

1312 ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

ample, the Title V Program in health occupations provided through the Detroit Public Health Service hospital has been highly successful and demonstrates the accomplishments possible with full cooperation of a well qualified public hospital. The hospital has trained 32 Title V participants in 10 different health service occupations, 31 of whom have already secured employment with an average weekly income of \$85.00. Thirty-two are currently in training in 21 different occupations.

In the education and welfare areas, the Program has also drawn on a variety of resources in developing work experience and training opportunities. For example, the Program is conducting 35 projects in 29 States for teachers' aides, five projects in one State for nursery school aides, 19 projects in 11 States for home-maker aides, 14 projects in seven States for recreational aides, three projects in three States for neighborhood aides, 19 projects in 13 States for child and day care aides, and four projects in four States for social work case aides.

In some cases, the need to develop meaningful work experience and training opportunities has also led to programs which help to overcome critical shortages of services essential to a successful Title V project. For example, policy has recently been approved by the Welfare Administration which has the two-fold purpose of providing employment for AFDC and other low-income groups as neighborhood family day care mothers and at the same time opening up new resources for the day care of children whose mothers receive social services and job training from public welfare agencies or are former recipients who are employed. These day care services will be provided in private homes located in low-income neighborhoods for the most part, that will be furnished, equipped, supplied, and supervised by local public welfare agencies to meet licensing standards.

While Title V has made maximum use of public resources available through its inter-relationships with many other Department of Health, Education, and Welfare programs. It has not overlooked the private sector. Use of private employers as sponsors to provide a wide variety of kinds of training in a real work environment has offered a very constructive resource to trainees in most communities. The results of such placements have been most successful in terms of job placements. A recent informal survey indicates that over 4,500 trainees have been or are currently assigned to private employers. Of these, 1,103 trainees have completed their assignments with 644 trainees obtaining employment with their sponsors and 459 obtaining other employment as a result of this experience. Placement with private employers for on-the-job training has served as a "door opener" as it were for welfare recipients since many of these employers would not have considered welfare recipients for employment except as a "civic duty" to try them out without cost and without obligations.

Program effectiveness

Before launching into the complex subject of Title V effectiveness, some undertaking of the precise mission of the Program is indispensable.

When the Economic Opportunity Act was passed in 1964, the express purpose of Title V was "to expand the opportunities for constructive work experience and other needed training available to persons who are unable to support or care for themselves or their families, so as to stimulate the adoption of programs designed to help unemployed fathers and other needy persons to secure and retain employment or to attain capability for self-support or personal independence. . . ." Thus, as originally conceived by Congress, the purpose of Title V was to stimulate the adoption of programs leading not only to employment, but also leading to the attainment or retention of capability for self-support or personal independence. However, because funds were limited in relation to the potential target group, it was administratively determined that the thrust of the Program be directed toward the goal of employment rather than personal independence. Later in 1966, the reference to "self-support and personal independence" was dropped from the law.

The initial administrative decision concerning employability versus self-support and personal independence as well as the subsequent change in legislative intent is extremely important. If the stress had been put on personal independence, the Program would have been focused primarily on those who had the greatest potential for achieving self-sufficiency in the shortest period of time. Instead, the policy decisions went against "creaming" the target group. An