

*8. Responsibility for approval of Title V projects centralized in Washington*

Responsibility for a number of decisions has been delegated to the regional offices under the Title V program. Examples of this are the placement with the regional offices of responsibility for review of arrangements for on-the-job training with private employers and approval of transfers of funds within specified limits from one budgetary item to another. However, the approval of projects has been maintained at the national level because of the problem of implementing national priorities under a declining program. Title V does not operate under a system of allocations of State funds which also makes it less feasible to decentralize administration.

*9. More flexibility needed in providing services aimed at individual needs*

Several examples are cited of Title V projects helping individuals during the early stages of regular employment and the suggestion is made that such notable illustrations might have been encouraged elsewhere. One of the purposes served by a series of regional seminars which we have conducted is the sharing with other project directors of experience which have been found successful in individual projects. Consultation provided by program development staff at the Washington and regional office level is another means of transmitting such information. Finally, the rating system which is being developed jointly with the Office of Economic Opportunity will provide a mechanism for identifying factors associated with the operation of successful projects and also for their incorporation of such factors in projects which are less successful but face essentially the same set of outside conditions.

The only new suggestion in the Levitan paper which has not already been tried in a Title V project is the one relating to provision of a second-hand car to enable a potential Title V trainee to get to an available job. This suggests other possibilities to meet transportation problems which will be discussed in relation to additional resources needed to move more Title V trainees into jobs.

*10. No need for a separate program to serve public assistance clients now that other manpower programs are aimed at serving the disadvantaged*

While other adult work training and special impact programs such as the "Concentrated Employment Program" provide comprehensive services, they do not give special priority to public assistance recipients. The Title V program, on the other hand, is administered by public welfare agencies which have a special responsibility for this population. Public welfare agencies throughout the country have had long experience in administering a comprehensive range of supportive and work-training services while similar services are as yet being developed under the new "Concentrated Employment Program."

While the broader definition of handicapped permits the vocational rehabilitation program to serve a larger group of handicapped persons, than formerly, it does not include the able-bodied but undereducated individual who lacks motivation, job skills and work experience, and is beset by a host of personal and family problems, which could not be characterized as "behavioral disorders."

The Eastern Kentucky experience when the Title V project had to be curtailed and other manpower programs were instituted is cited as an illustration that Title V is inter-changeable with other Federally-supported manpower programs. Quite the contrary view is brought out in the "Case Study of Leslie, Knott, Letcher, Perry (LKLP) Community Action Council, Eastern Kentucky (Whitesburg, Kentucky)" which was prepared for the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Sub-Committee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty. This report, which was prepared by Community Action Associates, Inc., describes the criticism expressed by trainees about the "different income range for differently sponsored programs"; the confusion about the varying eligibility requirements and the uncertainty because of the short-term nature of the Nelson-Scheuer projects. Anxiety was aroused because of the question as to whether participants under programs other than Title V were entitled to medical benefits under the State's Title XIX program and the food stamp program.

*11. Goal of stressing training of male family heads not reached*

As a goal, the Title V program set a desired minimum of 50 percent of the enrollment to be allocated to male heads of families. This goal was related to the objectives of (1) strengthening family life and (2) demonstrating AFDC-UP in States which have not yet adopted this program. While provision for the latter was dropped from Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act in 1966, it is still intended that the benefits of the program be brought to unemployed