these were initiated at the field team level there doesn't seem to have been any direction or support from OEO Senior Staff.

As long as Regional Office staff feel that top OEO officials in OEO/Washington and the Regional Director are personally handling the California SEOO, they will be reluctant to initiate any actions which may be out of line with policy about which they have little knowledge and in the development of which they have not participated.

Since members of the Regional Office staff perceive the SEOO as the antagonist of the poor and OEO, they perceive their responsibility to support the SEOO as incomprehensible.

### 4. RECOMMENDATION:

OEO must clearly define and assign the responsibilities for OEO support of the SEOO to the Regional Office without undue interference.

The Regional Office must exercise leadership in resolving working relationships between the Regional Office and the SEOO and CAAs.

### 5. FINDINGS:

Performance of the SEOO in its role as advisor to the Governor is perceived as "good" by Regional Office staff members only on the assumption that the State administration's commitment is not aligned with the interests of the poor and the CAAs and OEO. (See Cal Williams, field representative, on why he answered "good".)

Members of the Regional Office staff do not believe the SEOO gives significant emphasis to resource mobilization except in isolated incidents.

There is no evidence of help to the OEO Regional Office in resource mobilization although the SEOO has done some work independently.

There has been either no SEOO coordination and planning with the Regional Office or so little that it has gone unnoticed by almost all Regional Office staff. The Regional Office Planning Officer reported that the only information on causes and conditions of poverty in the State received from the California SEOO arrived February 26, 1971. Leonard Downs of the California SEOO brought a copy of a tabulation showing welfare aid recipients by county in the State (see Attachments). 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 is unaware of any attempts by the SEOO to act as an advocate for the poor.

Performance, especially as revealed by the style of most of the SEOO staff field work is perceived as antagonistic toward the poor.

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. The SEOO participation in the development of the Regional Office training and technical assistance plan was reported as not helpful. 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. They identified the December, 1970, resource mobilization workshop conducted by the SEOO and state agencies in conjunction with A.T.A.C. (American Technical Assistance Corporation) for rural CAAs as the only example they know of where the SEOO has sponsored a workshop. The SEOO has consulted with OEO to assist grantees in taking corrective action recommended by OEO as a result of the evaluation of Oakland and Berkeley, but assistance from the SEOO to those grantees has not resulted. 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.

Performance in grant pre-reviews is perceived as not helpful ranging from no-attendance to "partial" attendance in an "observer" role.

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.



SEOO monitoring reports are not shared with OEO Regional staff, although Regional Office staff has requested that these be shared and jointly reviewed prior to action by the SEOO. Usually the results of SEOO monitoring surface after a grant has been vetoed and supportive justification is offered.

Few joint evaluations have taken place. Therefore, observation of the SEOO in this area has been limited.

#### 6. CONCLUSIONS:

The SEOO has not performed those functions which call for support to the OEO Regional Office. Actual SEOO performance has resulted in very little apparent help to OEO or OEO grantees when judged against the standards set by OEO Instruction 7501-1 or the SEOO grant work programs.

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.

The quality of performance has been so poor that had OEO properly monitored the grants made to the state, suspension for non-performance could have been justifiably recommended. This non-performance by the SEOO has been largely ignored by OEO. The California SEOO emphasis on grantee investigation and the methods of investigation were known to OEO but were not corrected. Accordingly, OEO has not performed its function of advocating for the poor and for OEO grantees by requiring the SEOO to perform its proper functions and grant work program commitments.

No real improvements can be made in SEOO performance unless OEO enforces SEOO compliance with the intent and purpose of the Economic Opportunity Act and the grant work program and redirects the SEOO's thrust away from investigations to positive aid and assistance.

#### 7. RECOMMENDATION:

OEO must require SEOO conformance to the intent, and purposes of the Economic Opportunity Act and require compliance with grant work programs and OEO instructions.



## 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

### 3. 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 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.

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 re-funded 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.

# CALIFORNIA SEOO EVALUATION

## TABULATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE ANSWERS

- I - Purpose
- II - Procedures
- III - Findings
- Attachments
- #1 - Questionnaire Summary by Section
- #2 - Questionnaire Summaries by Function
- #3 - Tabulations of Individual Questions

## CALIFORNIA SEOO EVALUATION

### TABULATION OF QUESTIONNAIRE ANSWERS

#### I. Purpose

The questionnaire was designed to collect data showing how different groups perceive the performance of the California SEOO. This tabulation reflects the results.

#### II. Procedures

##### A. Groups interviewed and Questionnaire sections

1. Twenty-four persons on the SEOO professional field staff (community program analysts, coordinators, specialists) and twenty-three OEO regional office field staff were asked to complete Section III - The SEOO and CAAs; Section VII - The SEOO and the Regional Office; Section VIII - The Regional Office and the SEOO; Section XI - The California SEOO Work Program.
2. Five of the senior SEOO personnel were asked to complete selected sections of the questionnaire. (Accordingly, the tabulation tables will show different numbers of SEOO staff answering each section.)

Six OEO regional office staff personnel were asked to complete all or selected sections of the questionnaire. Three other regional office staff were asked to complete Sections I, II, VII, VIII which deal with the SEOO as advisor to the governor, with the SEOO and state agencies, with the SEOO and the Regional Office. These nine regional office staff personnel were selected from these divisions: Office of Governmental Relations; Plans, Budget & Evaluation; Program Management Support, VISTA; and Legal Services.

3. CAA executive directors and board chairmen were asked to complete Section III - The SEOO and CAAs and Section XI - The California SEOO Work Program.

Twenty-one CAA executive directors and 17 board chairmen were personally interviewed by the evaluation team.

Another thirteen CAA executive directors and four board chairmen submitted their questionnaires by mail in time for this tabulation. The questionnaires from two CAA executive directors arrived too late to be included.



4. Nine state agency officials completed Section II - The SEOO and Other State Agencies.
5. Fourteen staff personnel from other federal agencies completed Section IV - The SEOO and Other Federal Agencies. The agencies interviewed were:

Health, Education & Welfare - 2 (with four other staff participating in the interview)

Housing & Urban Development - 6 (including five who gave their answers by telephone)

Labor - 4

Small Business Administration - 1 (with six other staff participating in the interview)

Economic Development Administration - 1

6. Eighteen representatives of local government were interviewed and asked to complete Section V - The SEOO and Local Government.
7. Twenty-eight representatives or members of community groups, primarily organizations of poor people, were asked to complete Section VI - The SEOO and Community Groups.

B. Total number of questionnaires

This tabulation includes data from 168 questionnaires from people interviewed by the evaluation team plus 17 which were sent by mail for a total of 185 questionnaires.

(More than 168 people were interviewed, but some participated in interviews but were not asked to fill out questionnaires, e.g. CAA director's staff.)

C. Questions and Ratings

1. The questions in the questionnaire were written in either one of two ways:
  - a. "Has the SEOO . . . " which could be answered by a "yes/no/don't know" rating;



- b. "How well has the SEOO . . . " which could be answered by a "good/poor/don't know" rating.

(The SEOO Organization and Management section does not exactly follow the system.)

2. The questions were drawn from OEO Instruction 7501-1, "The Role of the SEOO" and from the SEOO CAP 81 and work programs. The scope of questions was deliberately designed to be comprehensive in order to avoid bias in the selection of questions to be included.

Altogether 119 questions appeared in the questionnaire.

#### D. The Tabulation Tables

1. Each Question

Tabulations of thirty questions (out of 119) are included in this report. They were selected as a fair and significant representation to show perceptions of SEOO performance.

2. Questionnaire Summary by Section (in percentages)

The figures shown in this summary are the percentage of the total number of responses to all questions in the particular section of the questionnaire.

3. Questionnaire Summaries by Function (in percentages)

The figures shown in these tables are percentages of the total number of responses to questions which relate to the particular function, e.g. Technical Assistance. These questions relating to a particular function appeared in several sections of the questionnaire.

### III. Questionnaire Tabulation Findings

1. The most striking and obvious finding in the tabulation is the high percentage of answers in the "don't know" category.

People in all groups and for almost all sections of the questionnaire don't know whether or not the SEOO has performed many of the tasks it is supposed to do or how well it has performed them.

Reviews of individual questionnaires revealed that this situation was relatively the same with experienced personnel as well as with new staff. Likewise, the interview experience confirmed that the "don't know" answers came from lack of knowledge rather than an unwillingness to state an opinion affirmatively or negatively.

2. The next most obvious finding is that while the SEOO perceives its performance positively no other group can agree. For questions which people believed they could answer (taking out the "don't knows") the results were generally negative. In other words, when people had knowledge of SEOO activities they thought poorly of the SEOO.
3. The CAAs were more decisive in stating their negative perception of SEOO performance than were the regional office staff.
4. The question asked concerning the SEOO's performance as advisor to the governor had mixed responses.

Some people insisted on writing in that their rating of "good" meant only that the SEOO performance carried out the governor's philosophy.

# QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY BY SECTION IN PERCENTAGE

	SECTION I (SECO AND THE GOVERNOR)				SECTION II (SECO & OTHER STATE AGENCIES)				SECTION III (SECO AND CAA's)				SECTION IV (SECO & FEDERAL AGENCIES)				SECTION V (SECO & LOCAL GOVERNMENT)				SECTION VI (SECO & COMTY GROUPS)			
	AF	NEG	DK	T	AF	NEG	DK	T	AF	NEG	DK	T	AF	NEG	DK	T	AF	NEG	DK	T	AF	NEG	DK	T
SECO	79	21	0	100	58	20	22	100	47	9	44	100	67	11	22	100	50	0	50	100	63	13	24	100
REGIONAL OFFICE	7	21	72	100	0	31	69	100	7	54	39	100	0	42	58	100	8	25	67	100	0	50	50	100
CAA's									10	62	28	100												
STATE AGENCIES					3	16	81	100																
FEDERAL AGENCIES													0	17	83	100								
LOCAL GOVERNMENT																	15	35	50	100				
COMMUNITY GROUPS																					2	52	46	100
	SECTION VII (SECO & OEO REG OFFICE)				SECTION VIII (OEO REGIONAL OFC. & SECO)				SECTION IX (OEO/OEO AND THE SECO)				SECTION X (SECO ORGANIZATION & MANAC.)				SECTION XI (SECO WORK PROG. CALIF.)							
	AF	NEG	DK	T	AF	NEG	DK	T	AF	NEG	DK	T	AF	NEG	DK	T	AF	NEG	DK	T				
SECO	30	9	61	100	8	40	52	100	32	24	44	100	89	7	4	100	55	4	41	100				
REGIONAL OFFICE	4	47	49	100	24	16	60	100	15	0	85	100	11	25	64	100	6	61	33	100				
CAA's																	6	61	33	100				

KEY [AF] = AFFIRMATIVE RESPONSE ("Yes" or "Good")  
 [NEG] = NEGATIVE RESPONSE ("No" or "Poor")  
 [DK] = DON'T KNOW  
 [T] = TOTAL



FUNCTION: Advisor to Governor

SAMPLE OF A QUESTION RELATING TO FUNCTION:

"How well has the SEOO assisted the governor concerning the governor's authority to dis-approve OEO grants and contracts of assistance?"

FUNCTION BY GROUP AND RESPONSE *YES/NO				
RESPONDING GROUPS	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	T
SEOO	100 %	0 %	0 %	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE	33 %	22 %	45 %	100 %
CAAs	%	%	%	%
STATE AGENCIES	%	%	%	%
FEDERAL AGENCIES	%	%	%	%
LOCAL GOVERNMENT	%	%	%	%
COMMUNITY GROUPS	%	%	%	%

\*YES/NO RESPONSE INDICATES THAT THE RESPONDENT FEELS THE SEOO HAS OR HAS NOT PERFORMED SPECIFIC TASKS RELATED TO THIS FUNCTION.

FUNCTION BY GROUP AND RESPONSE *GOOD/POOR				
RESPONDING GROUPS	GOOD	POOR	DON'T KNOW	T
SEOO	91 %	0 %	9 %	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE	27 %	27 %	46 %	100 %
CAAs	32 %	32 %	36 %	100 %
STATE AGENCIES	11 %	33 %	56 %	100 %
FEDERAL AGENCIES	0 %	7 %	93 %	100 %
LOCAL GOVERNMENT	23 %	30 %	47 %	100 %
COMMUNITY GROUPS	%	%	%	%

\*GOOD/POOR RESPONSE INDICATES THE QUALITY WITH WHICH THE SEOO HAS PERFORMED SPECIFIC TASKS RELATED TO THIS FUNCTION.



FUNCTION: Resource Mobilization

SAMPLE OF A QUESTION RELATING TO FUNCTION:

"How well has the SEOO on its own initiative, sought out or assisted in the development of every state, Federal, community and private agency resource (programs, expertise, funds, etc.) that can be effectively marshalled and/or coordinated to assist CAAs and other anti-poverty efforts within the state?"

FUNCTION BY GROUP AND RESPONSE *YES/NO				
RESPONDING GROUPS	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	T
SEOO	100%	0%	0%	100%
REGIONAL OFFICE	0%	50%	50%	100%
CAAs	%	%	%	%
STATE AGENCIES	11%	22%	67%	100%
FEDERAL AGENCIES	%	%	%	%
LOCAL GOVERNMENT	%	%	%	%
COMMUNITY GROUPS	%	%	%	%

\*YES/NO RESPONSE INDICATES THAT THE RESPONDENT FEELS THE SEOO HAS OR HAS NOT PERFORMED SPECIFIC TASKS RELATED TO THIS FUNCTION.

FUNCTION BY GROUP AND RESPONSE *GOOD/POOR				
RESPONDING GROUPS	GOOD	POOR	DON'T KNOW	T
SEOO	81%	0%	19%	100%
REGIONAL OFFICE	4%	65%	31%	100%
CAAs	8%	72%	20%	100%
STATE AGENCIES	22%	33%	45%	100%
FEDERAL AGENCIES	0%	21%	79%	100%
LOCAL GOVERNMENT	6%	44%	50%	100%
COMMUNITY GROUPS	%	%	%	%

\*GOOD/POOR RESPONSE INDICATES THE QUALITY WITH WHICH THE SEOO HAS PERFORMED SPECIFIC TASKS RELATED TO THIS FUNCTION.

FUNCTION: Coordination & Planning

SAMPLE OF A QUESTION RELATING TO FUNCTION:

"Has the SEOO Director provided other state agencies with information and statistics on the causes and conditions of poverty in the state, on the problems and needs of the poor, and the programs and efforts to overcome poverty within the state?"

FUNCTION BY GROUP AND RESPONSE *YES/NO				
RESPONDING GROUPS	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	T
SEOO	31 %	8 %	61 %	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE	1 %	42 %	57 %	100 %
CAAs	5 %	64 %	31 %	100 %
STATE AGENCIES	8 %	30 %	62 %	100 %
FEDERAL AGENCIES	%	%	%	%
LOCAL GOVERNMENT	31 %	44 %	25 %	100 %
COMMUNITY GROUPS	4 %	56 %	40 %	100 %

FUNCTION BY GROUP AND RESPONSE *GOOD/POOR				
RESPONDING GROUPS	GOOD	POOR	DON'T KNOW	T
SEOO	27 %	1 %	72 %	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE	1 %	49 %	50 %	100 %
CAAs	%	%	%	%
STATE AGENCIES	12 %	44 %	44 %	100 %
FEDERAL AGENCIES	0 %	21 %	79 %	100 %
LOCAL GOVERNMENT	%	%	%	%
COMMUNITY GROUPS	%	%	%	%

\*YES/NO RESPONSE INDICATES THAT THE RESPONDENT FEELS THE SEOO HAS OR HAS NOT PERFORMED SPECIFIC TASKS RELATED TO THIS FUNCTION.

\*GOOD/POOR RESPONSE INDICATES THE QUALITY WITH WHICH THE SEOO HAS PERFORMED SPECIFIC TASKS RELATED TO THIS FUNCTION.

FUNCTION: Advocacy for the Poor

SAMPLE OF A QUESTION RELATING TO FUNCTION:

"How well has the SEOO acted as a special advocate for the poor in state government by such activities as:

- Working for representation of the poor on state committees which operate programs affecting the poor? . . .
- Assessing state-poverty-related programs . . .
- Assessing state administrative procedures and working to make them more responsive to the needs and desires of the poor . . .
- Developing career opportunities for the poor within other state agencies . . ."

FUNCTION BY GROUP AND RESPONSE *YES/NO				
RESPONDING GROUPS	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	T
SEOO	27 %	14 %	59 %	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE	0 %	47 %	53 %	100 %
CAAs	2 %	84 %	14 %	100 %
STATE AGENCIES	0 %	26 %	74 %	100 %
FEDERAL AGENCIES	%	%	%	%
LOCAL GOVERNMENT	%	%	%	%
COMMUNITY GROUPS	%	%	%	%

FUNCTION BY GROUP AND RESPONSE *GOOD/POOR				
RESPONDING GROUPS	GOOD	POOR	DON'T KNOW	T
SEOO	38 %	4 %	58 %	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE	1 %	54 %	45 %	100 %
CAAs	3 %	56 %	41 %	100 %
STATE AGENCIES	0 %	33 %	67 %	100 %
FEDERAL AGENCIES	%	%	%	%
LOCAL GOVERNMENT	%	%	%	%
COMMUNITY GROUPS	%	%	%	%

\*YES/NO RESPONSE INDICATES THAT THE RESPONDENT FEELS THE SEOO HAS OR HAS NOT PERFORMED SPECIFIC TASKS RELATED TO THIS FUNCTION.

\*GOOD/POOR RESPONSE INDICATES THE QUALITY WITH WHICH THE SEOO HAS PERFORMED SPECIFIC TASKS RELATED TO THIS FUNCTION.



FUNCTION: Technical Assistance

SAMPLE OF A QUESTION RELATING TO FUNCTION:

"How well has the SEOO provided special technical assistance where needed to Community Action Agencies, community groups, and other grantees or potential grantees, in developing, conducting and administering programs to alleviate poverty?"

FUNCTION BY GROUP AND RESPONSE *YES/NO				
RESPONDING GROUPS	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	T
SEOO	46 %	13 %	41 %	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE	5 %	50 %	45 %	100 %
CAAs	8 %	69 %	23 %	100 %
STATE AGENCIES	0 %	22 %	78 %	100 %
FEDERAL AGENCIES	%	%	%	%
LOCAL GOVERNMENT	%	%	%	%
COMMUNITY GROUPS	%	%	%	%

FUNCTION BY GROUP AND RESPONSE *GOOD/POOR				
RESPONDING GROUPS	GOOD	POOR	DON'T KNOW	T
SEOO	39 %	11 %	50 %	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE	0 %	62 %	38 %	100 %
CAAs	6 %	77 %	17 %	100 %
STATE AGENCIES	11 %	22 %	67 %	100 %
FEDERAL AGENCIES	%	%	%	%
LOCAL GOVERNMENT	0 %	20 %	80 %	100 %
COMMUNITY GROUPS	0 %	48 %	52 %	100 %

\*YES/NO RESPONSE INDICATES THAT THE RESPONDENT FEELS THE SEOO HAS OR HAS NOT PERFORMED SPECIFIC TASKS RELATED TO THIS FUNCTION.

\*GOOD/POOR RESPONSE INDICATES THE QUALITY WITH WHICH THE SEOO HAS PERFORMED SPECIFIC TASKS RELATED TO THIS FUNCTION.

Grant Review, Monitoring &  
Evaluation

FUNCTION: \_\_\_\_\_

SAMPLE OF A QUESTION RELATING TO FUNCTION:

"How well has the SEOO provided advice and assistance at an early or pre-review stage in the development of program proposals by CAAs and other OEO grantees?"

FUNCTION BY GROUP AND RESPONSE *YES/NO				
RESPONDING GROUPS	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	T
SEOO	65%	8%	27%	100%
REGIONAL OFFICE	14%	58%	28%	100%
CAAs	23%	56%	21%	100%
STATE AGENCIES	%	%	%	%
FEDERAL AGENCIES	%	%	%	%
LOCAL GOVERNMENT	%	%	%	%
COMMUNITY GROUPS	%	%	%	%

FUNCTION BY GROUP AND RESPONSE *GOOD/POOR				
RESPONDING GROUPS	GOOD	POOR	DON'T KNOW	T
SEOO	55%	10%	35%	100%
REGIONAL OFFICE	%	49%	51%	100%
CAAs	7%	55%	38%	100%
STATE AGENCIES	%	%	%	%
FEDERAL AGENCIES	%	%	%	%
LOCAL GOVERNMENT	%	%	%	%
COMMUNITY GROUPS	%	%	%	%

\*YES/NO RESPONSE INDICATES THAT THE RESPONDENT FEELS THE SEOO HAS OR HAS NOT PERFORMED SPECIFIC TASKS RELATED TO THIS FUNCTION.

\*GOOD/POOR RESPONSE INDICATES THE QUALITY WITH WHICH THE SEOO HAS PERFORMED SPECIFIC TASKS RELATED TO THIS FUNCTION.

FUNCTION · Management

SAMPLE OF A QUESTION RELATING TO FUNCTION:

"How well is the SEOO organized to effectively utilize staff and financial resources?"

FUNCTION BY GROUP AND RESPONSE *YES/NO				
RESPONDING GROUPS	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	T
SEOO	90 %	4 %	6 %	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE	13 %	20 %	67 %	100 %
CAAs	18 %	10 %	72 %	100 %
STATE AGENCIES	%	%	%	%
FEDERAL AGENCIES	%	%	%	%
LOCAL GOVERNMENT	%	%	%	%
COMMUNITY GROUPS	%	%	%	%

FUNCTION BY GROUP AND RESPONSE *GOOD/POOR				
RESPONDING GROUPS	GOOD	POOR	DON'T KNOW	T
SEOO	98 %	2 %	0 %	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE	17 %	33 %	50 %	100 %
CAAs	%	%	%	%
STATE AGENCIES	%	%	%	%
FEDERAL AGENCIES	%	%	%	%
LOCAL GOVERNMENT	%	%	%	%
COMMUNITY GROUPS	%	%	%	%

\*YES/NO RESPONSE INDICATES THAT THE RESPONDENT FEELS THE SEOO HAS OR HAS NOT PERFORMED SPECIFIC TASKS RELATED TO THIS FUNCTION.

\*GOOD/POOR RESPONSE INDICATES THE QUALITY WITH WHICH THE SEOO HAS PERFORMED SPECIFIC TASKS RELATED TO THIS FUNCTION.



# SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

## SECTION #1 THE SEOO AND THE GOVERNOR

### QUESTION REFERENCE

#2. 7501-1 How well has the SEOO assisted the Governor  
2a. concerning the Governor's authority to disapprove  
OEO grants and contracts of assistance?

LIST grants or contracts which have been  
disapproved by the Governor in the past  
12 months.

T A B U L A T I O N      R E S U L T S									
RESPONDING GROUPS		GOOD		POOR		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	2	# 2	100 %	# 0	0 %	# 0	0 %	# 2	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	8	# 1	13 %	# 1	13 %	# 6	74 %	# 8	100 %
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

# SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

## SECTION #II THE SEOO AND OTHER STATE AGENCIES

### QUESTION REFERENCE

#6. 7501-1 How well has the SEOO developed effective inter-  
3a. agency mechanisms to assure good communication be-  
CAP 81 tween state agencies and offices whose activities  
IV-D affect the poor?

DESCRIBE those inter-agency mechanisms which  
have had significant success.

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS		GOOD		POOR		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	3	# 3	100 %	# 0	0 %	# 0	0 %	# 3	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	8	# 0	0 %	# 3	38 %	# 5	62 %	# 8	100 %
STATE AGENCIES	9	# 1	11 %	# 4	44 %	# 4	45 %	# 9	100 %
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

# SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

## SECTION # 11 THE SEOO AND OTHER STATE AGENCIES

### QUESTION REFERENCE

- #7. 7501-1 How well has the SEOO, on its own initiative,  
 3a. sought out and developed or assisted in the devel-  
 4d. opment of every state resource (programs, expertise,  
 6h. funds, etc.) that can be effectively marshalled  
 and/or coordinated to assist CAAs and other anti-  
 poverty efforts within the state?
- CAP 81  
 I-C  
 II-A LIST agencies and resources mobilized during  
 IV-C the past 6 months.
- W.P. DESCRIBE significant successes.  
 III-C  
 IV-A/C

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	GOOD		POOR		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	3	# 3	100%	# 0	0%	# 0	0%	# 3	100%
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	8	# 0	0%	# 3	38%	# 5	62%	# 8	100%
STATE AGENCIES	9	# 2	22%	# 3	33%	# 4	45%	# 9	100%
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%



# SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

## SECTION # II THE SEOO AND OTHER STATE AGENCIES

### QUESTION REFERENCE

#9. 7501-1 3c. Has the SEOO provided information and assistance with the objective of enacting and amending legislation and developing programs for the benefit of the poor - CAP 81 II-A

c. to other state agencies?

LIST proposed legislative actions or programs during the past year.

DESCRIBE significant successes or failures.

T A B U L A T I O N   R E S U L T S									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	YES		NO		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	3	# 2	66 %	# 0	0%	#1	34 %	# 3	100%
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	7	# 0	0 %	# 2	29%	#5	71 %	# 7	100%
STATE AGENCIES	9	# 0	0 %	# 2	22%	#7	78 %	# 9	100%
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

# SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

## SECTION # III THE SEOO AND COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

QUESTION REFERENCE

#1 7501-1 How well has the SEOO represented the Governor  
2b. with respect to CAAs?

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	GOOD		POOR		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	28	#26	93 %	#0	0%	#2	7%	# 28	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	28	#14	46 %	#9	32%	#7	22%	# 28	100 %
CAA EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS	33	#11	33 %	#11	33%	#11	34 %	# 33	100 %
CAA BOARD CHAIRMEN	19	# 6	32 %	# 5	26%	#8	42 %	# 19	100 %

# SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

## SECTION # III THE SEOO AND COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

### QUESTION REFERENCE

#3. 7501-1 3b. How well has the SEOO acted as a special advocate for the poor in state government by such activities as:

W.P. b. Assessing state-poverty-related programs and  
III-D working to make them more responsive to the needs and desires of the poor?

LIST the state-operated programs which the CAAs have asked the SEOO to assist to make more responsive during the past year.

DESCRIBE significant successes or failures.

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	GOOD		POOR		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	28	#13	46 %	#0	0%	#15	54%	#28	100%
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	28	#1	4 %	#18	64 %	#9	32%	#28	100%
CAA EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS	34	#1	3 %	#20	59 %	#13	38%	#34	100%
CAA BOARD CHAIRMEN	20	#1	5 %	#11	55 %	#8	40%	#20	100%



# SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

## SECTION #III THE SEOO AND COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

### QUESTION REFERENCE

#8. 7501-1 4a. CAP 81 II-A/B

How well has the SEOO provided special technical assistance where needed to Community Action Agencies, community groups, and other grantees or potential grantees, in developing, conducting and administering programs to alleviate poverty?

W.P. I-B IV-A/D

LIST occasions when special Technical Assistance has been provided, identifying subject and who provided the Technical Assistance during the past 6 months.

DESCRIBE significant successes or failures.

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	GOOD		POOR		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	28	#22	79%	#0	0%	#6	21%	#28	100%
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	27	#0	0%	#19	70%	#8	30%	#27	100%
CAA EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS	33	#4	12%	#26	79%	#3	9%	#33	100%
CAA BOARD CHAIRMEN	21	#1	5%	#15	71%	#5	24%	#21	100%

# SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

## SECTION #III THE SEOO AND COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

### QUESTION REFERENCE

#9. 7501-1 4a. Has the SEOO consulted with the CAAs -- using Checkpoint Form 76 -- at the time of grantee pre-review and when developing its own annual re-funding request to determine OEO grantee needs for specialized technical assistance and to get advice on how the SEOO can assist in meeting these needs?

CAP 81 II-B

W.P. I-B

LIST the occasions when the SEOO has consulted with the CAAs on their needs for specialized technical assistance during the past 6 months. Identify how this was done -- by letter, field visit, meeting, telephone.

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	YES		NO		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	27	#12	44 %	#1	4%	#14	52 %	# 27	100%
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	28	# 2	7 %	#12	43%	#14	50 %	# 28	100 %
CAA EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS	34	# 5	15%	#26	76%	#3	9 %	# 34	100 %
CAA BOARD CHAIRMEN	21	# 3	14%	# 12	57%	#6	29 %	# 21	100 %

# SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

## SECTION # III THE SEOO AND COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

### QUESTION REFERENCE

- #11. 7501-1 4b. Has the SEOO participated in the annual field pre-review of an OEO grantee, along with an OEO representative (Regional or Headquarters)?
- W.P. III-A LIST the grantee pre-reviews attended by the SEOO in the past 6 months.
- DESCRIBE pre-reviews when the SEOO has been helpful to the CAA Board in exercising its policy decision-making responsibilities.

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	YES		NO		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	28	#23	82%	#1	4%	#4	14%	#28	100%
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	28	#16	57%	#6	21%	#6	22%	#28	100%
CAA EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS	34	#17	50%	#16	47%	#1	3%	#34	100%
CAA BOARD CHAIRMEN	21	#13	62%	#7	33%	#1	5%	#21	100%



# SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

## SECTION #III THE SEOO AND COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

### QUESTION REFERENCE

#12. 7501-1 4b. CAP 81 II-B W.P. I-B/C

How well has the SEOO provided advice and assistance at an early or pre-review stage in the development of program proposals by CAAs and other OEO grantees?

LIST the occasions when the CAAs and grantees were assisted by the SEOO in the past 6 months at an early or pre-review stage.

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	GOOD		POOR		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	27	#13	48%	#3	11%	#11	41%	#27	100%
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	27	#0	0%	#16	59%	#11	41%	#27	100%
CAA EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS	34	#2	6%	#26	76%	#6	18%	#34	100%
CAA BOARD CHAIRMEN	21	#3	14%	#15	71%	#3	15%	#21	100%

# SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

## SECTION #III THE SEOO AND COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

### QUESTION REFERENCE

#13. 7501-1 4b. Did the SEOO sign the Form 77 (Checkpoint Procedure) on site at the conclusion of the field pre-review or no later than 15 days after receipt of the form?

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	YES		NO		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	28	#15	54 %	#2	7%	#11	39%	#28	100%
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	28	#2	7 %	#13	47%	#13	46%	#28	100%
CAA EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS	34	#11	32 %	#14	41%	#9	27%	#34	100%
CAA BOARD CHAIRMEN	20	#4	20 %	#4	20%	#12	60%	#20	100%

# SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

## SECTION #III THE SEOO AND COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

### QUESTION REFERENCE

- #21. 7501-1 6f. How well has the SEOO monitored some or all of the OEO-funded programs within the state if it has the staff capability and if this activity is part of the approved SEOO Work Program, which includes arrangements for periodic written reports plus other reporting of special activity or problems, to the appropriate OEO grant office.

LIST grantees where significant monitoring was done during the past 6 months.

DESCRIBE circumstances and results.

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	GOOD		POOR		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	27	#18	67 %	#1	4 %	#8	29 %	#27	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	27	#0	0 %	#16	59 %	#11	41 %	#27	100 %
CAA EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS	34	#3	9 %	#20	59 %	#11	32 %	#34	100 %
CAA BOARD CHAIRMEN	21	#1	4 %	#10	48 %	#10	48 %	#21	100 %



# SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

## SECTION # III THE SEOO AND COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

### QUESTION REFERENCE

- #21. 7501-1 6f. How well has the SEOO monitored some or all of the OEO-funded programs within the state if it has the staff capability and if this activity is part of the approved SEOO Work Program, which includes arrangements for periodic written reports plus other reporting of special activity or problems, to the appropriate OEO grant office.

LIST grantees where significant monitoring was done during the past 6 months.

DESCRIBE circumstances and results.

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	GOOD		POOR		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	27	#18	67 %	#1	4 %	#8	29 %	#27	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	27	#0	0 %	#16	59 %	#11	41 %	#27	100 %
CAA EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS	34	#3	9 %	#20	59 %	#11	32 %	#34	100 %
CAA BOARD CHAIRMEN	21	#1	4 %	#10	48 %	#10	48 %	#21	100 %

# SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

## SECTION #IV THE SEOO AND OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

### QUESTION REFERENCE

- #2. 7501-1 How well has the SEOO, on its own initiative,  
 3a. sought out and developed or assisted in the  
 4d. development of Federal resources (programs,  
 expertise, funds, etc.) that can be effectively  
 CAP 81 marshalled and/or coordinated to assist CAAs and  
 IV-E other anti-poverty efforts within the state?
- W.P. LIST federal resources mobilized during the  
 IV-C past 6 months.

DESCRIBE significant successes.

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	GOOD		POOR		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	3	# 2	67 %	# 0	0 %	# 1	33 %	# 3	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	4	# 0	0 %	# 2	50 %	# 2	50 %	# 4	100 %
FEDERAL AGENCIES	14	# 0	0 %	# 3	21 %	# 11	79 %	# 14	100 %
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

# SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

SECTION #V SEOO AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

QUESTION REFERENCE

#1. 7501-1 How well has the SEOO represented the Governor  
2b. with respect to local units of government?

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	GOOD		POOR		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	1	#1	100 %	# 0	0 %	# 0	0 %	# 1	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	3	#1	33 %	# 0	0 %	# 2	67 %	# 3	100 %
LOCAL GOVERNMENT	17	#4	24 %	# 5	29 %	# 8	47 %	# 17	100 %
CAA BOARD CHAIRMEN		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%



# SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

## SECTION # V THE SEOO AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

### QUESTION REFERENCE

#4. 7501-1 4a. How well has the SEOO provided special technical assistance where needed to local government agencies, in developing, conducting and administering programs to alleviate poverty?  
CAP 81 II-A

LIST occasions during the past six months when special technical assistance was provided. Identify subject and who provided the technical assistance.

DESCRIBE significant successes or failures.

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	GOOD		POOR		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	1	# 0	0 %	# 0	0 %	# 1	100 %	# 1	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	3	# 0	0 %	# 1	33 %	# 2	67 %	# 3	100 %
LOCAL GOVERNMENT	15	# 0	0 %	# 3	20 %	# 12	80 %	# 15	100 %
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

# SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

## SECTION # VI THE SEOO AND COMMUNITY GROUPS, PRIVATE AGENCIES AND GENERAL PUBLIC

### QUESTION REFERENCE

#1. 7501-1 How well has the SEOO provided special technical  
4a. assistance where needed to community groups in  
developing, conducting and administering pro-  
grams to alleviate poverty?  
CAP 81  
II-A  
W.P.  
I-B

LIST occasions during the past six months when  
special technical assistance was provided.  
Identify subject and who provided the tech-  
nical assistance.

DESCRIBE significant successes or failures.

T A B U L A T I O N R E S U L T S									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	GOOD		POOR		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	4	# 2	50 %	# 0	0 %	# 2	50 %	# 4	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	3	# 0	0 %	# 2	67 %	# 1	33 %	# 3	100 %
COMMUNITY GROUPS	27	# 0	0 %	# 13	48 %	# 14	52 %	# 27	100 %
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

# SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

## SECTION #VII THE SEOO AND THE OEO REGIONAL OFFICE

### QUESTION REFERENCE

#7. 7501-1 6d. How well has the SEOO advised OEO on funding requests for all applicants within the state or who will operate within the state with written comments on these applications.

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	GOOD		POOR		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	24	# 10	42 %	# 4	16 %	# 10	42 %	# 24	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	30	# 0	0 %	# 12	40 %	# 18	60 %	# 30	100 %
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%



# SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

## SECTION # VII THE SEOO AND THE OEO REGIONAL OFFICE

### QUESTION REFERENCE

#8. 7501-1 How well has the SEOO consulted with the Regional  
4a. office to determine OEO grantee needs for special-  
ized technical assistance and to get advice on how  
the SEOO can assist in meeting these needs?  
W.P.  
IV-D

LIST occasions and grantees during the past  
6 months when this was done.

DESCRIBE significant occasions when the SEOO  
responded to Regional Office requests.

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	GOOD		POOR		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	24	# 5	21%	# 5	21%	# 14	58%	# 24	100%
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	32	# 0	0%	# 24	75%	# 8	25%	# 32	100%
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

# SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

## SECTION #VII THE SEOO AND THE OEO REGIONAL OFFICE

### QUESTION REFERENCE

#13. 7501-1 6f. Has the SEOO provided the Regional Office with periodic written reports on its monitoring activities plus other reporting of special activity or problems to the appropriate OEO Grant office?

LIST grantees where significant monitoring was done during the past 6 months.

DESCRIBE circumstances and results.

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	YES		NO		DOUBT KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	24	# 10	42%	# 0	0%	# 14	58%	# 24	100%
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	31	# 1	3%	# 19	61%	# 11	36%	# 31	100%
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%