

Problems relating to funding also create massive uncertainties, often leaving in question even whether programs of great merit will continue to be funded. It is *extremely* important that the Federal Government face the reality that annual funding is a *program-defeating* process. Staff, community and recipients are flatly demoralized by funding uncertainties.

Ways must be found to fund programs for consecutive two-, three-, four- and five-year periods if there is to be any sense of stability, flexibility and serious purpose to programs.

It is a waste to operate a program for one year during which time both staff capability and the effectiveness of program usually increase, in many instances by an important process of trial and error, and then to dissipate these gains by abandoning the program.

Uncertainty about refunding invariably results in staff's beginning to look for other employment as much as six months before the termination of a one-year program. Anxiety about the stability of program reaches the poor whom it is supposed to be helping. And all of this sets in motion a program-defeating cycle which destroys all, or much, effectiveness. Under these circumstances, even if the program is ultimately refunded, valuable ground is lost.

In documented instances, programs have continued for as long as two months beyond the conclusion of the contract before being either refunded or terminated. It is inconceivable, regardless of the complexities of the funding process and the uncertainties of Congressional appropriations, that a way cannot be found to protect recipients, community and staff from such pressures and dislocations as these.

The *fourth question* asked of Urban League executives was "*What recommendations would you make for improving the overall anti-poverty program in terms of efficiency, coordination and scope? What features of the program should be kept and expanded and which should be scrapped?*"

Several common factors can be seen in Urban League responses from all five geographical regions in response to this question.

As noted previously, it is felt in all five regions that CAP should negotiate more contracts with existing agencies to perform program. In some instances, this concern is combined with a concern that CAP stop duplicating the services of voluntary agencies. In part, these concerns stem from the early development of OEO, wherein, at the outset, there was an almost total rejection of traditional social agencies on the grounds that they had previously failed to solve outstanding problems. It was not until after almost a year of operation that OEO officially began to invite the participation of the traditional agencies.

There is a consensus among the 79 Urban League cities responding that, at the *local* CAP level, the initial policy is still deeply entrenched, particularly in smaller communities. It would seem likely that leadership on this question will have to come in the form of guidelines from OEO in Washington, specifically instructing CAP to contract with existing agencies and institutions.

At the same time, criteria need to be developed to define the commitments traditional agencies and institutions should be required to adopt in undertaking CAP contracts. For example, they must be prepared to accept and implement the philosophy of participation by the poor in decision-making, planning and operation of programs. They need to be forced to re-examine existing programs and to reconsider whether or not they are actually reaching the most disadvantaged citizens. They also need to determine whether, in fact, their policy-making bodies are sufficiently representative and, if not, adopt procedures that will guarantee that they are. Traditional family-service agencies will need to be creative in devising new ways to involve people in solving their own problems.

There are indications that there is a need for such formal agreement as seen in what is happening, for instance, in New Orleans. In that city, there is a conflict of values between CAP program and the traditional social work organizations involved in carrying out portions of the CAP program. The conflict seems to revolve around the CAP philosophy of employment of sub-professional aids versus the traditional agencies' orientation toward total professionalism.

Another factor which emerges is the need, not only for involving more of the poor, but the need for leadership training of the poor within the framework of CAP program. In addition, there is a recurrent plea for better staff support of the poor on CAP boards, which is spelled out in more detail under question six of this report.

In all five regions a strong need is seen for recognizing the individuality of cities. This is best seen in the broad range of recommendations from city to city as reflected by Urban League executives.