

sultants in 25 additional cities, one as a paid consultant. Of the 321 instances of Urban League participation, 164 take the form of membership on advisory committees and 157 take the form of consultancies, of which 14 are paid consultancies.

This pattern of participation represents a major volunteer contribution to the war on poverty. It also demonstrates the extent of Urban League interest and influence in the war on poverty outside of program directly administered by the Urban League. In addition, the breadth of participation of Urban League personnel demonstrates the unique vantage point the Urban League occupies on a nation-wide basis for observing anti-poverty program at close range in urban areas.

Urban League local executives were asked to respond to a series of nine questions³ relating to their experiences in, and observations of, the war on poverty. The following is a digest of their views and experiences as reported question by question.

The first question dealt with the basis for rating poverty programs in Urban League cities, whether or not such programs were administered by the Urban League.

Of the 1,253 anti-poverty programs reported from 79 reporting cities, no ratings were offered on 438 (or 34% of the total). In most instances, the failure to rate was due either to the fact that the Urban League executive felt the program had not been in operation long enough to warrant a judgment, or that there was insufficient data available to permit a fair rating.

Making ratings was further complicated by the fact that in some cities programs have been in existence for only a short time because of delays in funding and because of various conflicts which prevented programs from getting underway. Some such conflicts were among CAP board members, particularly in conservative communities where there tends to be a resistance to accepting federal funds, federal direction or "handouts." Delays in funding are also traced to red-tape at County and Regional OEO levels, which frequently leave communities with a feeling they are being required to "hurry up and wait."

In all, 815 programs were rated. It should be stressed again that Urban League executives were not asked to restrict themselves to OEO programs but to report on all anti-poverty programs funded by the Federal Government. Again, the nation-wide results were:

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

Within each of the National Urban League's five geographical regions there is a range of ratings similar to the cumulative ratings above but there are some finer points that need to be mentioned.

It is interesting to note that even such a widely acclaimed program as Head Start, heavily rated as "good" and "excellent," is occasionally rated "poor" or "fair," demonstrating that even the best of programs can falter in a given community depending on local circumstances.

In Marion, Indiana, for instance, where Head Start is rated as "fair" the problem cited is one of less than fully qualified staff, demonstrative that there is clearly a need for intensive staff training for even the most highly regarded of programs to be successful. The Marion Urban League further attributes the "fair" rating to a lack of professional workers and the inability of the workers involved in the program to develop meaningful relationships with minority groups, and a tendency for staff to be patronizing toward the poor. In Battle Creek, Michigan, there is a feeling that Head Start lacks sufficient parent participation and that the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which is generally rated "good" or "excellent" in Urban League cities, lacks sufficient funds and sufficiently creative and/or challenging work experience for young people.

At the other end of the spectrum, Massillon, Ohio, reports that 75 percent of the children who were in Head Start are now achieving satisfactorily in Kindergarten. Springfield, Ohio, reporting on Upward Bound describes it as excellently administered with 20 of 40 seniors planning to enroll in college and a local program underway to raise scholarship funds.

Tulsa, Oklahoma, reported all programs as "good" but added that a lack of funds and personnel limit the scope of programs there. Cincinnati, Ohio indicates

³ See Appendix IV.