

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 (3 of 7)

Box: P27

To see more digitized collections visit:

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

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

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

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

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

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

SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

SECTION #VII THE SEOO AND THE OEO REGIONAL OFFICE

QUESTION REFERENCE

#16. 7501-1 How well has the SEOO advised the Regional Office
6g. on special problems in the state that might develop as a result of the activities or presence of VISTA Volunteers, and assisted the Regional Office in resolving such problems?

LIST the special problems during the past six months.

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	GOOD		POOR		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	24	#5	21%	#0	0%	#19	79%	#24	100%
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	31	#1	3%	#13	42%	#17	55%	#31	100%
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

SECTION # VIII THE OEO REGIONAL OFFICE AND THE SEOO

QUESTION REFERENCE

#1. 7501-1 How well has the Regional Office worked jointly
7c. with the SEOO to strengthen the SEOO staff capa-
bility to carry out its work programs and to
W.P. overcome any weaknesses that may be revealed by
II-D evaluations?

LIST joint training programs or workshops.
Identify number of SEOO-staff invited
and attending and their job levels during
the past year.

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	GOOD		POOR		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	29	# 1	3 %	# 20	69 %	# 8	28 %	# 29	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	31	# 7	23 %	# 11	35 %	# 13	42 %	# 31	100 %
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

SECTION # VIII THE OEO REGIONAL OFFICE AND THE SEOO

QUESTION REFERENCE

#1. 7501-1 How well has the Regional Office worked jointly
7c. with the SEOO to strengthen the SEOO staff capa-
W.P. bility to carry out its work programs and to
II-D overcome any weaknesses that may be revealed by
evaluations?

LIST joint training programs or workshops.
Identify number of SEOO-staff invited
and attending and their job levels during
the past year.

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	29	# 1	3 %	# 20	69 %	# 8	28 %	# 29	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	31	# 7	23 %	# 11	35 %	# 13	42 %	# 31	100 %
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

SECTION # VIII THE OEO REGIONAL OFFICE AND THE SEOO

QUESTION REFERENCE

#2. 7501-1 7d. Has the Regional Office ensured that the SEOO is consulted concerning OEO Regional Office plans and priorities with regard to OEO grantees?

LIST joint staff meetings held during the past six months. Identify number of SEOO staff invited and attending and their job levels.

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	YES		NO		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	29	# 1	3 %	# 20	69 %	# 8	28 %	# 29	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	31	# 14	45 %	# 5	16 %	# 12	39 %	# 31	100 %
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

SECTION # VIII THE OEO REGIONAL OFFICE AND THE SEOO

QUESTION REFERENCE

- #7. 7501-1 Has the Regional Office invited -- with adequate
7g. advance notice -- the SEOO to all "pre-reviews"
4b. held with other OEO grantees in the state?
- W.P. LIST the pre-reviews during the past 6
III-A months, with dates when notices were mailed.
- DESCRIBE cases when the SEOO has been particularly helpful to the Regional Office Field Representative.

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	YES		NO		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	29	# 6	% 21	# 12	% 41	# 11	% 38	# 29	% 100
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	31	# 19	% 61	# 1	% 3	# 11	% 36	# 31	% 100
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

SECTION # IX HEADQUARTERS/OEO AND THE SEOO

QUESTION REFERENCE

#4. 7501-1 8h. How well has the Office of Operations assisted the SEOO in its dealings with the Headquarters offices or other federal agencies?

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	GOOD		POOR		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	5	# 2	40 %	# 1	20 %	# 2	40 %	# 5	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	4	# 0	0 %	# 0	0 %	# 4	100 %	# 4	100 %
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

SECTION # X SEOO ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

QUESTION REFERENCE

#6. B. STAFFING

Do personnel perform job functions contained in the approved job descriptions.

DESCRIBE any departures of job function from approved job descriptions.

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	YES		NO		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	5	# 5	100%	# 0	0%	# 0	0%	# 5	100%
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	5	# 0	0%	# 1	20%	# 4	80%	# 5	100%
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

SECTION # X SEOO ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

QUESTION REFERENCE

#7. Are staff personnel qualified for jobs?

LIST personnel job title and qualifications.

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	YES		NO		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	5	# 4	80 %	# 0	0 %	# 1	20 %	# 5	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	5	# 0	0 %	# 4	80 %	# 1	20 %	# 5	100 %
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

SECTION # XI SEOO WORK PROGRAM - California

QUESTION REFERENCE

#1. CAP 81
II-B Has the SEOO reached the goal "To develop . . . demonstration projects in the use of volunteer services, excess property, and community college resources, in programs of technical aid to Indians, disadvantaged youth, and Head Start day-care projects; and in other specialities as indicated"?

LIST the demonstration projects and programs of technical aid which have been developed during the past year.

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	YES		NO		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	25	# 12	48 %	# 2	8 %	# 11	44 %	# 25	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	28	# 1	4 %	# 16	57 %	# 11	39 %	# 28	100 %
CAA EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS	33	# 1	3 %	# 26	79 %	# 6	18 %	# 33	100 %
CAA BOARD CHAIRMEN	17	# 0	0 %	# 13	77 %	# 4	23 %	# 17	100 %

SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

SECTION # XI SEOO WORK PROGRAM - California

QUESTION REFERENCE

#5. CAP 81 Has the SEOO provided "review of and
II-B assistance to grantees in greater depth
W.P. by an increased and better trained analyst
I-B staff . . . "?

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	YES		NO		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	25	#23	92 %	# 0	0 %	# 2	8 %	#25	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	28	#0	0 %	#24	86 %	# 4	14 %	#28	100 %
CAA EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS	33	#2	6 %	#26	79 %	# 5	15 %	#33	100 %
CAA BOARD CHAIRMEN	17	#2	12 %	#11	65 %	# 4	23 %	#17	100 %

SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

SECTION # XI SEOO WORK PROGRAM - California

QUESTION REFERENCE

#6. CAP 81 Has the SEOO provided "sufficient intensity
II-B and continuity of state-CAA relationships
W.P. to resolve as many areas as possible of mutual
I-B concern about programs prior to the refunding
review stage."?

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	YES		NO		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	25	# 18	72 %	# 1	4 %	# 6	24 %	# 25	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	28	# 0	0 %	# 22	79 %	# 6	21 %	# 28	100 %
CAA EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS	32	# 4	12 %	# 26	81 %	# 2	7 %	# 32	100 %
CAA BOARD CHAIRMEN	17	# 2	12 %	# 13	76 %	# 2	12 %	# 17	100 %

SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

SECTION # XI SEOO WORK PROGRAM - California

QUESTION REFERENCE

#7. W.P. Has the SEOO provided "higher quality multi-specialty technical assistance to CAAs" in this program year through the "addition of four management Specialists, eight Field Analysts, and three Special Programs Coordinators"?

IV-A

TABULATION RESULTS									
RESPONDING GROUPS	#	YES		NO		DON'T KNOW		TOTAL	
SEOO STAFF	25	# 18	72 %	# 0	0 %	# 7	28 %	# 25	100 %
REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF	28	# 0	0 %	# 22	79 %	# 6	21 %	# 28	100 %
CAA EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS	32	# 1	3 %	# 20	63 %	# 11	34 %	# 32	100 %
CAA BOARD CHAIRMEN	17	# 2	12 %	# 10	59 %	# 5	29 %	# 17	100 %

CALIFORNIA SEOO EVALUATION

ANALYSIS OF MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE IN ALLOCATION OF STAFF MANPOWER RESOURCES

- I - Purpose
- II - Procedures & Source Documents
- III - Analysis Results
- IV - Technical Recommendations
- V - Summary

Attachments

ATTACHMENTS

- #1. SE00 Roster of Personnel by Grant
- #2. Sample of Monthly Performance Report
- #3. SE00-Estimated Distribution of Manpower Resources by Function
- #4. Actual Distribution of Manhours by Function
- #5. Total Manhours/Overtime - September 1970 - January 1971
- #6. Grant Review Function: Budget/Actual Manhours
- #7. Coordination Function: Budget/Actual Manhours
- #8. Technical Assistance Function: Budget/Actual Manhours
- #9. Technical Assistance Function: Budget/Actual Manhours by
Technical Assistance Specialty
- #10. Grant Review Function: Manhours by Person, October - January
- #11. Coordination Function: Manhours by Person, October - January
- #12. Technical Assistance Function: Manhours by Person,
October - January

I. Purpose

The purpose of this analysis was to assess as well as possible management performance of the SEOO in the control and application of staff manpower resources and to provide the SEOO with analysis data which might be helpful in the future management direction of its operations.

The initial intent was to provide answers to these basic management questions:

1. How much does it cost to perform each major task or function?
2. How much does it cost to service each grantee or project?
3. How much does it cost to get major results?

It was not possible to work on the second and third questions because in the SEOO reporting system, the relevant source documents were the field trip reports. These trip reports were expected to identify grantees served and results accomplished. The SEOO declined to make these available to the evaluation team on the basis that the field trip reports purportedly contained the names of confidential contacts in the communities visited by SEOO staff.

II. Procedures & Source Documents

The procedures followed were to collect data source documents made available at the SEOO from its system, to make an analysis in the field, to confirm and expand the analysis after field work was completed.

Three major types of source documents were used in this analysis.

1. Roster of SEOO Personnel (See Attachment #1) This document listed staff personnel according to the various grants which funded their positions and identified job title assignments. We found, however, that SEOO personnel had been shifted from some positions and others, while assigned to specific jobs, were performing other duties. Tracing such shifts would have made the analysis difficult and complex. Instead, we used the roster and let the developed data show possible shifts in assignments.

2. Monthly Performance Reports. (See Attachment #2 for sample.) These monthly performance reports were the source for information on actual manhours applied to various functions.

This analysis is based on MPR's for the following:

January, 1971	-	21	professional staff employees
December, 1970	-	20	"
November, 1970	-	23	"
October, 1970	-	22	"
September, 1970	-	19	"

The reports (abbreviated to "MPR's") include those of four employees who were on the SEOO staff during the period covered but are no longer on the staff. Steele, Donaldson, Throne and Johnson.

The reports do not include the three top SEOO personnel: L. Uhler, the director, J. Sawicki, the deputy director, L. Down, the Staff Assistant for Planning. They also do not include MPR's for the following staff: R. Hawkins, CPA- Supervisor-North; J. Fattorini, Community Program Analyst; A. Chickering, Community Development STAP Specialist; D. McKee, Inter-Governmental Coordinator.

We believe that if these missing MPR's were included they would change the analysis results in detail but not significantly.

3. OEO Grant Budgets. These standard CAP Form 25s provided data on approved professional positions funded under each grant (also reflected in the Roster of SEOO Personnel - see attachment #1.).

III. Analysis Results

1. Estimated and Actual Manpower Distribution by Functions. (See Attachments #3 and #4.)

As a part of our field interviews, five of the senior SEOO staff were asked to estimate the percentage of their manpower resources and the number of staff allocated to each function listed in question #5 of Section X in the SEOO Evaluation questionnaire.

Mr. B. Schur added to his answer: "Object to this question. It can easily be misinterpreted and % allocation can be poorly used. Overlapping exists in all areas."

Attachment #3 shows the results of the SEOO senior staff estimates compared to the actual distribution of manhours shown in attachment #4.

The average SEOO estimate of manhours in grant review and monitoring was 33%. Since the SEOO considers the grant review and advice to the governor functions as interrelated, another 4% may be added for a total estimate of 37% for both functions.

Actual performance as reflected in this analysis was 57.4%.

The senior SEOO staff estimated an average of 26% allocated to the Technical Assistance function. The actual performance as reflected in this analysis was 13.1.

2. Total Manhours/overtime - September 1970 - January, 1971
(See Attachment #5)

The SEOO staff worked a considerable amount of overtime. For the five-month period September, 1970, through January, 1971, the employees covered by the Monthly Performance Reports made available to the team indicated they worked 3,782 hours of overtime. Of the 3,782 overtime hours, over one-half or 1,895 hours were compiled in the months of December, 1970, and January, 1971.

3. Grant Review Function: On-site and report writing time (See Attachment #10)

Professionals, such as auditors, who are required as part of their duties to write reports usually work on a ratio of 67% field or on-site work to 33% report writing time. We believe that this is considered the lowest acceptable ratio by the General Accounting Office.

This acceptable ratio was reflected in the SEOO Grant Review manhours for the months of October and November, 1970 but was reversed for the months of December, 1970, and January, 1971.

GRANT REVIEW:

	On-Site		Reports	
	Hours	Percent	Hours	Percent
January, 1971	573	34.8%	1,070	65.2%
December, 1970	1,225	54.5%	1,025	45.5%
November, 1970	860	61.7%	534	38.3%
October, 1970	1,190	72.6%	448	27.4%

4. Grant Review, Monitoring and Evaluation Function (See Attachments #6 and #10)

SEOO manhours applied to the Grant Review function exceeded the budgeted amount by some 1300 manhours during the four month period from October, 1970 through January, 1971. However, only 60% of

these manhours were provided by staff with normally assigned duties in this function. The other 40% came from staff who should have been performing other functions, primarily technical assistance.

5. Coordination Function (See Attachments #7 and #11)

The actual manhours applied to the coordination function decreased from 773 or 110% of budget in October to 474 or 74% in January.

The percentage of actual manhours performed by personnel listed on the roster with duties in these functions was constantly low. This may be explained in that personnel shifts had been made which were not reflected in the roster. However, the detailed analysis done in attachment #11 is not very helpful to confirm this.

6. Technical Assistance Function (See Attachments #8, #9, and #12.)

Actual performance in manhours for technical assistance was very low compared to budget. Most of this was delivered by staff funded by the STAP and Management/Demonstration Technical Assistance grants.

Attachment #9 (Technical Assistance Function: Budget/Actual Manhours by Technical Assistance Specialty) shows actual delivery in specific specialties which were funded:

Housing	339 hours out of 664 budgeted or 50%
Community Development	188 hours out of 664 budgeted or 28%
Economic Development	23 hours out of 664 budgeted or 3%
Management	29 hours out of 3240 budgeted or 0.87%

The budgeted total for Management Technical Assistance includes 4 professionals hired under the Management Demonstration grant for Personnel Management, Fiscal Management, Small Business Management, and Systems Management. It also includes one professional hired under the STAP grant for Management Technical Assistance.

IV. TECHNICAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The OEO staff who have done the analysis recommend that the Monthly Performance Report system be changed:

"We did not consider the Monthly Performance Report, format wise to be a very well structured management tool for measuring the work performance of an employee.

- "1. WHERE the employee was performing could not be determined.
- "2. Form was not structured to relate to budgeted performance.
Example: The Budget called for one full time expert STAP Specialist-Economic Development but the Monthly Performance Report did not provide for recording the performance. Further time spent in a specialty might be incorrectly reported.
Example: Frane was a Housing expert. He reported a certain amount of hours under Housing but also reported time at meetings, training etc. If the meetings and training concerned Housing then it perhaps should all be reported under Housing to show the proper performance against budget.
- "3. Time spent traveling should be charged to the major benefiting function. On the report travel time was simply charged as a separate function. It should be charged to either Technical Assistance, Grant Review or Coordination and Planning.
- "4. The form too nearly approximated a daily time and attendance card. This fact made the form too easily filled in long after the fact."

V. Summary

As stated earlier, the purpose of this analysis was to assess performance by studying manhours applied to functions and to provide the SEEO with helpful data in its management direction.

The analysis shows that SEEO personnel did not fully perform in the functions for which technical assistance grants were made, and staff manpower resources were diverted to the Grant Review and Monitoring function.

SEOO ROSTER OF PERSONNEL BY GRANT

Extract from SEOO
Roster of Personnel

REGULAR GRANT #CG-0364 E/4

Uhler, L.	Director
Sawicki, J.	Assistant Director
Down, L.	Staff Assistant for Planning
Hawkins, Jr., R.	CPA-Supervisor-North
Archuleta, Jr., G.	CPA-Supervisor-South
McInnes, T.	VISTA Coordinator
McKee, D.	Inter-Governmental Coordinator
Fattorini, Jr., J.	CPA
Gurule, A.	CPA
McGrath, D.	CPA
Thies, R.	CPA
Russo, K.	CPA
Trigger, K.	CPA
Kludjian, H.	CPA
Brown, H.	CPA
Petersen, E.	CPA
Charlton, B.	CPA
Goff, G.	CPA
Collins, M.	Senior Steno
Brockman, V.	Senior Steno
Gallion, C.	Steno II
Varela, C.	Clerk-Typist
Arnold, F.	Clerk-Typist
Pearson, M.	Senior Account Clerk
Elwell, W.	File Clerk
Singleton, J.	Senior Steno
Young, T.	Clerk
Fuller, L.	Steno II
Gray, P.	Steno II

MANAGEMENT/DEMO GRANT # CG-0364 E/3

Archer, Jr., S.	Spec. Programs Coordinator
Taylor, B.	Childhood Development Coordinator
Clark, G.	Personnel Management
Blaker, C.	Fiscal Management
Cunningham, H.	Small Business Management
Whiteley, G.	Systems Management
Davis, S.	Steno II
Brown, C.	Steno II

STAP GRANT # CG-0364 E/O

Frane, J.R.	Housing
Carter, T.	Economic Development
Schur, B.	Management
Chickering, A.	Community Development

OAKLAND GRANT # CG-9093 A/1 and A/2

Espana, S.	Consultant
Sekafetz, D.	Secretary

Name G. Clark
 Month of DEC 1970
G. Clark

MONTHLY PERFORMANCE REPORT
 CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	TO
REVIEW																																
On-site	4	6	6	7				8	8	6	7			6	6	7	7	7														
Reports	1		2	3			4	1	2	2				2	1	2	2	1	8		8	8	8	8				8	8	8	8	
Meetings	5	4	2				3			1					2		1	1			4	4	5					8	4	8		
COORDINATION																																
State																																
Other																																
Meetings																																
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (Detail Below)																																
A. Community Services																																
B. Education																																
C. Fiscal Management																																
D. Health																																
E. Housing																																
F. Manpower																																
G. Program Development																																
H. Training																																
I. Meetings																																
J. Other																																
TRAVEL TIME	13	2	10	3			6 1/2	4	10	10				11	10	12	13	12	8		12	12	13	8				16	17	16	8	

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Date	Code	Source	Hours

Date	Code	Source	Hours

SEOO-ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES BY FUNCTION

Note: Section X, Question 5

	Uhler	Sawicki	Down	Hawkins	Schur	Average
1. Advisor to Governor	3%-1 staff	5%	5%-1 staff	Combined with #6	5%-1 staff	4%
2. Resource Mobilization	10%-2 staff	15%	5%-1 staff	10%-2 staff	5%-4 staff	9%
3. Coordination & Planning	3%-1 staff	10%	10%-2 staff	5%-1 staff	10%-2 staff	8%
4. Advocacy for the Poor	3%-1 staff	10%	2%-1 staff	5%-1 staff	10%-All	6%
5. Technical Assistance	25%-8 staff	25%	25%-9 staff	30%-10 staff	25%-8 staff	26%
6. Grants Review Monitoring & Evaluation	40%-13 staff	30%	30%-13 staff	30%-10 staff	35%-12 staff	33%
7. Management	3%-1 staff	5%	10%-1 staff	5%-1 staff	5%-2 staff	5%
8. Other	3%-1 staff		13%-1 staff	15%-5 staff	3%	7%
9. Innovative & Creative Programs (added by SEOO)	10%-2 staff				2%	2%

ACTUAL DISTRIBUTION OF MAN-HOURS BY FUNCTION

Note: Actual Results Man-Hours Reported Per MPR
by Functional Area Compared Against Budget
Requirements for Period October 1970 through
January 1971

<u>FUNCTION</u>	<u>MAN HOUR BASE *</u>	<u>ACTUAL HOURS REPORTED PER MPR</u>	<u>ACTUAL PERCENT OF HOURS DELIVERED (17,319)</u>
Grant Review	8,632	9,939	57.4%
Coordination & Planning	2,656	2,345	13.5%
Technical Assistance	5,312	2,264	13.1%
Travel	- -	2,771	16.0%
TOTALS	16,600	17,319	100.0%

* Man-Hour Base is determined by adding the totals from Attachments 6, 7, and 8.
Also the actual hours reported per Monthly Performance Reports is compiled from
totals shown on Attachments 6, 7, 8.
Travel is included in this table because it is shown as a separate item on the
Monthly Performance Report and must be included here to provide a true picture.

Attachment #4

140-628

TOTAL MANHOURS/OVERTIME - SEPTEMBER 1970 - JANUARY 1971

Note: Total Manhours Worked -
Regular and Overtime

BASE PER MONTH	168 Sep 1970	176 Oct 1970	152 Nov 1970	176 Dec 1970	160 Jan 1971	Total Overtime	Dec-Jan Overtime
CPA							
Archuletta			146	320	201	185	185
Gurule	198	198	195	222	180.5	161.5	66.5
McGrath	173	245	195	199	204	184	67
Thies	153	213	171	229	175	124	68
Russo					203.5	43.5	43.5
Trigger		118.5	183	210	208	113	82
Kludjian	175	283	213	221	235	295	120
Brown	111	271.5	177	197	189	170	50
Peterson	176	220.5	182	217	214.5	178	95.5
Charlton	226	206.6	211	226	216.5	255	106.5
Goff		107.5	181	290	199	182	153
Steel	170	224.5	200	280		202	104
McInnes, Intergovt. Coord.	243	260.5	235	284		350	108
MANAGEMENT/DEMO							
Archer	205	194	152	159.5	202.5	97.5	42.5
Taylor	175	219.5	236	239	259.5	297.5	162.5
Clark	211	229	179	267.5	169	223.5	100.5
Blaker		121	186	201	207	106	72.2
Cunningham	115	226.3	166	260	179	168.2	103.5
Whiteley		84	128	196	174	34	34
Donaldson	201	183	153			41	
Johnson	145						
STAP							
Frane	191	196	152	203	179	89	46
Carter	129	182	169	179	209	75	52
Schur					143		
Throne	195	220	127			71	
OAKLAND GRANT							
Espana	183	218	199		193	137	33
	3375	4421.4	4136	4600	4141	3782.7	1895.2

GRANT REVIEW FUNCTION: BUDGET/ACTUAL MANHOURS

Note: Comparison of Grant Review Results
Monthly Performance Reports compared
to Personnel and Assignment Roster &
to CAP 14 Budget Support Documents

Month	Man Hour Base*	Actual Hours Performance Reported Per MPR	Hours Performed By CPA's	Percent	Hour Performed by Other Staff STAP & Mgt/Demo's	Percent
January 1971	2,080	2,558	1,482	58%	1,076	42%
December 1970	2,288	3,060	1,854	61%	1,206	39%
November 1970	1,976	2,036	1,232	62%	804	39%
October 1970	2,288	2,285	1,314	58%	971	42%
Total- 4-Month Period	<u>8,632</u>	<u>9,939</u>	<u>5,882</u>	<u>59%</u>	<u>4,057</u>	<u>41%</u>

* Manhour base for each month is determined by multiplying the number of calendar 8 hour days available in the applicable month by the number of staff budgeted, in this case 2 Community Program Analyst Supervisors plus a staff of 11 Community Program Analysts. Leave time has been ignored in above table. Travel has also been ignored because there is no way to determine which activity should be credited.

January 1971	160 x 13 = 2,080
December 1970	176 x 13 = 2,288
November 1970	152 x 13 = 1,976
October 1970	176 x 13 = 2,288

COORDINATION FUNCTION: BUDGET/ACTUAL MANHOURS

Note: Comparison of Coordination & Planning Results
Monthly Performance Reports Compared to
Personnel & Assignment Roster and to the
CAP 14 Budget Support Documents

<u>Month</u>	<u>Man Hour Base *</u>	<u>Actual Hours Performance Per MPR</u>	<u>Percent Budget Perf. Delivered</u>	<u>Hours Performed by Coordinators</u>	<u>Percent by Coord.</u>	<u>Hours Perf. By Other Staff</u>	<u>Percent by Others</u>
January 1971	640	474	74%	21	4%	453	96%
December 1970	704	548	78%	120	22%	428	78%
November 1970	608	550	90%	74	13%	476	87%
October 1970	704	773	110%	93	12%	680	88%
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
TOTAL (4 mo.prd.)	2656	2345	88%	308	12%	2037	88%

* Man-hour base for each month is determined by multiplying the number of calendar 8 hour days available in the applicable month by the number of staff budgeted - in this case 4 Coordinators (McInnes, McKee, Archer and Taylor). Leave time has been ignored in this table. Travel is also ignored because there is no way to determine which activity should be credited.

Jan. 1971 160 x 4 = 640
Dec. 1970 176 x 4 = 704
Nov. 1970 152 x 4 = 608
Oct. 1970 176 x 4 = 704

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FUNCTION: BUDGET/ACTUAL MANHOURS

Note: Comparison of Technical Assistance Results
Monthly Performance Reports compared to
Personnel and Assignment Roster and to the
CAP 14 Budget Support Documents

Month	Man Hour Base*	Actual Hours Performance Reported Per MPR	Percent Budget Perf. Delivered	Hours Performed by STAP's Mgt/Demo's	Percent of Performance By STAP's etc.	Hours Performed Other Staff	Percent By Others
January 1971	1,280	545	43%	471	86%	74	14%
December 1970	1,408	326	23%	326	100%	0	0
November 1970	1,216	762	62%	502	67%	260	34%
October 1970	<u>1,408</u>	<u>631</u>	<u>46%</u>	<u>597</u>	<u>95%</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>5%</u>
Total 4 Months	5,312	2,264	43%	1,896	84%	365	16%

* Man hour base for each month is determined by multiplying the number of calendar 8 hour days available in the applicable month by the number of staff budgeted - in this case 4 STAP's and 4 Management Demo's. Leave time has been ignored in above table. Travel has also been ignored because there is no way to determine which activity should be credited.

January 1971	160 x 8 = 1,280
December 1970	176 x 8 = 1,408
November 1970	152 x 8 = 1,216
October 1970	176 x 8 = 1,408

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FUNCTION: BUDGET/ACTUAL MANHOURS BY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SPECIALTY

Note: Comparison of Technical Assistance by Specialty
 Monthly Performance Report compared to the
 Personnel & Assignment Roster and to the CAP 14
 Budget Documents

	Total 4 Mo. Pd. Hours	Per- cent	Jan. 1971 Hours	Per- cent	Dec. 1970 Hours	Per- cent	Nov. 1970 Hours	Per- cent	Oct. 1970 Hours	Per- cent
<u>HOUSING</u>										
Budget 1 expert	664	100%	160	100%	176	100%	152	100%	176	100%
Reported by Frane	270	40	97	61	82	47	69	45	22	12
Reported by Other Staff Members	69	10	15	9	1	-	28	18	25	14
Total Hours & %	339	50	112	70%	83	47%	97	63%	47	26%
<u>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT</u>										
Budget 1 expert	664	100%	160	100%	176	100%	152	100%	176	100%
Reported by Chickering	-0-		-0-		-0-		-0-		-0-	
Reported by Other Staff Members	188	28	91	57	-0-	-	23	15	74	42
Total Hours & %	188	28%	91	57	-0-		23	15%	74	42%
<u>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</u>										
Budget 1 expert	664	100%	160	100%	176	100%	152	100%	176	100%
Reported by Carter	23	3%	23	14%	-0-		-0-		-0-	
Reported by Others	-0-		-0-		-0-		-0-		-0-	
Total Hours & %	23	3%	23	14%	-0-		-0-		-0-	
<u>MANAGEMENT</u>										
Budget 5 experts	3320	100%	800	100%	880	100%	760	100%	880	100%
Reported by 5 assigned experts	-0-		-0-		-0-		-0-		-0-	
Reported by others	29	.87%	6	.75%	6	.68%	10	1.3%	7	.79%
All but 1 hr by Taylor										
Total Hours & %	29	.87%	6	.75%	6	.68%	10	1.3%	7	.79%

GRANT REVIEW FUNCTION: MANHOURS BY PERSON, JANUARY

e: Grant Review Results

MPR's Compared to Personnel and Assignment Roster

Per Personnel & Assignment Roster CPA/Sup.-CAA Staff	Results Per MPR					
	Month of: JANUARY					
	Unspec- ified	On Site	Reports	Meetings	GR Total	Manhour Base
Hawkins CPA/Sup*	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	160
Archuleta CPA/Sup			105	72	177	160
Fattorini*	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	160
Gurule		76	21		97	160
McGrath		116	62		178	160
Thies			45	104	149	160
Russo	10.5				10.5	160
Trigger		33		4	37	160
Kludjian		55	3	117	175	160
Brown		58	57	35	150	160
Peterson			112	62	174	160
Charlton			51.5	98	149.5	160
Goff			186		186	160
Steele	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	---
Sub-total	10.5	338	642.5	492	1482	2080
Mgt/Demo's						
Clark	---	---	148	2	150	---
Blaker	163.2	---	---	---	163.2	---
Cunningham	---	---	122	38	160	---
Whitely	50	61	43	5	159	---
Sub-total	213.2	61	313	45	632.2	---
Consultant						
Espana (Sub-total)**	44	22	20	37	123	---
STAP's						
Frane	---	---	2	---	2	---
Carter	---	64	52	28	144	---
Schur	---	1	15	5	21	---
Chickering*	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	---	---
Throne						
Donaldson						
Sub-total	-0-	65	69	33	167	---
Coord.						
Archer	---	---	---	---	---	---
Taylor	---	87	26	40	153	---
McInnes*	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	---
McKee *	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	---
	-0-	87	26	40	153	---
GRAND TOTALS	267	573	1070	647	2558	2080

* No MPR's filed or available ** 44-evaluation

Attachment #10

Page 1 of 4

GRANT REVIEW FUNCTION: MANHOURS BY PERSON, DECEMBER

Note: Grant Review Results

MPR's compared to Personnel and Assignment Roster

Per Personnel & Assignment Roster CPA/Sup.-CAA Staff	Results Per MPR					
	Month of: DECEMBER					
	Unspec- ified	On Site	Reports	Meetings	GR Total	Manhour Base
Hawkins CPA/Sup*	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	176
Archuletta CPA/Sup		2	162	99	263	176
Fattorini*	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	176
Gurule		102	67		169	176
McGrath		46	1	22	69	176
Thies		22	62	118	202	176
Russo						176
Trigger	15	93			108	176
Kludjian		23	3	70	96	176
Brown		71	79	31	181	176
Peterson		8	105	44	157	176
Charlton		29	74	75	178	176
Goff		15	157	42	214	176
Steele		164.5	28	25	217.5	
Sub-total	15	575.5	738	526	1854.5	2288
Mgt/Demo's						
Clark		85	95	57	237	
Blaker		154.7			154.7	
Cunningham		156	48		204	
Whitely	88	69	8		165	
Sub-total	88	464.7	151	57	760.7	
Consultant						
Espana (Sub-total) **						
STAP's						
Frane		12	8		20	
Carter		74	32	38	144	
Schur						
Chickering*						
Throne						
Donaldson						
Sub-total		86	40	38	164	
Coord.						
Archer						
Taylor		84	15	57	156	
McInnes *		15	81	29	125	
McKee *						
		99	96	86	281	
GRAND TOTALS	103	1225	1025	707	3060	2288

* No MPR's filed or available ** 44-Evaluation

Attachment #10

Page 2 of 4

GRANT REVIEW FUNCTION: MANHOURS BY PERSON, NOVEMBER

Note: Grant Review Results

MPR's Compared to Personnel and Assignment Roster

Per Personnel & Assignment Roster CPA/Sup.-CAA Staff	Results Per MPR					
	Month of: NOVEMBER					
	Unspec- ified	On Site	Reports	Meetings	GR Total	Manhour Base
Hawkins CPA/Sup*	---	---	---	---	---	152
Archuletta CPA/Sup	---	---	---	---	---	152
Fattorini*	---	---	---	---	---	152
Gurule		67	53	6	126	152
McGrath		116			116	152
Thios		24.5	40	79	143.5	152
Russo	---	---	---	---	---	152
Trigger	4	56	4	14	78	152
Kludjian		15	1	124	140	152
Brown		43.5	72	42.5	158	152
Peterson	2	19	103	29	153	152
Charlton		20	43.8	87.6	151.4	152
Goff			29	17	46	152
Steele		36	30.5	53.5	120	---
Sub-total	6	397	376.3	452	1232	1976
Mgt/Demo's						
Clark		82	2		84	
Blaker		142		6	148	
Cunningham		104	40	2.5	146.5	
Whitely						
Sub-total		328	42	8.5	378.5	
Consultant						
Espana (Sub-total)**		12	16	8	36	
STAP's						
Frane	---	---	---	---	---	
Carter	96	8	20	28	152	
Schur						
Chickering*						
Throne	3	6		1	10	
Donaldson						
Sub-total	99	14	20	29	162	
Coord.						
Archer						
Taylor		63	25	22	110	
McInnes *		46	55	17	118	
McKee *						
GRAND TOTALS	105	860	534	536	2036	1976

* No MPR's filed or available ** 44-Evaluation

Attachment #10
Page 3 of 4

GRANT REVIEW FUNCTION: MANHOURS BY PERSON, NOVEMBER

Note: Grant Review Results

MPR's Compared to Personnel and Assignment Roster

Per Personnel & Assignment Roster CPA/Sup.-CAA Staff	Results Per MPR					
	Month of: NOVEMBER					
	Unspec- ified	On Site	Reports	Meetings	GR Total	Manhour Base
Hawkins CPA/Sup*	---	---	---	---	---	152
Archuletta CPA/Sup	---	---	---	---	---	152
Fattorini*	---	---	---	---	---	152
Gurule		67	53	6	126	152
McGrath		116			116	152
Thies		24.5	40	79	143.5	152
Russo	---	---	---	---	---	152
Trigger	4	56	4	14	78	152
Kludjian		15	1	124	140	152
Brown		43.5	72	42.5	158	152
Peterson	2	19	103	29	153	152
Charlton		20	43.8	87.6	151.4	152
Goff			29	17	46	152
Steele		36	30.5	53.5	120	---
Sub-total	6	397	376.3	452	1232	1976
Mgt/Demo's						
Clark		82	2		84	
Blaker		142		6	148	
Cunningham		104	40	2.5	146.5	
Whitely						
Sub-total		328	42	8.5	378.5	
Consultant						
Espana (Sub-total)**		12	16	8	36	
STAP's						
Frame	---	---	---	---	---	
Carter	96	8	20	28	152	
Schur						
Chickering*						
Throne	3	6		1	10	
Donaldson						
Sub-total	99	14	20	29	162	
Coord.						
Archer						
Taylor		63	25	22	110	
McInnes *		46	55	17	118	
McKee *						
GRAND TOTALS	105	860	534	536	2036	1976

* No MPR's filed or available ** 44-Evaluation

Attachment #10

Page 3 of 4

GRANT REVIEW FUNCTION: MANHOURS BY PERSON, OCTOBER

Note: Grant Review Results

MPR's Compared to Personnel Roster

Per Personnel & Assignment Roster CPA/Sup.-CAA Staff	Results Per MPR					
	Month of: OCTOBER					
	Unspec- ified	On Site	Reports	Meetings	GR Total	Manhour Base
Hawkins CPA/Sup*						176
Archuletta CPA/Sup						176
Pattorini*						176
Gurule		23	71	9	103	176
McGrath		146	--	7	153	176
Thies		66	30	75	171	176
Russo						176
Trigger	2.5	71	2		75.5	176
Kludjian		69	16	90	175	176
Brown		52	45	97	194	176
Peterson		51	41.5	90.5	183	176
Charlton		7.5	25	--	32.5	176
Goff		--	63	--	63	176
Steele		152	6	6	164	--
Sub-total	2.5	637.5	299.5	374.5	1314	2288
Mgt/Demo's						
Clark		98	--	40	138	
Blaker		55	1	1	57	
Cunningham		108	40	36	184	
Whitely						
Sub-total		261	41	77	379	
Consultant						
Espana (Sub-total) **		89	23	50	162	
STAP's						
Frane				3	3	
Carter		104	6	55	165	
Schur						
Chickering*						
Throne		18	3	6	27	
Donaldson						
Sub-total		122	9	64	195	
Coord.						
Archer						
Taylor		42	13	40	95	
McInnes *		39	63	38	140	
McKee *						
		81	76	78	235	
GRAND TOTALS	2.5	1190.5	448.5	643.5	2285	2288

* No MPR's filed or available ** 44-Evaluation

Attachment #10
Page 4 of 4

COORDINATION FUNCTION: MANHOURS BY PERSON,
JANUARY

	State	Other	Meet- ings	Total	Man Hour Base
<u>Coordinators</u>					
McInnes	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	160
McKee	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	160
Archer	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	160
Taylor	-0-	3	18	21	160
<u>CPAs</u>					
Brown		15	13	28	
Clark			7	7	
Espana (consult)		3	8	11	
Goff		5		5	
Gurule	8	7	1	16	
Kludjian	32			32	
McGrath	2			2	
Russo		193		193	
Schur		16	6	22	
Trigger	85	28	20	133	
Whitely	4			4	
 Grand Total				453 21 <hr/> 474	

COORDINATION FUNCTION: MANHOURS BY PERSON,
DECEMBER

	State	Other	Meet- ings	Total	Man Hour Base
<u>Coordinators</u>					
McInnes	61	19	27	107	176
McKee					176
Archer					176
Taylor	7		6	13	176
				<u>120</u>	
<u>Others</u>					
Carter			8	8	
Cunningham	25			25	
Frane	4	4		8	
Goff		35	24	59	
Gurule	8	11	2	21	
Kludjian	67	22	14	103	
McGrath	105		12	117	
Peterson	17			17	
Trigger	54	11	5	70	
				<u>428</u>	
Grand Total				548	

COORDINATION FUNCTION: MANHOURS BY PERSON,
NOVEMBER

	State	Other	Meet-ings	Total	Man Hour Base
<u>Coordinators</u>					
McInnes	20	13	25	58	152
McKee					152
Archer					152
Taylor	8	3	5	16	152
				<u>74</u>	<u>608</u>
<u>Other Staff</u>					
<u>CPAs</u>					
Brown	2	3		5	
Charlton	4			4	
Clark		59	7	66	
Donaldson STAP	3	6	12	21	
Espana		2	8	10	
Goff		82	39	121	
Gurule	13	9	3	25	
Kludjian	6		30	36	
McGrath	56			56	
Steele		44.5	8	52.5	
Trigger	10	34	24	68	
Whitely	12			12	
				<u>476</u>	
Grand Total				550	

COORDINATION FUNCTION: MANHOURS BY PERSON,
OCTOBER

	State	Other	Meet- ings	Total	Man Hour Base
<u>Coordinators</u>					
McInnes	23	27	8	58	176
McKee					176
Archer					176
Taylor	8	18	9	35	176
				<u>93</u>	<u>704</u>
<u>Other Staff</u>					
<u>CPAs</u>					
Blaker	24.5	3	8	35.5	
Brown		18	29	47	
Charlton	30.5	31.3	39	100.8	
Carter	2			2	
Clark		43	33	76	
Donaldson STAP	18	22	24	64	
Espana	1	1	13	15	
Frane	2	17	23	42	
Gaff		11	25	36.3	
Gurule	11	16	11	38	
Kludjian	31	2	16	49	
McGrath	57			57	
Steele	2	15	4	21	
Thies	5.5			5.5	
Throne	11			11	
Trigger		21	3	24	
Cunningham	10			10	
Whitely	44			44	
				<u>678</u>	
				678	
				<u>93</u>	
				<u>771</u>	

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FUNCTION MANHOURS BY PERSON

Note: Technical Assistance Man-Hours
Worked MPR's Compared Against
P&A Roster and CAP 14-Budget

DECEMBER

From Personnel and Assignment Roster	A Comm Svs	B Educ	C Mgt	D Hlth	E Hous ing	F Mpr	G Prog Dev	H Tr	I Meet	J Other	TOTAL	MAN HOUR BASE
STAP												
Frane (Housing)					82		26		36	4	148	176
Carter (Econ Dev)											-0-	176
Schur (Mgt)												176
Chickering (Comm Dev)												176
Subtotal					82		26		36	4	148	704
MGT/DEMO												
Archer							62.5		50	17	129.5	
B. Taylor		10	6		1	1	15				33	
Clark (Mgt)												176
Blaker (Mgt)											-0-	176
Cunningham (Mgt)												176
Whitely (Mgt)										16	16	176
Subtotal		10	6		1	1	77.5		50	33	178.5	704
CONSULTANT												
Espana												
CPA												
Gurule												
Grand Total		10	6		83	1	103.5		86	37	326.5	1408

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FUNCTION MANHOURS BY PERSON

Note: Technical Assistance Man-Hours
Worked MPR's Compared Against
P&A Roster and CAP 14-Budget

JANUARY

From Personnel and Assignment Roster	A Comm Svs	B Educ	C Mgt	D Hlth	E Hous- ing	F Mpr	G Prog Dev	H Tr	I Meet	J Other	TOTAL	MAN HOUR BASE
STAP												
Frane (Housing)					97		15	4	29	3	148	160
Carter (Comm Dev)	13	1	1		10	4	8	6		5	48	160
Schur (Mgt)	63										63	160
Chickering (Comm Dev)											-0-	160
Subtotal	76	1	1		107	4	23	10	29	8	259	640
MGT/DEMO												
Archer							20	2	23	126	171	
B. Taylor	6	21	5		1		2				35	
Clark (Mgt)										6	6	160
Blaker (Mgt)											-0-	160
Cunningham (Mgt)												160
Whitely (Mgt)												160
Subtotal	6	21	5		1		22	2	23	132	212	640
CONSULTANT												
Espana									15	44	59	-0-
CPA												
Gurule	9				4		2				15	-0-
Grand Total	91	22	6		112	4	47	12	67	184	545	1280

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FUNCTION MANPOWER BY PERSON

Note: Technical Assistance Man-Hours
Worked MPR's Compared Against
P&A Roster and CAP 14-Budget

NOVEMBER

From Personnel and Assignment Roster	A Comm Svs	B Educ	C Mgt	D Hlth	E Hous ing	F Mpr	G Prog Dev	H Tr	I Meet	J Other	TOTAL	MAN HOUR BASE
STAP												
Frane.					69				38	24	131	152
Carter												152
Schur												152
Chickering												152
Donaldson	15			4	27	2	28	19	9	6	110	
Throne								17	27	41	85	
Subtotal	15			4	96	2	28	36	74	71	326	608
MGT/DEMO												
Archer							47		26	53	126	152
Taylor	8	16	10	4	1		9		2		50	152
Clark												152
Blaker												152
Cunningham												
Whitely												
Subtotal	8	16	10	4	1		56		28	53	176	608
CPA'S												
Archuletta								101.5	29.5		131	-0-
Gurule										7	7	-0-
Charlton												
Goff												
McInnes												
Subtotal								101.5	29.5	7	138	
CONSULTANT												
Espana									5	117	122	
Grand Total	23	16	10	8	97	2	84	137.5	136.5	248	762	216