

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

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

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

Folder Title: California State Office of Economic Opportunity
– Response to Federal Evaluation, 04/29/1971,
Vol. II (4 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/>

Charge:

"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."

Response:

The State Office of Economic Opportunity has begun a very positive effort to develop better communication and program development with CAAs. The turnout, of CAPs, forty out of the forty-four in our recent Resources Mobilization Conference, indicates an interest and a desire on the part of the Community Action Agencies and the State to develop better working relationships and better programs for the poor. It is hard for the State Office of Economic Opportunity to feel that it is at all possible to develop a better communication system with Region IX, OEO, because of the recent news leak of our evaluation. Under OEO National Guidelines, such evaluations do not become official until the grantee has responded to said evaluation. There is only one possible source for the detailed news leak, and that is Regional OEO.

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 (SEOO AND THE GOVERNOR)				SECTION II (SEOO & OTHER STATE AGENCIES)				SECTION III (SEOO AND CAA's)				SECTION IV (SEOO & FEDERAL AGENCIES)				SECTION V (SEOO & LOCAL GOVERNMENT)				SECTION VI (SEOO & 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
SEOO	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 (SEOO & OEO REG OFFICE)				SECTION VIII (OEO REGIONAL OFC. & SEOO)				SECTION IX (OEO/OEO AND THE SEOO)				SECTION X (SEOO ORGANIZATION & MANAC.)				SECTION XI (SEOO WORK PROG. CALIF.)							
	AF	NEG	DK	T	AF	NEG	DK	T	AF	NEG	DK	T	AF	NEG	DK	T	AF	NEG	DK	T				
SEOO	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	%	%	%	%

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	%	%	%	%

*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: 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:

- a. Working for representation of the poor on state committees which operate programs affecting the poor? . . .
- b. Assessing state-poverty-related programs . . .
- c. Assessing state administrative procedures and working to make them more responsive to the needs and desires of the poor . . .
- d. 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 &
FUNCTION: Evaluation

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.

TABULATION RESULTS									
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 3a. How well has the SEOO developed effective inter-agency mechanisms to assure good communication between state agencies and offices whose activities affect the poor?
- CAP 81
IV-D
- 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 # II 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.

TABULATION RESULTS									
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. 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?
- CAP 81
II-A/B
- 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. CAP 81 II-B W.P. I-B

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?

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. 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?

CAP 81 II-B

W.P. I-B/C

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?

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	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.

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	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.

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	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
2h. with respect to local units of government?

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	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. CAP 81 II-A

How well has the SEOO provided special technical assistance where needed to local government agencies, in developing, conducting and administering programs to alleviate poverty?

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. LIST occasions during the past six months when
I-B 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-
W.P. ized technical assistance and to get advice on how
IV-D the SEOO can assist in meeting these needs?

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		DON'T 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%
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%

SEOO EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATION

SECTION #VII THE SEOO AND THE OEO REGIONAL OFFICE

QUESTION REFERENCE

#16. 7501-1 6g. How well has the SEOO advised the Regional Office 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-
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

- #2. 7501-1 Has the Regional Office ensured that the SEOO
7d. 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.

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	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 . . .?"

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	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. IV-A 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"?

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 SEOO with helpful data in its management direction.

The analysis shows that SEOO 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
Archuletta, 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

MONTHLY PERFORMANCE REPORT
CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Name G. Clark
Month of Dec 1970

G. Clark
110

	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	TOT.
REVIEW																																
On-site	4	1	1	7				8	8	1	7			6	6	7	7	7														83
Reports	1		2	3			4	1	2	2				2	1	2	2	1	0		8	8	8	8				8	8	8	8	80
Meetings	5	4	2				3			1					2		1	1			4	4	5					8	9	8		5
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	3				6			0	3			3	1	3	3	3														
	13	12	12	13			13	13	10	10				11	12	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	189		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	8,632	9,939	5,882	59%	4,057	41%

* 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%
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/ANNUAL 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

re: 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
Archuletta 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

ote: Grant Review Results

MPR's compared to Personnel and Assignment Roster

Per Personnel & Assignment Roster CPA/Sup.-CoA 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
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	
Whiteley						
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, 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
Archuleta CPA/Sup						176
Pattorini*						176
Gerule		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 *						
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