

1314 ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967

expect me to know all they were trying to cram into me. After all, I wouldn't be going to school if I had known all the answers already. So I made up my mind to learn all I could. To do my best was all they could expect of me. I began to relax and really enjoy learning. The more I learned, the more I wanted to learn. But as the time drew near for me to graduate, once again the old fears began to gnaw at me. What if I hadn't really learned all that I needed to know? What if the confidence I had felt was just false security? But the training I had received saw me through. I could look and sound confident, even though I was scared stiff.

"This schooling gave me an opportunity I never dreamed I would have. In my job I have to make decisions on my own. No one does it for me, and you know what? I can do it!

"My training has offered many open doors before me. All I have to do is walk through. The going was rough. My parents, my children, and myself sacrificed many things for me to be able to continue; but it was worth it all. Even to being forced, because of finances, to live away from my children will be rewarding. Since last November they have lived with my folks, and I have lived here—45 miles away, five days a week. But now, I have a good job with a good company, and when the school years ends my children will join me here. We will make Texarkana home—a far cry from our position 18 months ago."

In addition to the lack of baseline data for measuring program achievements, aggregative analyses of the Title V Program frequently ignore what might be called secondary gains. For example, the beneficial effect on school attendance of children of Title V trainees has been widely noted. This is particularly noticeable in areas like Eastern Kentucky where the parents themselves are attending classes and gaining, perhaps for the first time in their lives, an appreciation of the benefits of education. A related objective is the strengthening of family relationships as a result of the children seeing the father as an employed person working to improve the family's standard of living. Educational objectives are supported by the Title V projects in tangible ways such as the building of bridges so that children can get to school, repair of dilapidated classrooms and renovation of school ground play areas.

Title V projects have contributed substantially to community development and improvement on Indian reservations and other economically depressed areas. For example, in Wolfe County, Kentucky, rated the second poorest county in the United States, some 150 unemployed fathers in the Title V Program have constructed an estimated \$1 million worth of flood control work in the Red River Valley. Trainees in Wolfe County also constructed a public garbage dump (on land donated by a private citizen), the first such facility to be established in the township. This resulted in the community designating April 13, 1967, as "Clean-Up Day" with Title V trainees manning borrowed trucks to pick up the trash collected by the local residents.

The Title V project played a major role in the economic development of at least one Indian reservation—the Rosebud Reservation in South Dakota. The project, in cooperation with a private computer manufacturer, conducted an experiment to see if Indians could perform acceptable job functions in this type of industry. Previous attempts by influential Indian Tribal leaders and Bureau of Indian Affairs officials to obtain necessary support and funds to conduct such an experiment had failed. The evaluation of the results of this experiment showed that the attention span of the Rosebud trainees was far superior to that of the average trainee or worker in the Fabritek industry. In comparison to the 30 minute attention span of the average trainee in building core memory stacks, that of the Rosebud trainee was two hours. It was also determined that the quality of work was comparably equal or superior. As a consequence of this experiment, the company is moving ahead to build a plant on the Reservation.

The third major defect in an aggregative evaluation of the Title V Program is that it disregards the extremely wide variation in the effectiveness of individual projects. For example, taking the percent of project trainees employed as a criterion, Table 3 shows for three of the more than 250 Title V projects the following results:

[Percent of Trainees employed]

Eastern Kentucky-----	33
Cleveland, Ohio-----	45
St. Paul, Minn-----	70