

In essence, the plea in all five regions is one for greater adaptability to local needs rather than rigidities which ear-mark funds for specific purposes while demonstrated needs go unmet.

Most cities stress a need for continuing research both in the provision of current data and to develop standards of measurement. No program should be permitted to proceed beyond the six-month mark without providing a progress report. This progress report should document both successes and failures. There *must* be a willingness to *learn* from failures as a matter of administrative staff and program development. There must be a freeing of administration and staff of programs from chaotic anxiety over "blame" and "mistakes." There must be a willingness to involve recipients of service in the periodic evaluations of program. Only through an on-going gathering of facts, a documentation of successes and failures can the effectiveness of program truly be measured.

It is not sufficient, for example, to state that 400 people were placed in jobs. It is essential that the individuals be followed up. How many are still working three weeks later, or three months later? Of those no longer working, how many were fired, how many resigned? What were the reasons for the firings, or the resignations? How many can be reached and helped to find other employment or strengthened in order to function more effectively once employed? These are only some of the complexities involved in providing *quality* services to the poor. We must never lose sight of the fact that the gravity of their circumstances and the cumulative cost to society *demands* that the quality of service be exceptional if the war on poverty is to be won.

The next recommendation ramifies the need for reorganizing the individuality of cities and their programs. Most cities reflect a desire for expanded employment, job-training and education programs with less emphasis on programs of importance, but less urgency, such as consumer education, home management, credit union projects, etc.

To allude to an earlier recommendation, the great need is again stressed for adequate preparation and training of the poor for effective participation. This is particularly true in respect to their functioning on CAP boards, where, as a result of OEO guidelines, they now have $\frac{1}{3}$ representation in most instances. At the same time, the *quality* of participation, in many instances remains open to question, or it is found that the views of the poor are ignored at the moment of decisionmaking by the "professionals."

Memphis, Tennessee, cites an instance where no action could be taken in the course of six consecutive meetings of the CAP board because of the lack of a quorum. Procedures need to be developed to deal with such situations, through replacement of individual members, or otherwise.

The specialized needs of individual cities is again emphasized by a variety of suggestions relative to CAP agencies. One most frequently expressed is that "delegate" agencies should be represented on CAP boards. Another is highlighted in Omaha, Nebraska, where, at one time, OEO regional officials communicated with the community only by telephone and it was not until they began to make personal visits to secure firsthand information that adequate understanding developed between regional OEO officials and local leadership.

In the smaller cities, one finds a desire for the expansion of all program largely because only minimal program is in operation, reflecting the relatively limited impact which the anti-poverty program has had in such cities.

The *fifth question* was "What have been the benefits of the OEO? How effective is the OEO as an operating agency? Are there management deficiencies in the OEO?"

In response, the OEO is seen as having awakened communities to the many problems confronting the poor. On the other hand, it is felt that the OEO needs to generate the effective political support of the poor and that the limited extent to which the poor have given the OEO such support is indicative of the extent to which they have remained suspicious, unreached and, to some extent, disenchanted by the failure of the anti-poverty program to fulfill promises, to fulfill the belief that "something is being done for us." In sum, it is relatively simple to dismiss the poor as "apathetic," or to avoid facing the reality of the need for effective communication.

Many cities report that the OEO has encouraged people to help themselves and has given many people hope that the problems of poverty can be solved. The OEO is credited, in some instances, with having removed health and welfare services from political control. There is abundant praise for the OEO for having encouraged programmatic experimentation.

The OEO, nationally, is judged to be doing an efficient job in some communities, though, in most instances, there were no comments concerning the OEO