

In the field of *employment*, programs covered in this report include: Neighborhood Youth Corps, Job Corps, On-Job-Training, Manpower Development, Small Business Development and miscellaneous others. Small Business Development is funded exclusively by the OEO. Job Corps and On-Job-Training are funded in some instances by the OEO and in others by the Department of Labor. The Neighborhood Youth Corps, Manpower Development and some of the miscellaneous employment programs are funded in some instances by the OEO, in some instances by the Department of Labor and in still others by HEW.

In the field of *family services*, programs covered in this report include: Home-maker Service, Project ENABLE, Foster Grandparents, Family Planning and all other child and family services. Project ENABLE is funded by the OEO. The remainder are funded in some instances by the OEO and in others by HEW.

In the field of *health services*, programs covered in this report include: Medicare Alert and miscellaneous other health services, including pre-natal and infant care, reproduction and sex education, and community and school health services. Medicare Alert was funded by the OEO. Miscellaneous other health services reported were funded in some instances by the OEO and in others by HEW.

In the field of *housing*, 16 cities report 29 programs funded by the OEO and 9 programs funded by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

A *miscellaneous* category covered in this report includes: Legal Services, CAP programs unspecified, City and Neighborhood Centers, Delinquency and Crime Control, Program Administration, Program Development, Migrants and miscellaneous other programs, variously funded.

The 79 reporting Urban League cities reported on a total of 1,253 anti-poverty programs, all of which they were asked to rate as "poor," "fair," "good" or "excellent." Ratings were given on 815 programs, or 66 percent of the total.²

The nation-wide results were:

	Percent
Poor -----	5
Fair -----	19
Good -----	54
Excellent -----	22

Broken down by regions, the ratings were as follows:

Region ¹	Total cities reporting programs	Total programs reported	Total programs as rated				
			Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	No rating
Eastern -----	23	395	7	49	121	40	178
Southern -----	11	165	7	22	75	29	32
Midwestern -----	17	262	8	26	129	51	48
Western -----	19	225	13	39	87	40	46
-----	9	205	3	20	28	20	134
Total -----	79	² 1,253	38	156	440	181	438

¹ The eastern region includes Connecticut, the District of Columbia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico. The southern region includes Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. The midwestern region includes Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, and West Virginia. The midwestern region includes Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, and Wisconsin. The western region includes Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

² The total figures includes OJT program administered by the NUL, which is not and does not appear in the regional totals.

The extent of programs under Urban League auspices, by region and by city, is contained in Appendix II.

Table III, Appendix III, demonstrates the full extent of Urban League participation in anti-poverty programs which are not administered by the Urban League.

Responses from the 79 cities show 321 instances of Urban League participation on advisory committees and/or as consultants. Urban League executives serve as members of CAP advisory committees in 28 cities and as CAP con-

² A detailed discussion of the basis for ratings is included later in this report, beginning on page 6. A subsequent discussion of nine open-ended questions directed to local Urban League executives contains many insights into the determinants of effectiveness of given programs.