DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 397   UD 016 652

AUTHOR   Fenton, Calvin W.
TITLE   Youth Monitoring and Self-Evaluation Services. Final
                Report.
INSTITUTION   University Research Corp., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY   Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE   30 Nov 70
CONTRACT   OEO-B-99-4998
NOTE   152p.

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.83 HC-$8.69 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *Evaluation Methods; Leadership; *Participant
                Involvement; Program Content; Program Coordination;
                *Program Descriptions; Program Design; Program
                Development; *Program Evaluation; *Self Evaluation;
                Social Action; Social Change; Youth Problems; *Youth
                Programs

ABSTRACT
                Youth monitoring and self evaluation services were
developed for fourteen youth programs in the Eastern Region, the
mid-Western Region and the Western Region of the United States. The
concept of youth involvement is central to these fourteen projects.
Youth involvement is defined as "initial participation by project
beneficiaries in the determination of the nature of their program and
continuing participation in on-going managerial and policy-making
activities." Its purpose is to enable project participants to find
their place in community affairs through democratic experience and
collective social action. A problem facing some of the projects is
the lack of a clearcut relationship between the youth board and the
adult boards. For this reason it is recommended that programs of
youth involvement be continued, but that a new structure be developed
to emphasize cooperation between youth and adult boards. Evaluation
for each of the youth projects was provided by a third party. This
report includes a detailed discussion of the evaluation process and
emphasizes the use of evaluation as a tool for program improvement
rather than as a measure of success or failure. Youth participating
in all the programs included members of many ethnic groups and
members of both sexes. Most participants were from poverty groups.
(PR)

ED133397

VD 016652

YOUTH MONITORING AND SELF-EVALUATION SERVICES

FINAL REPORT

NOVEMBER 30, 1970

CALVIN W. FENTON - PROJECT DIRECTOR

Performed under contract with the United States Office of Economic
Opportunity, Youth Programs Research and Demonstration Section.

(B-99--4998)

University Research Corporation, 4301 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Washington, D.C. 20008

2

DEC 2 0 1976

YOUTH MONITORING AND SELF-EVALUATION SERVICE

PERSONNEL

Calvin Fenton	Project Director
Ernest Middleton	Deputy Director
Elaine Hudson	Administrative Coordinator
Dan Robbin	Western Regional Coordinator
Conrad Graves	Eastern Regional Coordinator
William Pickard	Mid-Western Regional Coordinator

CONSULTANTS

Charles Grosser	James Goodman
Shirley Jones	Carolyn McCannon
Mae Churchill	Lloyd Johnson
Edward Dowdy	George Roemer
Terry Rose	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

5

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

University Research Corporation undertook the task of providing Technical Assistance and Self-Evaluation Services to fourteen (14) [1] Youth Programs underwritten by the Office of Economic Opportunity, awarded on July 1st, 1969.

The terms of this contract require the provision of the following services:

(1) To work closely with Local Youth Program staff in developing self-evaluation designs and techniques.

(2) To provide training for the implementation of such evaluative techniques.

(3) To provide the Office of Economic Opportunity with four quarterly reports throughout the Contract period, indicating the progress being made by local youth programs.

(4) To recommend to the Office of Economic Opportunity the various types of Technical Assistance required by each Youth Program.

---

1. Note that the National Recreation and Parks Association's program functioned in three separate locations, (Cincinnati, Baltimore and Yuma). Thus, fourteen (14) programs were serviced covering sixteen (16) sites.

6

(5) To undertake Feasibility Studies of Youth Program Development,
the nature of which is to be determined by the Office of Economic
Opportunity at some point during the Contract period. (A
total of 20 consultation days were to be set aside for this pur-
pose. Four feasibility studies were designated by OEO.)

(6) To provide OEO with an overall analysis at the end of the Con-
tract period, which would provide a general frame of reference
to determine the quality and quantity of Youth Program function-
ing.

_____

During the initial stages of this Contract, eight (8) of the four-
teen (14) youth programs designated by the Office of Economic Opportuni-
ty were being served by A.L. Nellum and Associates. Although the Nellum
corporation provided Third Party Evaluation Services, rather than Self-
Evaluation Services, it was mutually agreed upon by The Office of Econo-
mic Opportunity and University Research Corporation to await the termina-
tion of the above mentioned Contract before initiating contact with the
eight Youth Programs covered in the Nellum Contract (termination date Sep-
tember 30, 1969). This was done in order to avoid confusion, and to allow
each service to maintain its distinctive quality.

All Youth Programs designated by the Office of Economic Oppor-
tunity, Youth Demonstration and Research Section, are listed in the
chart provided on page 5, of this report. ,

The Program Manager of OEO, Miss Jean Miller, has provided on-going
consultation, and has greatly assisted the implementation of this contract.

2

During the period covered in this Report, OEO terminated the fund-
ing of Youth Programs in five cities, namely: Brockton, Massachusetts;
Los Angeles and San Francisco, California; Dalles, Oregon; and Syracuse,
New York. Brockton is not listed in the above mentioned Chart since
this program terminated early during the contract period (before
the agreed date to begin field work.). It should also be noted
that no services were provided to the Mission Rebels in Action,
San Francisco, California, and it is not listed because it terminated
while being covered by the A. L. Nellum Contract.

Although consultation services were provided to New Communica-
tors, Inc., of Los Angeles, prior to its termination it will not be
included in this report. A full analysis of this program was provided
in our second and third quarterly reports. Certain references will
be made to this program within a general frame of reference; however,
special emphasis will be given to programs to which we provided
on-going coverage.

It should be noted that a follow-up study was undertaken for
New Communicators, Inc., which attempted to determine the effect
of their training program and the disposition of program partici-
pants following completion of the training program. This task was
undertaken several months following program termination. The result
of this effort is described in our third quarterly report.

Of the five youth programs terminated during the contract
period, self-evaluation and/or monitoring services were provided in:
Los Angeles, California; Dalles, Oregon; and Syracuse, New York.

3

8

Following a re-evaluation of the cities designated by OEO
in the original Contract Agreement, new cities were substituted
for coverage, all of which are designated in the Chart.

The fourteen (14) Youth Programs served were assigned to three
geographical regions: Eastern--URC Regional Office in New York City ;
Mid-Western--based in Columbus, Ohio; and Western--URC Regional Office
in San Francisco, California . Three (3) Regional Coordinators were
employed to oversee Youth Programs assigned to the respective regions.
Program consultants were also employed, where necessary, to provide
on-going consultation to Youth Programs which could not be covered by
the Regional Coordinator for various reasons.

EASTERN REGION

NAME OF PROJECT	ADDRESS	PROJ
1. Hartranft Multi-Purpose Youth Development Project	2328 Germantown Ave. Philadelphia, Pa. 19133	Pa
2. Projection '70, Inc.	501 Clarendon St. Syracuse, New York	C.
3. The Real Great Society Community Fashion Industries	69 Suffolk Street New York, New York 10002	Ro
4. Commission of Human Relations Youth Board	1420 Tampa Street Tampa, Florida	Ja
5. The School of Philadelphia Board of Education Site: 12th and Oxford	1550 North 7th Philadelphia, Pa. 19103	Ja
6. National Recreation and Parks Association Site: The Martin Luther King Recreation Center	122 North Vincent St. Baltimore, Md. 21223	My

5

10

MID-WESTERN REGION

7. Youth Civic Center 966-1/2 East Main St. LeRoy Tolliver Extended
 Columbus, Ohio 43205

8. National Recreation and Parks Clark & Court Sts. on Linn St. Mrs. Sue Thomas Extended
 Association Cincinnati, Ohio
 Site: Lincoln Center

9. Dayton Youth Patrol 1451 West 3rd Street Harold J. Wright Extended
 Dayton, Ohio 45407

WESTERN REGION

10. Neighborhood House 321 Alamo Avenue Joe Polito Extended
 Communications Project Richmond, California

11. Mid-Columbia Youth for P.O. Box 727 Rita Kulick Terminated
 Progress, Inc. Dalles, Oregon 97058

12. Colonias Del Valle P.O. Box 907 Alex Moreno Extended
 Work-Study Research Project Colonias Del Valle
 San Juan, Texas

13. National Recreation and Parks Association Site: Carver Community Park & Recreation Center	Carver Park, 5th St. & 13th A. Yuma, Arizona	Thelma Elyoid	Extended
14/ New Communicators Inc.	6211 Hollywood Blvd. Los Angeles, California	Fred Nobles	Terminated

YOUTH PROGRAM	PROGRAM CONSULTANT

EASTERN REGION

1) HARTRANFT MULTI-PURPOSE YOUTH
   DEVELOPMENT PROJECT,
   Philadelphia, Pa.

   CONRAD GRAVES

2) PROJECTION '70 INC.
   Syracuse, New York

   Lloyd Johnson

3) THE REAL GREAT SOCIETY-
   COMMUNITY FASHION INDUSTRIES
   New York, N.Y.

   Conrad Graves

4) COMMISSION OF HUMAN RELATIONS
   YOUTH BOARD
   Tampa, Florida

   Lloyd Johnson

5) 12TH & OXFORD,
   Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

   Conrad Graves

6) NATIONAL RECREATION AND PARKS
   ASSOCIATION
   Site: THE MARTIN LUTHER KING
   RECREATION CENTER,
   Baltimore, Maryland

   Shirley Jones

MID-WESTERN REGION

7) YOUTH CIVIC CENTER,
   Columbus, Ohio

   William Pickard

8) NATIONAL RECREATION AND PARKS
   ASSOCIATION
   Site: LINCOLN CENTER,
   Cincinnati, Ohio

   William Pickard

8

9) DAYTON YOUTH PATROL   William Pickard
   Dayton, Ohio

   WESTERN REGION

10) NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE   Dan Robbin
    Richmond, California

11) MID-COLUMBIA YOUTH FOR PROGRESS, INC.   James Goodman and
    Dalles, Oregon   Dan Robbin

12) COLONIAS DEL VALLE   Dan Robbin
    San Juan, Texas

13) NATIONAL RECREATION AND PARKS   Dan Robbin
    ASSOCIATION
    Site: CARVER RECREATION CENTER
    Yuma, Arizona

14) NEW COMMUNICATORS, INC.   George Roemer
    Los Angeles, California

. . . .

9

APPROACH

This report is divided into four distinct sections and is intended to provide a general frame of reference for understanding the nature of youth program functioning throughout the contract period. The indroduction is directed toward acquainting the reader with the posture and general conditions under which the contract was implemented. The second section offers position papers which attempt to provide the reader with general background information related to the concept of "Youth Involvement" and the problems and issues related to evaluation and self-evaluation. Section three (3), "The Analysis of Program Reports,"is divided into six distinct sections, all of which are organized around the central theme of youth involvement. The first section of this chapter specifically deals with the extent to which youth were, in fact, involved in each program. This section also includes a blend of the hard data collected from each program throughout the contract period. The areas of interest which follows in this chapter are: program activity; Boards and Adult-Youth Relationships; Administration; Leadership;and Self-Evaluation and Training.

The fourth and final chapter represents our recommendations for future activities on the part of the Office of Economic Opportunity in supporting Research and Demonstration programs. It should be noted that by contractual agreement, we were to undertake four(4) feasibility studies of youth programs, as designated by the office of Economic Opportunity. Twenty(20) days of consultation were set aside for this purpose. In April of 1970 the project manager of OEO indicated that in lieu of

18

this requirement, OEO would benefit from the development of a sample Research and Demonstration plan which could provide some direction to the future activities of this section of the agency. Following several conferences with various OEO officials this plan was completed and submitted. The fourth section of this report represents an expansion of some of the basic concepts previously offered and a summary of our recommendations.

During the contract period, three(3) staff conferences were held to discuss various issues related to the provision of consultation services to youth programs. Two conferences were held in New York City during October of 1969 and the second in January of 1970. Representatives from the Office of Economic Opportunity attended both conferences and were extremely helpful in assisting us think through the nature and quality of consultation services being provided.

Our staff convened once again by telephone conference in June of 1970. The major purpose of this conference was to firmly establish our position in terms of the collection of hard data from each youth program. Considerable discussion also took place related to how each program could be formally assisted in developing data collection systems.

The specific design for the collection of hard data was finally cleared with the program manager of the Office of Economic Opportunity in June of 1970. The results of im-

19

plementing this design may be found in chapter three(3) of

this report,as part of the Youth Involvement Section. This

information is offered to support the content of the analysis

provided for each program. A brief summary of hard data is also

provided reflecting the nature of certain stipulated program

groupings. The specific design used is offered in Appendix "A"

of this report.

It should be noted that in certain cases the collection of

hard data was hampered by the inability of various programs to

overcome significant problems covering a wide variety of issues

throughout the contract period.

During the initial stages of the contract, reporting forms

were developed which could provide a systematic frame of reference

for determining the progress being made by each Youth Program.

This activity was undertaken to develop a "PROJECT PROFILE"

(see Appendix "B") for each Youth Program which would provide a

solid base for determining at what point a particular Youth

Program was functioning and developing during the initial stage

of our intervention.

After from two (2) to four (4) visits were made to each

program, the "Project Profile" was completed and filed for

future reference.

Following the establishment of Project Profiles for each youth

program, monthly site visits were made to trace basic program

12

changes and modifications as they developed and to provide Technical Assistance as required. A second form was developed to accomplish this purpose, namely   The Site Visit Report, (see Appendix "C"). This form used the basic topical headings designated in the Project Profile; however, site visits reports, following the completion of a Project Profile, only reported changes in program direction. This information also provides a base for analyzing the development and progress various youth programs experienced throughout the grant period. This also assisted youth programs in developing a process of self-evaluation.

Our Third Quarterly report included a "Final Project Profile" for each youth program serviced during the contract period. This was done in order to provide the reader with a comparative view of the disposition of each program serviced prior to our intervention and desposition after several months of program operations.

13

STATEMENT ON YOUTH INVOLVEMENT

What we mean by Youth Involvement is initial parti-
cipation by project beneficiaries in the determination
of the nature of their programs and continuing parti-
cipation in on-going managerial and policy-making activi-
ties.

This commitment entails a change in orientation
regarding the reasons young people fail to become integ-
rated into the community. For decades, workers in all
phases of Youth Programming have focused on the provi-
sion of services geared to treatment, enrichment, the teach-
ing of skill and socialization. Such programs were pro-
vided to rehabilitate youngsters seen as "disturbed",
"pathological" or "anti-social". This approach, endemic
to correctional, recreational, and treatment agencies,
focused on changing the individual so that he could
effectively cope with his social, educational, and
vocational environment.

Since World War II, and especially in the last
decade, youth workers (along with many others) have
come to see the limits of this approach. First, it
was increasingly apparent that successful rehabilitation

came to naught when opportunities for employment or education remained closed.

Since programs were rendered impotent when opportunities for full citizenship were denied, even to such commonplace facilities as public accommodations, it also became apparent that the vast majority of young people in marginal positions in our communities were not disadvantaged as a result of personal failures or inadequacies.

Youth workers came to see that conditions of social, political, educational, and employment inequality significantly affected the failure of young people to assume conventional social roles. The recognition of social inequity as a major determinant of youth deviance forced the consideration of social reforms (to achieve equity) as a strategy for dealing with youth problems.

Thus, the need to make local institutions equally responsible to and involve all sections of the population was recognized as an essential component of any youth project. This socio-structural component co-exists with -- it does not replace -- the rehabilitative elements in the programs. Each component is rendered ineffective by the absence of the other. 23

Early comprehensive youth projects attempted
to achieve explicitly stated goals regarding chang-
ing such social institutions as Educational and Employ-
ment Opportunity Systems. The amount of local conflict
engendered by such direct approaches soon rendered them
obsolete.

Being unable to directly confront elements in the
environment which produced social pathology, youth
projects were forced to avoid explicit statements
regarding social-structural change. This occurred, even
though it had been widely acknowledged that such
change was basic to any successful youth program.

. . . .

In an attempt to find a viable way in which to
maintain a social action component, projects increas-
ingly turned to youth participation as a device which
would provide a focus on the social environment. If the
project itself, through youth involvement, could be a
unique entity that differed substantially from other local
institutions; if the project were truly responsive to
youth needs, making no invidious designations or exclusions;
then this, in and of itself, would provide something of
an environmental change. Youth participation in the
shaping and management of their own project is no sub-

24

stitute for their participation in local school
agencies, political parties, and the like.

The virtue of youth participation is that it
is reflective of the democratic ethos, is universal-
ly acceptable, and it provides young people with some
opportunity for shaping their lives. It is because
Youth Involvement remains as the only attempt at
dealing with environmental factors open to
the projects   that it is currently seen as the
sine qua non of a successful youth program.

Through successful participation in project
management and policy making, youth may very well be
encouraged to venture forth into other aspects of
the democratic process. If, federally-sponsored
programs can adhere to the tenants of pluralistic demo-
cratic process, young people may be encouraged to
seek similar experiences in other social and politi-
cal spheres. Such participation and experience is
the very essence of social reform.

. . . .

18

Youth project members will understand that the
changes called forth by their efforts will be modest.
They will know, too, when tokenism and the illusion of
change are substituted for substantive conces-
sions.

Youth projects are modest measures, conducted
on a local level   to enhance opportunities for social
success. Such projects should not be seen by their
federal sponsors as shaking the social structure of
the nation, or redistributing its resources -- even
when they press for a substantive reordering of
local priorities.

Youth involvement   is also basic to project success.
Programmatically, participants will have a commitment
to, and stake in,programs which they helped form,
whereas they will remain uninvolved in, and un-
touched by,programs imposed and managed by adults
and institutional officers.

Young people know themselves   and their problems.
Given the opportunity, they will introduce relevant pro-
gram components which reflect their life experience.

The wisdom and insight that comes from being
indigenous to the community and its problems cannot

19

be found in expertise or officialdom. This in no way denigrates the substantial contribution to be made by trained personnel.

Youth are most receptive to help provided on their terms that is reflective of their own priorities. What has sometimes appeared to be resistance to outside help is actually resistance to the unrelatedness, not the competence of, the helper. Youth involvement avoids this pitfall, and provides a basis on which adult technical assistance can be effectively used.

. . . .

The young people whom we seek to reach through Youth Programs are those who, as a result of unsatis-factory experiences with existing local institutions, have withdrawn from conventional community life into understandable-- and often justifiable-- alienation and hostility.

These young people cannot be reached by the very institutions and adults who are seen as having rejected them or blocked their access to opportunity. Even with the incentives and innovations of a Federal R & D grant, the local institutions remain suspect on the basis of

27

20

past performance.

Youth involvement deals with this impasse in
two ways: first, it is tangible evidence that the
existing arrangements are being modified. Second,
and even more important, it provides a vehicle whereby
youth can approach other youth -- thus bridging the gap
of distrust and hostility which often separates pro-
grams from those who will use them.

The democratic process, in and of itself, is
fraught with risk and uncertainties. Totalitarianism
and oligarchy can guarantee, though only for a time,
stability and predictability.

Youth involvement unquestionably introduces an
element of risk into a project. Such risk, however,
can be avoided only at the expense of the project's
ability to reach and affect young people. Youth
involvement is · after all, only another designation
for the democratic ethic which will inevitably deter-
mine the success of any social institution in American
society.

To seek such meaningful participation by young
people in their programs is only to ask that they ful-
fill their basic responsibilties as citizens.

28

Providing such opportunities to youth, who may
have reason to believe that they do not exist, is
surely the way to induct them into community life.

And, conversely, denying such opportunities to youth
who may have reason to believe such opportunities do not
in fact exist, thereby confirming their belief -- is
even more certainly increasing their alienation.

22

EVALUATION AND SELF EVALUATION: SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT ITS MEANING, USES, AND APPLICATION TO SOCIAL ACTION PROGRAMS

Typically the guidelines of OEO Youth Research and Demonstration programs and those of other federal agencies stipulate that plans for the evaluation of the program should be included in the proposal offered for federal funding. In most cases, the applying agency or organization either neglects to address this requirement or promises that it will be accomplished at some point during the grant period. This requirement is usually viewed by the applicant as just one more bureaucratic bottleneck which the program will somehow have to overcome within a few months following initial funding.

If a formal evaluation design is included in the initial application, it is most likely the product of an overstated promise made by a private firm or professional consultant who is unrelated to the program, whose product is developed merely to meet a funding requirement, and who usually has no involvement in the implementation of the design formula.

In the case of OEO youth programs serviced during the contract year, the evaluation requirement had another dimension of confusion. In the previous year (1968-69), the evaluation requirement was assumed by the Office of Economic Opportunity (the funding agency). In this case, OEO let a single contract to carry out the evaluation of all youth programs funded during that period.

23

At the time this contract was <u>announced</u>, (Youth Monitoring and Self Evaluation Services) there was no official determination by OEO that this procedure would continue to be followed and this issue was never resolved throughout the contract year. Consequently, some programs had to arrange for a third party to develop a design and plan for evaluation within a prescribed period of time (usually 90 days after funding) and other programs were merely required to cooperate with whatever arrangement the funding agency made for their evaluation. And, as stated above, this was never fully realized.

It should be noted, however, whoever makes the arrangement for the evaluation of the program (whether it is the funding agency or the grantee), it is understood that it must be carried out by an "objective third party".

The third party evaluation process is basically directed towards reporting to the grantor the degree to which program objectives are being fulfilled, the degree to which agency guidelines are being met, and the degree to which the program has been effective. Unfortunately the grantee usually percieves the evaluator as a "spy for the Feds," rather than as a friend of the program. The evaluation process should be viewed by the grantee as a method by which program problems and issues can be brought to the surface and handled openly. This process should be viewed by the grantor as an attempt to gain important information and knowledge regarding the implementation of specific program concepts. It is apparent however

31

that both parties (grantee and grantor) are somewhat overwhelmed with attempting to determine program "success and failure" and thus misuse the function of evaluation.

Another critical issue related to third party evaluation is that often the grantor and the grantee view and interpret program goals and objectives differently. As a result, the evaluation process produces conclusions which may be weighed differently by the grantee and the grantor. To further complicate this set of circumstances more often than not personnel within the funding agency often differ in their own perceptions of program objectives and program implementation. Thus, the grantee and evaluator are projected into a confused set of circumstances from which they cannot be extricated.

32

THE EVALUATION PROCESS

The complicated, ill-defined process of program evaluation requires considerable thought in order to obtain a clear view of the problems and issues which lie at the heart of carrying out this task.

The following represents a set of definitions offered by OEO in order to clarify terms relevant to the Research and Demonstration mission.

1. "Research consists of systematic analyses of the causes of poverty and evidence on the relationships between economic, social, educational and political factors and the incidence of poverty or the equality of opportunity.

2. Experimentation is the examination of a clearly-stated hypothesis through controlled variation of policy instruments. Generally experimentation will utilize well designed control or reference groups.

3. Developmental projects are intended to transform accepted hypotheses concerning program objectives and means into workable program models. Emphasis is placed upon the development of administrative procedures and program and training materials. Developmental projects should usually be undertaken in clusters so that alternative project designs may be examined. An evaluation design should be an integral part of the program.

4. Demonstration projects are primarily a means of demonstrating a proven program concept. Their function is, in large part, the dissemination of information concerning these concepts. "[1]

Within the context of these definitions, OEO has required that

---

[1.] OEO Memorandum dated 4/7/70 "Definitions of Research, Experimentation, Development and Demonstration," Thomas K. Glennan Jr., Director of Research.

third party evaluations be undertaken to gain some understanding
of the development and implementation of such programs.

According to Webster (Unabridged), "to evaluate is to ascer-
tain or fix the value or amount of something; to appraise care-
fully." This clearly implies the existence of criteria by which
the value can be judged. In the case of Social Action Programs,
such as those undertaken by the Office of Economic Opportunity,
are such criteria defined anywhere? If so, what are they?

Inasmuch as OEO Programs are presumably innovative, i.e.,
without precedent, how are the criteria to be established? By
whom? Consider the possibilities: Criteria may be established
by legislative fiat, by the funding agency, by the program inno-
vators, by the program operators who are not necessarily the same
as the program innovators; and, last but not least, by the group
to be served by the program.

A case could be made for using any of the means named above,
but it is obvious that the criteria chosen would vary according
to the source. Any set of criteria might have some utility, pro-
vided that it was clearly defined, understood, and accepted by
all parties concerned.

27

34

Has any mechanism been developed to achieve such clarity of
assessment in OEO programs? The question can, with equal relevance,
be raised with respect to the entire gamut of governmental programs.
OEO is politically more vulnerable than most government agencies--
not necessarily more culpable, however. It would be interesting
to see, for example, how Department of Defense Programs are
"evaluated"; by whom the criteria are established; at what stage in
their operation is their effectiveness judged; and the consequences
of a negative evaluation.

Questions of time quickly emerge when one starts considering
the meaning of "Evaluation". Are we concerned with the immediate
value of a given program? Or, must some distinction be made
between short-range and long-range results? How can one judge the
long-range consequences of a program with a life-span of one year,
or perhaps, if it is lucky, two years, as in the case of demons-
tration programs?

Inasmuch as the new programs are presumably created in order to
meet unfilled needs, and hence are unprecedented in one or another
crucial aspect, does it make sense to attempt to judge the operation
on a short-run basis when most of the time elapsed is, of necessity,
a learning experience for all concerned? What allowance can
or should be made for the element of insecurity built into the
year-by-year funding process characterizing OEO programs?

It must be apparent that the built-in insecurity of demonstration
programs must affect the quality of personnel available for ad-
ministering programs, and that this in turn is reflected in the
operation of the program. In fact, one-year, or even two-year

grants with which to demonstrate new services, or new combinations
of services, contain an implied threat-- make it look good, or else!

Experience indicates that, under these circumstances, the manage-
ment of innovative programs is left to those persons in our society
who are, for one reason or another, unequipped for dealing with the
complexity of the situations for which they take responsibility.
Most people with training, experience, and/or some political
sophistication, tend to avoid such responsibility. We thus are
faced with a paradox: the most difficult undertaking, i.e.,
those without established precedent and traditions which might
conceivably be made to work if the most dedicated, accomplished
practitioners in the field were operating them are left to those
willing to take on incredibly complex duties-- with a minimum
of background, experience and judgement.

In addition, these innocent innovators can usually count
not upon cooperation from the more knowing professionals in the
field but much more certainly on their opposition, concealed
or open. And, to add insult to injury, the professionals have
managed not only to escape operating responsibility with all
its trauma, but they have also managed to become the outside
evaluators of the innovative programs.

If, somehow, criteria were clearly established by which a
program could be evaluated, the question remains: who can best
measure the extent to which the criteria are met? Proposals are
frequently written by a person or persons with one set of goals
in mind, operated initially by still another group, not infre-

36

quently taken over by a third group, and evaluated by an outside organization. Whose judgement then is the relevant one?

The outside evaluation generally consists of a flying visit - lasting a couple of days, during which the visitors talk with as many participants in the program as possible-- getting thoroughly confused in the process-- and adding to the confusion normally present in groups struggling for survival, in which the struggle for control is a parallel contest. With the best intentions in the world, the flying visit by outside consultants can hardly be expected to produce a measured objective judgement and the consultants become crucial in deciding the fate of the program. Its operators will, of necessity, put as good a face on their activities as is possible and opposition elements within program, hoping perhaps to gain control and succeed to the Management or key spots within the organization, will feed their own brand of information to the consultants.

Objectively verifiable data are usually scarce-- and for good reason. Funding agencies' concern with evaluation has rarely extended to including proper budget items needed for careful data collection, record-keeping, analysis, etc.-- with the result that most information available to the outside evaluators is narrative and much of it is fiction.

In fairness to the funding agencies, it should also be added that, with innovative programs, the difficulties of designing good evaluative research are real. Without a certain amount of

30

experience and knowing the major variables-- how do we know a good research design for an experimental program when we see it? Furthermore, here too, even a good design is not sufficient. What is needed is intelligent execution of the design. There is very little reason to believe that the importance or uses of evaluative research have been accepted by most participants in social action programs. The gap here between the theorists and the operators is enormous .

Until the gap is narrowed, it is just plain silly to expect persons struggling with the day-to-day problems of trying to make a program work also attend to conceptual and archival problems of evaluative research, particularly since intuition and experience suggest that information collected can as readily be used against a program as in its favor.

. . . .

Ideally, Social Research is modeled along experimental lines, with variables identified, controls provided for contrast, etc. But, in practice, such design is rarely built into demonstration programs. There are sound human and political reasons for the omission . Most people involved in Social Action Programs are ill-disposed to the role of subjects-- not even for the best of social science reasons. As Peter Rossi, an outstanding scholar in the field has observed:

"... Few evaluation researches employ controlled experiments as their basic research design...

31

"It is important to understand that a key reason
for this condition lies not so much in the difficulty
of designing such experiments, but in the impediments
to their use in practice....

"Perhaps the major obstacles to the use of controlled
experiments in evaluation research is a political one ...
namely, that practitioners are extremely reluctant to
allow experimenters to exercise proper controls over the
allocation of potential subjects to experimental and
control groups...

"For example, the proper evaluation of the Job Corps
would require that potential trainees be separated into
experimental and control groups, the former receiving
either no treatment at all, or some sort of training
differing in essential respects from Job Corps treatment...

"The political sore point is that a controlled experiment
means that some potential trainees who are otherwise
qualified, are barred arbitrarily from training, an
act which public agencies are extremely reluctant to authorize.[2] "

An equally basic problem in evaluation arises from the very fact that
OEO programs are essentially interstitial in nature. That is, Congress
created OEO originally for the purpose of "coordinating" anti-poverty
programs already in existence throughout the federal government. That
it was never meant to supplant existing programs or to create basic

---

2.   Rossi, Peter, <u>Practice, Method and Theory in Evaluating Social Action
     Programs</u>. Paper read at 1966 meeting of the American Statistical
     Association, pp. 14-15

new services is clear, not only from the legislation
but from the budgetary allotments as well.

It is very much more difficult to evaluate a coordinating
mechanism than it is to evaluate a single, distinct service.
It is also very much more difficult to isolate any effects
whatsoever from marginal programs dealing with small, special
groups, by definition excluded from the mainstream of ex-
isting services. Peter Rossi has labeled this program as that of
"weak effects".

OEO programs, planned to "coordinate", to "supplement", to
"rehabilitate", are aimed for the most part at individuals,
not systems. Their effects, therefore, are not systematic, but
slight. Slight effects are either immeasurable, or extremely
difficult to measure, calling for the most refined of measure-
ment techniques. Thus, for example, adding a special form of
social service or of training to parallel the much broader existing
services may produce benefits which, though real to the relatively
few individuals involved here, are virtually invisible,
statistically. Rossi's analysis, concludes:--

"... new treatments can be expected to yield only
marginal improvements over existing treatments, and

40

hence cost-benefit ratios can be expected to rise
dramatically as target problems and populations
constitute smaller and smaller fractions of their
universes...

"When only marginal effects are to be expected,
evaluation becomes more difficult to achieve
and at the same time, program administrators can
be expected to be more and more apprehensive con-
cerning the outcome of evaluative research...

"Effective new treatments which produce more
than equivocal results can be expected to be
expensive ... To compound difficulties, the
costs of evaluation for programs which are
marginally effective are more expensive (for
the same quality) than for programs which are
very effective...
"If effects can be expected to be small, then
greater precision is needed in Research to
demonstrate their existence unequivocally...
However, although with the best of research we
could show very slight results-- with the worst
of research we could show anything. 3"

    If further proof is needed of the marginal nature of OEO
Programs as the subject for Evaluative Research, consider

_____

3.   Op. cit, p.6.

34

41

the following : OEO has identified some 156 other programs
administered by at least 15 other federal agencies, including
programs for Education, Manpower, Health, Welfare, Social
Security, Housing, Urban Renewal, and also Economic Development.

All of the foregoing agencies make direct contributions to
the anti-poverty effort. In 1967, the President's budget re-
commendations included estimated expenditures of $21,000,000,000
for Federal benefits and services to the poor from administrative
budget and trust funds. Of these, OEO expenditures comprised
$1.6 billion, or 7.5 per cent.

The "lion's share" of anti-poverty funds thus clearly went to
well-established agencies-- with special emphases long established
by Congressional mandate. The feasibility of evaluating OEO's
contribution to the general anti-poverty effort, or, in specific
instances, the impact of any given OEO program within the larger
categories of federal action, becomes highly dubious.

Perhaps different terminology would be helpful: "Evaluation"
is a weighty word, with implications of precision and controlled
methodology somewhat less than appropriate as applied to OEO
programs. Does it follow then, from this, that no attempt should
be made to assess the quality of the performance? Perhaps too,
it would be helpful to consider that the essential judgement with
respect to any given program is made at the point of deciding
that it is worthy of funding; that, if it is funded, serious
effort should be made to incorporate into the program a system

of Management tools, essentially Operations Research designed
to help inexperienced staff continuously judge how the program
is working and to make correction possible before their cumula-
tive effect has become ruinous; to provide constant feed back
between program operators and the group served with systematic
record-keeping for the sake of all concerned.

This might not meet the needs of the professional social
scientists, or even those of the GAO's office-- but it might
help those persons innocent or heroic enough · to attempt to
do what no one has done before.

43

WHY SELF-EVALUATION ?

Youth Programs cannot be singularly indicted
for not attempting to systematically evaluate   and
review their direction and status at any given point
in time.

Most Research and Demonstration Programs, what-
ever their nature, are guilty of the same crime, that
is -- the need to prove that they have had a "success-
ful" program experience.

This need to establish "program credibility"
has often led to the avoidance of reporting the basic
problems and issues related to program development
and program implementation. Unretrievable knowledge
is lost in the process.

It is our feeling that the fear of failure must
be diminished and thirst for information and knowledge
emphasized. A "success story" produces little that
can be used by others unless it is reported within the
context of the very real problems and issues related
to program development   and program implementation.

44

Federal Demonstration and Research Agencies have
learned little in the Social Sciences, primarily be-
cause of their insistence on having a "success story",
and the limitation of one-year funding. Certainly,
"success stories" assist federal agencies in acquiring
bigger and better new legislation, authorization, and
appropriations. However, the political ramifications
of continued funding negates a position of complete,
honest reporting. Honest reporting should be reward-
ed -- not punished .

Self-evaluation can provide a frame of refer-
ence for the systematic utilization of self-investiga-
tion, review, and conscious program direction. Unfor-
tunately, most demonstration programs neither have the
resources   nor the time to undertake the luxury of
such procedures.

The urgency of success weighs heavily on Program
Operations. Thus, the "final product" becomes the essen-
tial goal -- and the "process" is lost.

Self-evaluation represents a means by which a
project can review its own experience   without the
threat of a flying two (2) day visit by a third party
evaluation team which is required to make judgement
about the degree to which a program is successful in

accomplishing its goals.

The concept of self-evaluation is based on a conscious review by the program staff in determining where they have been and where they are going. The specific design used for self-evaluation is not significant. The importance of this process remains in the concept of self-investigation, self-direction, and a willingness to report what one experiences.

The basic concept in self-evaluation is the development of a _fearless honesty_ in looking at one's self and the _capacity to sharply report what is seen._

The self-evaluation and third party evaluation are not mutually exclusive procedures. They can and should provide youth programs with a wide variety of supportive measures directed towards developing knowledge, information, and direction. The implementation of both procedures within the context of a single youth program, however, can be quite confusing if not undertaken with considerable clarity and understanding on the part of all parties involved in the process.

39

ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM REPORTS

The experiences of the fourteen (14)[1] projects included in the monitoring grant are extraordinarily varied. The projects themselves were located in a dozen different cities, each of which influenced the program through different complex interactions. Furthermore, the projects themselves differed in that some had been in existence for a number of years and others were hastily put together. While youth were involved in all of the projects, in some they were the central core and in others they functioned as part of a larger community coalition. Some projects were located in small or rural communities while others were in giant urban industrial centers. The programs in which the projects were engaged included recreation, film making, public health, training, and business ventures.

The differences enumerated suggest the sweep of divergence which characterized the projects under contract. They are not meant, nor do they begin, to inventory those differences. This section of the report will attempt to analyze the program experience of the projects under contract. In so doing, it will necessarily make certain generalizations which do not sufficiently account for individual project differences. To the extent that it is possible, an attempt will be made to acknowledge differences and to account for them. It should be noted that detailed and unique project materials are contained in the individual volumes which comprise the third quarterly report submitted to O.E.O. This report will attempt to draw generalizations from specific experiences which appear significant and can serve to

---

1. As indicated previously "New Communicators Inc." will not be contained in this analysis.

provide replicable information to federal agencies with regard to funding and program policies.

Attention will be given to those areas central to the concerns of the projects and the central funding agency; these will include funding and administration, self evaluation, youth adult relationships, particularly with regard to policy making and accountability, program activity, and the local boards of directors. Because of the centrality of youth involvement to all the projects under contract, this area will be considered first in some detail. The areas discussed subsequently will implicitly relate to the central issue of youth involvement. Explicit references between the other aspects of program and youth involvement will be made as needed.

YOUTH INVOLVEMENT

As noted in the position paper offered in the first section of this report and as indicated in the OEO guidelines, youth involvement is the central facet of the Research and Demonstration projects under discussion. The most recent guidelines for youth programs (effective March 5, 1970) devotes the major portion of its twelve pages to this subject and to issues related to it. The guidelines state explicitly that youth involvement is a key goal. The overall goals of youth development programs are stated as follows:

"Provide poor youth with a formal voice in planning and implementing programs in which youth increase their ability to deal with problems affecting their lives.

48

Through collective social action, especially on behalf of their own community or neighborhood, bring about positive changes in their values, aspirations and behavior.

Prepare youth to deal more effectively with the institutions designed to serve them, and by speaking together, to become instrumental not only in expressing their needs to those institutions, but also in being able to orderly change them in order to improve the quality of life in their neighborhoods." *

Thus, youth involvement is projected as a device which will enable excluded young people to find their way into the central core of community affairs through democratic experience and collective social action. With the exception of the National Recreation and Parks Association projects, about which we shall comment later, all of the contract projects contained substantive youth involvement components. Consistant with the points made earlier regarding the broad range of experience encompassed by these programs, this component varied from virtually total youth control and involvement on every level in the Real Great Society in New York City, to struggle for youth participation and option in the Neighborhood House project in Richmond California. Before drawing generalizations from the aggregate experience of the contract projects we shall comment briefly on the youth involvement components of each. It should also be noted that following our comments on each program in this section, a presentation of hard data is provided which offers information related to the general characteristics of program participants.

---

* OEO insert 6168-1A

I YOUTH CIVIC CENTER, COLUMBUS, OHIO

The Youth Civic Center has had a functioning youth board and extensive youth involvement from its inception as part of the East Columbus Community Organization (ECCO). This program began in 1965 under the aegis of the English Lutheran Church. At that time considerable effort was vested in involving the youth community in the creation and formulation of their own program. Having set this early precedent, the youth themselves, the community, f u n d i n g agencies, and local community institutions then struggled with the presence and the contribution of the youth. Since the youth center was itself conceived by the youngsters and effectively brought to life through their active participation, they were optimistic regarding their ability to substantially effect events concerning it.

In addition to serving as Board members of the youth program, the youth also were elected as Board members and as committee members of the adult organization. At one point, youth had majority control of this Board. However, it was difficult for them to sustain their interest. Until recently, when some issues of consequence were handled by the ECCO board in a way unsatisfactory to the youth, the youth delegates attended ECCO meetings rarely and participated erratically.

The youth program is under the responsibility of the Youth Board which is composed of nine members, all under the age of 25.

44

This board meets regularly and sets policy for the program. All
staff members are youth with the exception of the program director and
deputy director. The working relationship between the youth and the
adult director is such that all decision making is a joint process.
Members of the youth program are also on the Executive committee
of the adult board.

51

YOUTH CIVIC CENTER HARD DATA

I.   TOTAL PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS   500

II.   AGE   Range 16-24

III.   SEX   25% Female
                                           75% Male

IV.   MARITAL STATUS   80% Single
                                           20% Married
                                           Average family size 5.2

V.   SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS   40% below the federal poverty level.
                                           Substantial number on public
                                           assistance.

VI.   ETHNIC BACKGROUND   100% Black

VII.   EDUCATION   50% Completed 4 years of High
                                               School.
                                           25% Less than 4 years of High
                                               School.
                                           25% Unknown

VIII. PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE   33% Unemployed.

46

II. DAYTON YOUTH PATROL, DAYTON, OHIO

The Dayton Youth Patrol was an offshoot of the indigenous
"White Hat Patrol" which was formed as a part of the resolution of
the Civic disturbances in Dayton. Under the strong charismatic
leadership of the Executive Director and his two assistant direc-
tors, and in response to the dramatic events which gave the pro-
ject birth, widespread youth involvement in the program develop-
ed in a genuine, though personalistic, manner around this leadership.
This was facilitated by substantive commitment of the director to the
involvement of youth members at all levels of the project, mana-
gerial, staff recipient and neighborhood. Youth involvement is
frequently frustrated in the face of strong charismatic leadership .
However, when such leadership is truly committed to participation
by youth, it facilitates the process by adding the weight and pres-
tige of the leader to the ideas and thoughts of the neophyte parti-
cipants. This is in effect what occurred in Dayton. The project
executive, highly respected in his own community and in the communi-
ty at large, lent his office to the participants in the patrol so
that, through him, involvement by youth in the community as a whole
took place. As is frequently the case, at many programs of this
nature, the youth leadership tended to be more actively involved
than general membership. An unfortunate decision which probably
exacerbated this state of affairs was the discontinuance of general
membership meetings. The Patrol is going through that organizational

53

phase where the charismatic leadership and the intensity of crisis, which gave it birth and supported it in its early stages, is being replaced by organizational structure and regularized ongoing programs. The Board of the Patrol consists of twenty members, 50% adults and 50% youth. Although it formally sets policy for the program, this responsibility is informally held by the director. With the exception of the director, all staff are youth, and the decision-making is held by the director and the young leaders.

DAYTON YOUTH PATROL HARD DATA

I.   TOTAL TRAINEES   120

II. SEX   55% Male
                                      45% Female

III. AGE   Range 15-35   22 average

IV. MARITAL STATUS   2% married
                                      98% single

V.   SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS   100% low income

VI. ETHNIC BACKGROUND   98% Black
                                      2% White

Job Placement Program estimated placements per year - 400 approximately.

The following is a sample of 50 people placed on jobs in the past year:

Age   Range 15-35   20 Average

Sex   90% Male
                                      10% Female

Marital Status   Unknown

Socio-Economic Status   low income

Ethnic Background   100% Black

Of 50 people, 40 had no previous work experience.

49

III MID-COLUMBIA YOUTH FOR PROGRESS, THE DALLES, OREGON

Youth for Progress was never operational during the time it was covered by this contract, having received a short term (three months) planning grant. However, the grant request itself grew out of the indigenous activity of a group of local youth and the plan submitted was drawn directly by the youth, albeit a small number of them. This latter fact is something of an accomplishment, for there have been very few opportunities for the youth themselves to substantively draw their own program proposals. (Several exceptions are included in the projects under contract, i.e. Real Great Society and Youth Civic Center). The board executive and membership structure proposed by Y.F.P. provided for substantial youth involvement in the program submitted. Local adults approved this arrangement though it became clear that their approval was based on the expectation that the project would never be funded. When, in fact, funding appeared possible, a series of abandonments ensued as group after group of adults withdrew their support. The planning grant itself, by its unfulfilled promise, turned the youngsters away from substantive program to developing a proposal. Once this proposal was subject to indefinite delay and became a matter of local politics, the planners had no plan/ and therefore no program and they soon melted away. The Dalles represents an example of lip service to youth involvement by adults ultimately defeating the notion itself.

56

No hard data is available for this program since it was a planning
effort only and no youth council was ever functional.

57

IV. COMMISSION OF HUMAN RELATIONS YOUTH BOARD, TAMPA, FLORIDA

Like the Dayton Project, the Tampa program had its genesis

in the White Hat Patrol which operated during the demonstrations

which shook that city in 1967. The Commission on Community Re-

lations which sponsored that effort sought to involve young people

in the life of the community as an alternative to civil disorder and

as a method of redressing grievances and achieving social reform.

Though generally not publicly acknowledged, the fact is that in

both Dayton and Tampa, youth involvement(and the Patrol) were devices

offered to cool off aggrieved citizens (mostly youth) who had taken

to the streets. Though in other cities this has also been the case,

it is rare that the connection the instrument created to restore

order became the organization of constructive social action. Youth

involvement offered, as it were, under the gun may be as genuine and

comprehensive as when it is provided as a matter of conviction.

While the mechanics of local youth participation were built into

the original proposal, actual involvement proceeded moderately.

However, by the summer of 1969, the constituency participated in

electing a youth board of Directors which meets regularly and appears

to exercise the prerogatives of a policy-making body. It is com-

posed of 23 youths between the ages of 17-24 and meets on a weekly

basis. In the course of this year, the board determined how the project

shall proceed regarding several of its businesses, expanded its con-

stituency by reaching participants in the community at large and

developed viable working relationships with staff. The staff, in this

case, is young adults between 20-38. At this point in time the

relationship between the staff, the sponsoring agency and the youth

board is again being refined to determine specific areas of

responsibility.   58

I.   TOTAL TRAINEES ON STIPEND
      BOARD AND IN-SCHOOL   82

II.   SEX   65 Male
                                               17 Female

III. AVERAGE AGE   18

IV.   MARITAL STATUS   77 Single
                                                5 Married

      CHILDREN   76 No
                                                6 Yes

V.   SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS   4% above federal poverty level
                                               96% below federal poverty level

VI.   ETHNIC BACKGROUND   70 Black
                                               12 White

VII. EDUCATION   52 Still in High School
                                               13 Drop outs from High School
                                               17 Have High School Diploma

VIII. PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE   Types of Jobs
                                               Gardener, Clean-Up, Dishwasher,
                                               Custodian, Window washer, Bag-boy,
                                               Porter, Cashier (1).

                                               Highest Salaries

                                               $2.05 per hour

                                               Lowest Salaries

                                               $1.25 per hour, average

53

V. COLONIAS DEL VALLE, SAN JUAN, TEXAS

The staff of the Colonias project consists entirely of local Mexican-American youth devoted to developing a series of programs for the community as a whole. In a sense, the Colonias represents youth leadership rather than youth involvement. The youth have been engaged in developing programs whose value is community-wide, rather than focused specifically on the interests or participation of youth. Youth fulfillment and self realization is projected in this project as stemming from generic rather than particularistic, youth-centered activity. Problems in facilitating these objectives were evidenced in the meager direction provided the youngsters in how to go about developing these community-wide programs. Apart from this shortcoming, youth contacted many families through a health research survey, worked in a cooperative food program, and helped with welfare, legal, health and other problems. More than this, they have come to understand and have developed a deep committment to working to solve the widespread problems which beset the southwestern Mexican-American community.

When the original grant for a survey was awarded, there was no formal youth structure that existed, merely the identification of youth leadership as indicated above. The formation of a formal youth board under the legal auspice of the community organization is just now in the beginning stages. All staff members of the program are youth, aged 25 and under, and they are actively involved in the business of the sponsoring organization.

54

COLONIAS DEL VALLE   HARD DATA

I.	TOTAL PARTICIPANTS HIRED		23
II.	SEX		Unknown
III.	AGE	Range 16-25	Average 20.5
IV.	MARITAL STATUS		Unknown
V.	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS		78% less than $3,000 per year
VI.	ETHNIC BACKGROUND		100% Mexican-American
VII.	EDUCATION		3 College Courses 6 High School Drop outs 14 In School
VIII.	PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE		Farm Laborer

61

VI.   12TH AND OXFORD CORPORATION, PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

The Board of Directors of the 12th and Oxford Corporation
is made up of 12 local youth, age 20-24, who meet weekly, and is
advised by a group of older community adults. The youth, board,
and staff set policy, manage,and control the corporation. Board
and staff members are indigenous to the project target area and
are closely identified with the program. While conventional objec-
tivity and impartiality are considered the sine qua non of
board functioning, this is clearly not the case with 12th and
Oxford, nor should it be. The Board provides the major vehicle
for youth involvement in all aspects of program development
and operation. Another unique substantive opportunity for youth
involvement grew out of the relationship which the project de-
veloped with Temple University. Apart from opening educational
opportunities to neighborhood youngsters, members of the
12th and Oxford Corporation serve as lecturers in a special
workshop organized by the University. The opportunity local
ghetto youth had to address the community at large via the
university represents a distinctive and important bridge between
these youngsters and the city as a whole. The neighborhood
within which this project is located has been the scene of per-
sistant gang conflict over the years.

56

Members of 12th and Oxford's Board worked informally with city
officials to attempt to alleviate these conflicts. Other than
theses two activities mentioned above, there is no formal relation-
ship between board members and other community committees.

/

12TH AND OXFORD HARD DATA

I. PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS (6/30/70)   76

II. SEX   100% Male

III. AGE   Range 12-22   Average 17   Participant
                Range 20-24   Average 22   Board

IV. MARITAL STATUS   72 Single
                                         4 Married

V. SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS   Poverty level
                                         70% on Welfare

VI. ETHNIC BACKGROUND   100% Black

VII. EDUCATION   24 High School Drop outs
                                         Remaining - uncertain

64

This program, sponsored by the School District of Philadelphia
and delegated to Hartranft Community Corporation, an adult
neighborhood corporation, is under the direct responsibility
of a Youth Council formed with the development of the youth
program. The youth council is composed of approximately thirty
members of local youth gangs. These representatives are chosen
by each group affiliated with the program. The council meets every
two weeks nd technically has responsibility for policy and
administration of the program. However, the adult board which
has designated a committee of four adults to oversee the decisions
of the youth board has been reluctant to allow the youth board
any of the prerogatives which it has agreed to. While the
structure currently exists to allow for appropriate youth
involvement, the struggle around making this a reality for
the youth continues. At the time of the last election for the
adult board, the youth took an active interest, ran several of
their members for seats on the council, and succeeded in winning four
of them.

65

HARTRANFT COMMUNITY CORPORATION HARD DATA

I.   NUMBER OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS   2000

II.   AGE   Range 15-28

III.   SEX   Both Male and Female

IV.   LENGTH OF ASSOCIATION WITH
        THE PROGRAM   2-1/2 years average

V.   SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS   Low Economic bracket

VI.   ETHNIC BACKGROUND   Black and Puerto Rican

VII.   SCHOOL ATTENDANCE   High percentage of drop outs

VIII.   PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE   12 out of 100 employed
                                            86% unemployed

IX.   SOURCE OF FAMILY INCOME   Welfare and Public Assistance

X.   NATURE OF PROGRAM
        PARTICIPATION   See Quarterly Report

60

VIII. NEW COMMUNICATORS, INC., LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

Because of the nature of the program, the board of New
Communicators was made up primarily of persons with skills
or contact in the film industry. Youth trainees were re-
presented on the board and the program plan called for a
trainee cooperative. However, the responsibility of the youth
representatives on the board of this program was continuously
questioned by adult members and this issue was never really
resolved. The intervention of the funding agency was neces-
sary in order to guarantee the youth representative voting
rights on the board.. This happened late in the program year.

In summary, though youth were very "involved" in strug-
gling with the conflict over adult domination, this program
did not represent formal recognition by the sponsoring organ-
ization of the concept of youth involvement.

61

NEW COMMUNICATORS, INC. HARD DATA

I.   TOTAL TRAINEES   17

II. AGE   Range 19-33   Average 23

III. SEX   15 Male
                                                      2 Female

IV. MARITAL STATUS   12 Single
                                                      5 Married

V.   SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS   13 At or below poverty level,
                                                      including 1 on Welfare.

VI. ETHNIC BACKGROUND   9 Black
                                                      7 Mexican-American
                                                      1 White

VII. EDUCATION   5 Didn't complete High School
                                                      11 Completed High School and
                                                         either had training or some
                                                         higher education courses.
                                                      1 College Degree

VIII. Previous work experience varied from laborer, waitress, mailman,
      unemployed. Only 1 had full-time employment prior to program.

68

IX.   NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE COMMUNICATIONS PROJECT, RICHMOND, CALIF.

The Neighborhood House project was generated in the youth program existing in the center. Several groups of youngsters participated in establishing a Youth Advisory Board which was assigned responsibility for program policy and was represented on the Neighborhood House Board. Substantial youth involvement took place through youth serving as staff and media personnel, and by the interaction of these youngsters with community youth and adults who comprised their audiences. Youngsters attracted to the program wanted to participate directly in its activities. They were reluctant to get involved in such instrumental activities as the council, board or other managerial-administrative roles. This lack of interest was exacerbated by the settlement's strong executive director, who took her prerogatives of leadership and policy making seriously. These factors contributed to a situation where the apparatus for youth involvement, though present, was largely inoperable. This problem grew worse as board and youth staff drifted further apart and the vacuum left was filled by the administration of the sponsoring agency. As program developed and youth participants became more identified with the program, a working agreement was developed between the youth board and the adult board. By the end of the contract period, a functioning board of eleven youth and six adults guided the decision making of the project.

69

This program truly represents the dynamics of making the concept of youth involvement a functioning reality.

NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE COMMUNICATIONS PROJECT   HARD DATA

I.   TOTAL PARTICIPANTS AND STAFF   293

II.   SEX   55% Male
                                             47% Female

III.   AGE   Average 22

IV.   MARITAL STATUS   Unknown

V.   SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS   90% within federal poverty criteria

VI.   ETHNIC BACKGROUND   100% Black

VII.   EDUCATION   Unknown

VIII. PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE   Unknown

65

X. THE REAL GREAT SOCIETY, NEW YORK, NEW YORK

The Real Great Society is unique as a true example of a
youth conceived, developed and administered program. The
organization as a corporation is composed of ghetto youth. In
the case of RGS there is no aspect of the operation of the pro-
ject which is not in the hands of youth. In existence for seve-
ral years prior to OEO funding, the proposal submitted to OEO was
developed by the youth. Board and staff are youth; program, bud-
get, hiring et. al. are done by youth. In short, the program is a
truly indigenous youth project whose every activity reflects youth
involvement.

RGS struggled through some sharp problems of interpersonal
relationships and roles. The youngsters demonstrated a willing-
ness to accept adult assistance with these problems and managed
to continue without the bitter divisive battles and sweeping changes
of personnel which so often characterizes this sort of organiza-
tional conflict. The youngsters survived a series of economic
and political crises which might very well have destroyed the pro-
ject and it is not unreasonable to assert that the substantive
control of program by the youth themselves contributed immeasurably
to this survival.

72

REAL GREAT SOCIETY HARD DATA

I.   TOTAL STAFF   8
     Information on staff only since
     nature of program is economic development

II. SEX   7 Male
                                                1 Female

III. AGE   Range 20-33   Average 26

IV. MARITAL STATUS   Unknown

V.   SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS   All low income, ghetto residents

VI. ETHNIC BACKGROUND   7 Puerto Rican
                                                1 Chinese

VII. EDUCATION   1 GED
                                                1 Drop out from High School
                                                1 High School and some College
                                                3 High School and training
                                                2 Unknown

VIII. PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE   Salesclerk, Bookkeeper, Sales
                                                Manager, Manager of Clothing
                                                Store, Designer, Department
                                                Store.

73

XI. NATIONAL RECREATION AND PARKS ASSOCIATION: MARTIN LUTHER KING
XII. CENTER, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND: LINCOLN CENTER, CINCINNATI, OHIO:
XIII. AND CARVER COMMUNITY PARK AND RECREATION BOARD, YUMA, ARIZONA.

The youth involvement components of the three NRPA projects
were introduced as a consequence of actions by OEO staff and by
program consultants available under the technical assistance
grants. Such devices as youth councils, youth representation
on boards and youth in staff assignments were employed by the
Martin Luther King Center. The Youth Council provided a vehicle
for effective participation, even to the lending of funds
earned through conducting public programs, to the MLK board.
Youth staff members were also enthusiastic, effective and hard
working,providing a core of leadership and esprit de corps
to the entire project.

Board participation on the other hand was sporadic and largely
ineffectual, reflecting more adult intransigence than youthful
inabilities.

At the outset, the Lincoln Center project was unable to
effectively integrate local youngsters in the governance of the
project. Despite the unavailability of formal channels for
involvement, youngsters, again,by their enthusiasm and commit-
ment as participants in program,provided a catalytic force which
pushed the project forward. As the project developed, more
influence was exercised on the project by youth through their
increased participation on the project board, the majority of

68

which were under the age of twenty-four. Using creative pro-
gramming to gain support and recognition, youth assumed a number
of leadership positions on the board--the secretary-treasurer
is 21, the president 23. Some youth active in the project board
have moved on to participate in Model Cities and other programs
serving the West End Community.

The Carver project projected a Youth Advisory Council
of at least one young adult staff member and two seats on the
adult board. Throughout the bulk of the project's experience,
intrusive battles within the board and persistent difficulty
in getting the program off the ground effectively precluded
youth involvement. After a young staff member was hired, the youth
council was organized and the presence of the youngsters within
the project appeared highly saluatory. At this point, the board
seemed to have resolved a number of its major difficulties and
the prospect of youth involvement in its deliberations has once
again become viable. In this program,the local director of recrea-
tion has supported the program consultant's efforts to move the
issue of youth participation,and this has unquestionably facil-
itated the progress noted.

* MARTIN LUTHER KING CENTER HARD DATA

I.   NUMBER OF REGULAR PARTICIPANTS   725

II.   AGE   Range 2-85   56% (400) High School Students
                                        25% (175) Young Adults
                                        21% (150) Adults

III.   SEX   75% Male
                                        26% Female

IV.   ETHNIC BACKGROUND   100% Black

V.   EMPLOYMENT   Males in Construction

VI.   INCOME   60% of Families on Public Welfare
                                        Average Income $4,800 per year

VII.   MARITAL STATUS   Unknown
                                        Program participation had
                                        a slight drop

VIII. SCHOOL ATTENDANCE   95% of 400 youth in school,

* Note: No hard data was available from two (2) of the three (3)

       NRPA programs, namely, Cincinnati and Yuma.

<div align="center">

76

</div>

SUMMARY: YOUTH INVOLVEMENT EXPERIENCES

Of the twelve (12) programs described above, seven (7)
have formal structures providing youth involvement in decision
making within all aspects of the program functioning. The
remaining five (5) sites (which includes the three (3) programs
of the NRPA grant) never achieved any formal structure directed
towards the testing of youth involvement concepts.

Of the seven (7) that have formal structures, four (4)
youth boards are not incorporated, but act in an advisory cap-
acity to a sponsoring adult organization. These four (4) pro-
grams are Hartranft, Commission on Community Relations, The
Youth Civic Center, and Neighborhood House Communications Project.
The remaining three (3), The Real Great Society, 12th and Oxford,
and Dayton Youth Patrol, are incorporated organizations receiving
direct funding from OEO. Of these three (3), the board member-
ship of two, namely, The Real Great Society and 12th and Oxford,
are entirely composed of youth. The Board membership of the
Dayton Youth Patrol is evenly distributed between youth and adults
(approximately 50%/50%).

For those four (4) programs where youth Boards exist in an
advisory capacity to a sponsoring adult organization, the predom-
inant issue of the program year was the development of a clear
understanding of the responsibilities of each Board and the

accountability of each to the other. This situation is clearly exemplified by the experience of the Neighborhood House youth program of Richmond, California. (Please refer to our third quarterly report.)

For the two (2) programs where the Boards are entirely made up of youth representing youth decision making in its purest form, their predominant difficulty was the failure of adult institutions to actively respond to the concept of youth involvement.

Based on these experiences, it is our recommendation that the concept of youth involvement should continue to be tested but that a new structure should be developed which will actively encourage youth involvement and, in addition, produce a creative partnership between youth and responsive adults. Further elaboration on this concept will be provided in Section IV of this report.

The summary of hard data which follows offers a collective picture of the characteristics of youth involved in each of these programs.

SUMMARY: HARD DATA

In the following summary of hard data we have separated the information of three programs (The Commission on Community Relations, The Dayton Youth Patrol, and The New Communicators, Inc.) from the summary of the remaining seven (7). This is done because the three mentioned above are training programs whose goals and effectiveness are measured differently from other types of social action programs which produced data. However, as noted, a complete report on hard data for each program is included in the Analysis Section of this report.

TRAINING PROGRAMS

The Commission on Community Relations

The Dayton Youth Patrol

The New Communicators, Inc.

I.	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	Average 73 (Total 219)
II.	SEX	65% Male 35% Female
III.	AGE	Average 27
IV.	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS	93% Below federal poverty level 7% Above federal poverty level
V.	ETHNIC BACKGROUND	90% Black 7% White 3% Mexican-American

73

SOCIAL CHANGE PROGRAMS

NRPA (The Martin Luther King Center)

12th and Oxford

Hartranft

Colonias Del Valle

Neighborhood House Communications Project

The Real Great Society

The Youth Civic Center

I.	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	Average 454
II.	SEX	74% Male * 26% Female
III.	AGE	Average 21 **
IV.	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS	71% Below federal poverty level or on Welfare *

V.	ETHNIC BACKGROUND	100% Black for four (4) programs.
		 100% Mexican-American for one (1).
		 88% Puerto-Rican, 12% Other for
		     one (1) program.
		
		 88% Black, 12% Puerto Rican for
		     one (1) program.

VI.	EDUCATION	23% High School Drop Outs*** 67% High School and Additional Training (2 had college degrees).
VII.	PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE	Varied from farm laborer to custodian.

---

* As reported in five(5) programs.
** As reported in six (6) programs.
*** As reported in three (3) programs.

BOARDS AND ADULT-YOUTH RELATIONSHIPS

Policy making, like self-evaluation, is an integral part
of any program which purports to substantially involve program
participants. Policy making is of course a complex procedure
in that it involves not only the accountability of the program
to those who use it, but also accountability to the larger comm-
unity in which it is located and the sponsoring agencies which
fund it. In addition, the policy-making body, the board of
directors, is, in fact, the entity which is legally responsible
for the actions of the project and thus is the official face and
spokesman for it. All these factors combine to influence the
composition and operation of the project boards. Also, in a
number of cases, policy-making or advisory bodies of municipal
departments or local sponsoring or affiliated agencies existed
which claimed part or all jurisdiction over the conduct of the
local youth program. Thus, in a good many instances, the project
board becomes the arena within which a substantial portion of
formal youth-adult relationships get worked out.

Because the various projects under contract shared, either
as a matter of obligation or conviction, a commitment to youth
involvement, there was in every case at least a pro forma arrange-
ment whereby youth were to participate in the governance of the
project. By the arrangements made, a certain quota of seats on
the local board were set aside for youth representatives. In
most instances, these representatives were chosen directly by

75

81

the project's youth constituency; in several instances, however,
they were selected by staff or the Board as a whole. Setting
aside three to six seats for youth, generally between ten and
twenty percent of the total, proved ineffective as a device
to engage youngsters in project policy making. Board meetings
tended to be highly formal. They were held at a time and place
convenient to their adult majority and agendas were determined
without the participation of youth. Thus, youth members felt
the style of the Board was uncongenial. In addition, since
the aforementioned arrangement left youth with no power to affect
policy decisions, they viewed participation as a meaningless
and somewhat trying ritual. Such arrangements did not work.

Illustrated by the above is the fact that meaningful repre-
sentation cannot be granted by the adults to the youth as a
matter of sufference or noblesse. When this occurs youth repre-
sentatives serve the adult board's purpose. Such purpose, i.e.
to provide information or advice, may either be legitimate or false;
legitimate when youth's counsel is heeded or seriously consider-
ed, false when youth serve as a facade to give the illusion of
involvement where none exists. In either case, however, such
purpose is not participation in the policy-making function of
the board. Participation that has meaning can take place only when
the youth are a significant group, answerable to their own and

82

with sufficient power so that they can be neither implicitly nor explicitly ignored. The experience of the various projects emphatically supports these generalizations both in the affirmative and the negative. The earlier reports indicate that, in every case, pro forma representation just doesn't work. In those instances where youth viability and potency were evident, i.e. Baltimore and Youth Civic Center, shared responsibility for policy making was possible and effective.

An interesting issue is presented by the consideration of youth-adult cooperation in policy making. To what extent should the agency's commitment be to the literal involvement of young persons as opposed to the enactment of policies which will meet their needs. If, after all, as has so often been the case, there are no substantive differences between youth and adults why should it matter who makes the decision. Often adult surrogates for youth interests are more forceful, more e 'ctive, than the youth themselves could ever be. These observa s regarding surrogate advocacy on behalf of youngsters apply equally to staff as well as to board. A case in point is the Dayton Youth Patrol, whose adult leadership embodied the essence of youth vested interest and whose effectiveness with larger municipal, state and federal systems brought these interests to life through the Patrol. Without adult dominance, at least at its genesis, this program would never have come to be. Similar circumstances obtained in most of the other projects under contract.

In keeping with the position taken in the first part of this section, it is the view of these consultants that while adults can, should, and will often act independently on behalf of a youthful constituency, such action must be limited. The absence of substantive difference is a matter of momentary circumstance and no program purporting to serve youth in the ways outlined in the OEO guidelines can do so without them, on their behalf. The experience of the projects being serviced supports this contention; lack of operational viability quickly became an issue when youth participation was limited to pro forma tokenism, i.e. Neighborhood House, Youth Civic Center.

The model of an autonomous youth board, made up of and controlled by youth, is somewhat rare. It can be found most unambiguously in the experience of RGS and in the Youth Civic Center. Youth boards which are autonomous, independent and self-controlled do not eschew adult participation or involvement. In fact, substantive independence includes the freedom to make alliances and common cause with others (adults in this case) and to utilize resources which they may have,i.e. expertise, community contacts, etc. Both RGS and the Youth Civic Center were able to utilize adult resources extensively because they were secure in their independence. Such utilization was not felt as impinging on the project; quite the contrary, it was seen as facilitating the project's work.

84

Board training is an activity about which a great deal
is said and very little done. For if the truth is to be
known, boards are generally seen as unnecessary complications
in the lives of the few staff or community influential elites
who usually control program.   From this view it is preferred
that boards be acquiescent and passive so that they can be re-
lied upon to come up with decisions which the program dominants
consider appropriate. Thus,board training when it takes place
is an effort to socialize board members to the values of the pro-
fessionals or the ideology of the community people who dominate
the agency or project.

As viewed by the monitoring-technical assistance staff,
however, board training was an instrument for providing inexperi-
enced local residents with the skills by which they could demo-
cratically run their own organization. It was, in addition, the
vehicle by which self-evaluation, youth involvement and other
substantive elements in the project could be brought into the
local community and vested there. Finally, board training was seen
as providing the insights and skills by which various community
groups could function harmoniously: youth, adults, sponsors,
other local institutions, et al.

Because the monitoring staff viewed the board as a central
instrument of project success rather than as an impediment, it
sought to help create effective boards through training. An
active informed participating board can be a strong impediment

to oligarchy; it therefore is central to projects such as these, whose raison d'etre is participation and involvement. Work with the Martin Luther King Center best illustrates the training process we have in mind,though it is reflected in the other two NRPA projects as well.

86

ADMINISTRATION

Specific recommendations regarding the most troublesome administrative aspects of project life are made in Section IV of this report. Apart from them, we should like to make several observations regarding the administration of the programs conducted by the projects. Our comments are relative; that is they are in keeping with the vaudeville comic who when asked, "How's your wife?" answered, "Compared to what?" We are impatient with the popular sweeping generalizations so often made regarding administrative sloppiness and poor management of community-based programs. Compared to what ? The military,which gives itself medals for fictitious heroism? The phone company ? The airlines ? Any federal, state or municipal agency ? The calamities heaped on community-based programs reflect bias and politics that are not based on substance. They are plagued with problems which they are sometimes unable to handle efficaciously. They also frequently find themselves in positions for which they are unprepared and have no protocol on which to rely. Basically, however, their efforts go to program viability and their false starts and errors rarely reflect corruption or deceit. Often, in fact, they are faulted for doing the very things they've been mandated to do: involve locals, institute changes, redress grievances,and provide experience from which youngsters and adults will draw a sense of independence and self-sufficiency. Since such achievements

81

can rarely be attacked directly, vested institutional forces,
smarting under their own culpability, raise the ever present
spectre of administrative mismanagement.

LEADERSHIP

Implicit in this report is an affirmation of the concept
of youth involvement expressed by the experience of youth programs
serviced during the contract year. Such shortcomings as were suffered
by all the projects are not attributable to any fallacy in this basic
assumption regarding the management of their own affairs by local
residents.' The essential factor which supports this claim is the
substantive and qualitative resource represented by the local
youth themselves. This resource has been evidenced in every project
under contract. Not by single outstanding charismatic leaders alone,
but by the ability of rank and file youth to assume responsibility.
Such leadership is endemic; as described in the reports, it appears
in the ghettos of New York City and Philadelphia, in Midwest Urban
centers such as Columbus and Dayton, in small rural communities
such, as The Dalles and San Juan, Texas. To have such a resource
and to deny or harass it, is to fly in the face of history. To own
such a resource, to embrace it and give it its head, is the route
by which the storms of current social change can be weathered.
Each of the youth projects herein described, have, to some extent,
offered youth the opportunity to do their own thing. The experience
has been submitted.

88

SELF-EVALUATION DESIGN AND TRAINING

As indicated earlier, contact was made with some programs early during the contract period and, in other cases, contact did not occur until October or November, 1969. By November of 1969, it was clear that each program was overwhelmed with monumental problems which, in most cases,were related to their acquiring refunding, special supplements, extentions, problems with Boards of Directors, administration and a host of other issues. It was also evident that every program was suffering from the severe limitations of one-year funding and the vast amount of internal problems such funding mechanisms create.

After completing contact with each program, we reviewed the nature and quality of services being provided by our consultants.

It was obvious that the primary concern of most programs was that of determining how such programs would survive three (3) to six (6) months following the date of our visit. Some had funds but were concerned about receiving an extension from OEO; others had limited funds but were concerned about refunding. Almost every program had severe problems in receiving direction from their res-

pective Boards of Directors in terms of supporting and developing
true mechanisms for youth involvement. Many had administrative
problems and sought technical assistance in this area. It should
also be noted that at this time ten (10) of the fourteen (14) youth
programs covered were due to expire within six months or less.

Although each project director was clearly informed by the contrac-
tor and OEO of the nature and usefulness of developing a formal self-
evaluation design and process, in almost every case the problems
of program survival overwhelmed undertaking such a task. Each pro-
gram leaned very heavily upon our consultants for technical assist-
ance in generalized areas which were directed towards the urgency
of today's problems.

The formal process of self-evaluation, on the surface, appeared
time consuming, unproductive and did not have an immediate pay-off
for program survival. This set of circumstances led us to reevaluate
how the concept of self-evaluation could be structured such that it
became functional to each youth program rather than just another
grant requirement which burdens the fulfillment of program objectives.

As indicated earlier, the essence of self-evaluation is that of
undertaking self-investigation, self-direction and a willingness to
accurately report what one experiences. The specific design used in
this process is unimportant. However, in carrying out such procedures,
one must create an environment in which the fear of failure is dimin-
ished and the quest for knowledge given the highest possible priority.
This process can take place only by mutual agreement between the fund-
ing agency and the grantee.

90

84

As suggested above, when survival becomes the most important problem of the movement, "bureaucratic requirements" such as self-evaluation are hardly relevant to the grantee. Therefore, in order to make the services of the contract useful, it was necessary to address the most pressing problems first in order to later proceed into a process of self-evaluation.

In most cases, the problems of survival persisted throughout the program year.

Examples of the problems and issues experienced by specific youth programs covered by the Youth Monitoring and Self-Evaluation contract may be found in Appendix "D". This document represents a summary of our staff conference held in New York on January 21 and 22 of 1970. This conference was designed to assess the status of each youth program covered by contractual agreement and to project future consultation activities.

The problems faced by all programs during this period can be separated into five(5) distinct categories:

    I.   Programs terminated by OEO during the contract period.

    11.   Programs facing termination within thirty(30) days of our conference.

    111.   Programs which had severe problems with their respective Boards of Directors or other administrative problems.

91

IV. Programs which were in the throes of attempti⸱⸱⸱
to develop a new proposal for refunding.

V. And, programs ready for the self-evaluation process--
meaning that although such programs may have been beset
by other problems, there remained some capability to
engage in a systematic process of self-evaluation.

Categories

1............................ 1. Brockton, Mass.

2. Los Angeles, California

11............................ 1. Syracuse, N.Y.

2. Hartranft, Phila., Pa.

3. San Francisco, Calif.

111............................ 1. Yuma, Arizona

2. Baltimore, Md.

3. Richmond, California

4. Cincinnati, Ohio

1V. .... 1. Dalles, Oregon

2. Columbus, Ohio

V............................ 1. New York, N.Y.

2. Tampa, Florida

3. 12th and Oxford, Phila., Pa.

4. Dayton, Ohio

92

It should be noted that the categorical designations offered
above are not mutually exclusive and that considerable overlapping
exists in determining the extent to which various programs were
not capable of engaging in a formal process of self-evaluation.
For example, almost every program had considerable problems in
one form or another of administration and in gaining direction
from their respective Board of Directors. The intensity of these
problems varied from program to program. Thus, if the activity of
the Board and Program administration was not seen as a central
issue at the time of our intervention, it was not classified
in the above chart.

/

87

SELF-EVALUATION PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

The program of self-evaluation requires that the grantee
possess a fair degree of organizational clarity, the involvement of
participants in program development activities and the assurance
of relative freedom from pressing day-to-day crisis. Unfortunately,
most of the projects under contract did not contain these requisite
circumstances, particularly at their inception. Therefore, the
degree to which it was possible for self-evaluation and as a
palpable force in the life of these progra: : so ewnat cir-
cumscribed.

Program consultants recognized that their primary technical
assistance task was directed towards basic organization building.
They utilized the components of self-evaluation to achieve this
end. Thus, assistance emphasized participation by as broad an
aggregation as possible in the building of viable organizational
structures and the articulation of reaffirmation of the program's
objectives. The bulk of assistance offered went to dealing with
the innumerable crises precipitated by unanticipated occurrences,
by the uncertainties created by funding problems, and the inter-
action of the project with various community constituencies.

In the case of the NRPA projects, local participation actua
began with the arrival of our consultants. The prior reports
illustrate the ways in which technical assistance was utilized to
build these entities. We believe that the precedents set in the

88

past year provided these groups with experience in, and a commitment to, the self-evaluation process. It is to be hoped that such precedents will continue without continued outside assistance. Though, in candor, we are forced to say that in these three programs, as well as in several others (i.e. Neighborhood House and The Commission on Community Relations), it is not unlikely that more autocratic procedures will takeover in the absence of consultants committed to self-evaluation.

It is not surprising to find that it is in the long-lived projects, such as R.G.S. and the Youth Civic Center, that the self-evaluation process operated at its most effective and comprehensive level. Nor is it presumptuous to suggest that in such projects as these it is most unlikely that there will be a regression to a less democratic form of operation. Despite the strengths of these programs, however, it is notable that even here the process was substantially aided by the technical assistance provided by the consultant. In other programs, such as Neighborhood House and Mid-Columbia Youth for Progress, Inc., the self-evaluation process was limited by the reluctance of numbers of participants to engage in non-expressive activities (that is, more managerial activities, unrelated to program). Youngsters were in the main interested in those activities from which they could derive direct satisfaction, rather than in appraisal and decision-making. These latter efforts, as we so well know, are often highly frustrating because the benefits are remote and future delibera - tion requires the kind of compromise and flexibility which can

89

effectively bleed the excitement and magic out of the most attractive program. That some groups found such instrumental activity as self-evaluation exciting and rewarding was a function of their identification and involvement in the project. It was not a reflection of any intrinsic excitement stemming from the activity itself. We would speculate,therefore, that self-evaluation can succeed only when it is meaningful, when issues are real and the decisions made implemented. This would suggest that the experience of Neighborhood House and Mid-Columbia might have been different had there been a willingness on the part of the Settlement Board in the first case, and the local CAP in the second, to allow the youth to make substantive decisions.

The notion that the evaluation process is most fruitfully fulfilled by the recipients of service is both simple and profound. It reflects the fact that those who use programs have the greatest stake in their constancy and integrity and that as participants they have the most comprehensive and least ambiguous view of the program itself. Such a view does not suggest, nor does it imply, that participants necessarily have the requisite technical skills and resources to conduct a self-evaluation process. It is believed that such skills can be initially attained from outside resources and ultimately incorporated into the repertory of skills of project participants and personnel. Unfortunately, it is difficult to acquire the expertise needed to conduct evaluative activity. Local resources, universities, or private consultant firms, are

96

generally loath to put their skills into the hands of project
persons. Such experts generally hold the view that the entire
process must be controlled and conducted by themselves. Thus,
while they would be perfectly willing, even anxious, to accept
responsibility for all aspects of the evaluative process, they
are quite reluctant to help the project to do it themselves.
Reflecting this state of affairs, many projects had great difficul-
ty obtaining the kind of ongoing assistance that would enable them
to carry out self-evaluation. Several notable exceptions were
Youth Civic Center and 12th and Oxford, Inc. who were fortunate
to find at Ohio State and Temple Universities exactly the kind
of persons who would facilitate the groups conducting their own
appraisal process.

A word needs to be said regarding the matter of objectivity.
Self-evaluation is not a technique of formal inquiry conducted
along norms of scientific method to ascertain knowledge or
discover new Truths. It is,rather, a device for involvement and
accountability which keeps a complex social endeavor on course.
Objectivity, then,in rigorous social science research, is more
a matter of recognizing and allowing (to the extent that one is
able) for bias, rather than the absence of bias. Therefore,
the argument that self-evaluation isn't objective is moot. At
best, one could suggest that the biases of another party should
be substituted for the biases of the project itself. And this
argument, of course, is answerable by the earlier assertion
regarding the primary commitment to the project's program and

91

of its participants. This commitment is the factor which makes the bias of the project personnel least likely to be destructive or diversionary.

As indicated earlier, almost all youth were struggling with severe problems of survival and thus the development of formal self-evaluation designs was an impossibility. We also suggested earlier that each program was reevaluated and the nature of our specific task clarified. Thus, with the concurrence of OEO, in January of 1970, our basic strategy changed from attempting to develop formal self-evaluation designs to that of assisting various programs with more rudimentary problems through an informal process of self-investigation. Appendix "D" described the specific issues discussed in January of 1970. The following represents the nature of the struggle experienced by each youth and the consultation provided by contract agreement:

EASTERN

1. Martin Luther King
Recreation Center,
Baltimore, Md.

1. Difficulty in operationalizing programs.
2. Severe Problems with Board.
3. Scarce monetary resources--Low level funding.

1. Assisted with development of self administered Board Training Programs.
2. Assisted with developing group sessions (Board of Directors and Staff) directed toward self investigation.
3. Assisted in planning program operations and finding new funding sources.

2. 12th And Oxford Corp.
Phila.,Pa.

1. Severe community problems such as "gang wars" and inter-organizational conflicts.
2. Access difficulty.

1. Provided assistance in stemming gang conflicts. Held joint meetings with city officials and others.
2. Held group sessions directed towards program evaluation.
3. Program received considerable supportive services from personnel at Temple University (Miss Betty Schantz).

3. Hartranft Multi-Purpose Youth
Development Project.
Phila., Pa.

1. Severe community problems ("gang wars") inter- organization conflict.
2. Staff problems in high staff turnover and some problems with narcotics addiction.
3. Program implementations impeded by nature of funding.

1. Provided considerable assistance in resolving inter-organizational difficulties.
2. Assisted in stemming gang conflicts.
3. Assisted with staff problems.

96

99

100

4.	Real Great Society New York, N.Y.	1.	Severe staff problems.	1.	Provided self-evaluative T-Group sessions in order to resolve staff problems.
		2.	Internal fiscal management problems resulting from previous year's grant to "University of the Streets."	2.	Provided Technical assistance in Fiscal Management and in fulfilling OEO guidelines regarding work programs.
		3.	Problems with work programs		

5.	Commission on Human Relations Youth Board	1.	Problems with The Local sponsoring Community Action Agency.	1.	Received considerable assistance from outside consultant, Mr.William Blount. in addition to our consultant in developing self-evaluation procedures. This resulted in production of considerable hard data and the development of self-evaluation strategies. Result of this effort is described in third quarterly report.
		2.	Problems in developing program direction and making program decision.		
		3.	Youth Board.	2.	Assisted in resolving problems with local CAA.

94

| 6. | Projection '70
Syracuse, N.Y. | 1. | Program suffered from severe gaps in refunding by OEO; caused loss of staff and in effect terminated program. | 1. | Initial attempt made to assist in the development of new programs; however, such an attempt would result in beginning all over again. Undertaking such a venture was not feasible. |
| | | 2. | Project Director withdrew request for refunding. | | |

MIDWESTERN

7.	Youth Civic Center Columbus, Ohio	1.	Early major concern was that of developing new program proposal to be submitted for refunding; gap in refunding.	1.	Assistance provided in program development.
				2.	Assistance provided in dealing with Adult Board and administration.
		2.	Problems with the Adult Board of Directors and some administrative problems.	3.	Evaluation and self-evaluation services provided jointly with Mr. Jack Kasmond of Ohio State University.
					Note: The onerational procedures of this program built self-evaluation into almost every aspect of the program. (that is, self-government).

101

8. Lincoln Center (NRPA) Cincinnati, Ohio	1. Severe problems with Board of Directors. Required further development in order to provide program direction. 2. Unclarity regarding nature and purpose of grant. 3. Desire to develop and implement wide range of various program activities. 4. Low level of funding thus limiting program development activities.	1. Provided generalized consultation related to refunding; problem with Board of Directors and program development. 2. Major effort made to clarify nature and purpose of grant in addition to assisting with program implementation. 3. Formal self-evaluation procedures not appropriate.
9. Dayton Youth Patrol Dayton, Ohio	1. Although capability for formal self-evaluation process, severe staff problems created immobility in this area. Program continued to function. However, did not meet maximum potential; difficulty with the implementation of various program components.	1. Major assistance directed towards resolution of staff problems. 2. Assistance provided in attempting to develop systematic collection of vast amount of hard data. 3. Assistance provided in program development and implementation.
	WESTERN	
10. Neighborhood House Richmond, Calif.	1. Severe problems with Board of Directors and in receiving administrative and flexible fiscal support. 2. Required greater clarity with implementation of Youth Involvement. 3. Considerable problems with staff and program leadership.	1. Consultant provided formal Board training services with the aid of Mr. G. Roemer; attempted to clarify work program, relationship of Board to youth, staff problems, fiscal and administrative arrangements and OEO guidelines.

95

103

104

11.	Mid-Columbia Youth for Progress Dalles, Oregon.	1.	Struggle with completing proposal resulting from planning period (short term initial grant for planning purposes).	1.	Assistance provided in program development, in clarifying OEO guidelines and other grant requirements.
		2.	Major concern program development and refunding.	2.	Assistance provided in attempting to help community institutions and individuals understand nature of grant and concept of youth involvement.
		3.	Serious problems with acquiring community support of program and in accepting concept of youth involvement.		

12.	Colonias Del Valle Work-Study Research Project. San Juan, Texas	1.	Short-term planning grant.	1.	Provided consultation related to program development and in sensitizing central project staff to OEO requirements.
		2.	Major concern program development and refunding.		
		3.	Problems with nature of "migrant" program participants.		

13.	Carver Community Parks and Recreation Center. (NRPA) Yuma, Arizona.	1.	Low level of funding which limited program development activities.	1.	Attempted to provide assistance in sharpening program direction.
		2.	General unclarity regarding nature and purpose of grant	2.	Assisted with staff recruitment and staff development.
		3.	Severe lack of program leadership.	3.	Provide program development consultation.
		4.	Ineffective Board structure and Board functioning.	4.	Clarified nature and purpose of grant and grant requirements.
		5.	No real community constituency or support.	5.	Generally assisted with all aspects of program functioning.
		6.	Program ill-defined and vague.	6.	Self-evaluation procedures not appropriate.

96

105

106

14. New Communicators, Inc.
Los Angeles, California

1. Terminated early during contract period.
2. Severe staff conflict led to destruction of program.
3. Although considerable interest evident by other community institutions such as UCLA and others, program was terminated.

1. Provided general consultation services directed towards reducing internal conflict among program staff.
2. Assisted in establishing a dialogue between OEO and grantee regarding project issues.
3. Undertook follow-up study to determine disposition of trainees who completed training program.

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

As described in the materials included in earlier quarterly reports, the programs of the various projects under contract encompassed a broad range of activities. Successful programs seem to have varied with local circumstances. The experience of the projects does not indicate any particular activity or set of activities as particularly effective. Generally, when the project as a whole was functioning well, that is, when participants were actively involved, staff were competent and dedicated, funds were available, and no crises were pressing, programs flourished.

The Communications Media: Several of the projects, most notably New Communicators Inc., Neighborhood House and 12th and Oxford, were based on the arts as related to films, video tape and journalism. The objectives of these programs generally included the use of the media to give information to the community at large and for training youth in media skills.

The 12th and Oxford motion picture, The Jungle, is perhaps the most striking example of a group's getting its message across creatively, artistically and effectively. As noted in earlier reports, this film was widely shown as a dramatic illustration of the life of urban ghetto youth. A program which produces a film such as this has an impact which goes much beyond the project and the target community. Widely circulated, shown before national groups and federal agencies, The Jungle brought its

message, which was in effect the message of the R&D unit of OEO, to a variety of populations. The experience of New Communicators best illustrates the use of the media to train youth for commercial employment in the field. The bulk of the trainees of this project were able to find employment in the industry as a consequence both of their technical training and of the connections to industry held by various members of the project's board. This suggests that skills, at least in this field, are not sufficient. Skills achieved through such experience are, of course, of value in and of themselves in that they provide creative channels for self expression.

Such expression is a most positive device for enabling communities to express and redress grievances. The sharper the content of the work, the greater the personal pay-off to the program participants. In light of this, it was unfortunate that some in the local community and in the sponsoring agency were fearful of controversial material and discouraged groups from areas where conflict might be induced. This, for example, was the case with Neighborhood House, particularly with regard to the community Newsletter. At times like these, when so many are forced to seek the expression of wrongs or inequities through less socially acceptable means, it is most shortsighted to inhibit projects devised to "tell it like it is" through the arts.

Recreation: Such programs were the mainstay of the three National Recreation and Parks Association projects--Baltimore,

99

Yuma, and Cincinatti. Recreation components were also built into

a number of the projects including the Youth Civic Center, 12th

and Oxford, Hartranft and the Mid Columbia Youth for Progress,

and were implicitly a part of many of the others.

The N.R.P.A. programs in particular demonstrated the efficacy

of recreation as an effective program for groups with relatively

little experience in self-determined activities. As a relatively

low common denominator device, it provides an umbrella of activity

with wide appeal which makes demands on its participants.

In addition, it is inexpensive, relatively easy to administer and

able to accommodate large numbers of participants. The broad

appeal of recreation programs also permits local youth, who may

be very different in many ways, to come together for common

activity.

While the N.R.P.A. projects demonstrated this phenomenon

at its inception, the Youth Civic Center is illustrative of the

development that can take place in a project beginning with an

interest in recreation and evolving to a significant instrument

for youth participation and involvement, with a complex idealogy

which sees program as an instrument for bringing youth into an

equalitarian, pluralistic decision-making process.

The N.R.P.A. experiences show that youth are

particularly receptive to recreation, which provides an

excellent beginning for participation in more complex,

less immediately rewarding activities. The enthusiasm and

111

commitment of the young participants was frequently the strongest asset
the project had. Youth groups formed out of recreation programs
offered leadership (and even financial support as in Baltimore)
which was often the difference between a project's success or
failure.

It is difficult to conceive of a youth program which doesn't
include a recreation component either implicitly or explicitly.
The Mid-Columbia project began as a recreation program. During the
planning grant period,however,the recreation component fell away as
youngsters entrusted with more substantive youth affairs became
involved in creating what was essentially a youth economic develop-
ment program. While the youngsters so involved were intensely
committed to the planning process and its ultimate success, the
major rank and file constituency was not able to remain involved in
such heady stuff. As a result of this loss of ongoing expressive
activity, the youth base of the project drifted away. The contract
consultant thus attempted to assist in finding local support for a
recreation component so that the planning might once again operate
out of a larger youth constituency.

Economic Development and Job Training: Activities designed
to enable youngsters to develop an economic life of their own fell
into two categories: those designed to develop appropriate, in-
digenous youth-managed business ventures such as RGS, Tampa Youth
Board, the two Philadelphia projects, Dayton and Mid-Columbia,
and those whose primary focus was to provide skills that would facilitate

112

impact on the job market such as New Communicators. All projects in the first category included skill training as a substantial component,and given the fact that they were all time-limited demonstration grants, the business ventures themselves were more training operations than substantive, permanent commercial enterprises.

R.G.S. was clearly the most sophisticated of the self directed business venture programs. This group conducted a number of commercial endeavors with considerable success. Success,however,is properly evaluated by programmatic,rather than commercial,standards in that the ability to plan and conduct such activities is at issue here; such abilities do not insure success in highly competitive industries where forces much beyond the reach of the project will determine outcomes. R.G.S. demonstrated the ability of youth to deal with the complexities of creating businesses with originality and vigor. On the other hand,such attempts as the laundromat by the Hartranft project represent the impossibility of a successful experience in the face of the difficulties suffered as a consequence of their status as a federally-funded project. This status rendered the group unable to deal with such exigencies as contracts, leases, purchases and the like. That R.G.S. managed to cut through the red tape which entangled Hartranft contributed substantially to their difficulties as described in earlier reports.

The major problem with all training programs is that the graduates are often unable to find employment. As numerous studies have

- 102

revealed, training often becomes an alternative to, rather than
a preparation for, employment. For the factors which permit
minority urban ghetto youth from entering the job market (and we
acknowledge such exceptions as New Communicators) are not soluble
by individual training efforts.

Services: A final program component which needs to be specified
is community service as exemplified by Colonias Del Valle and the
Health project of the Dayton Youth Patrol. While such components
are present to some extent in any program which is truly indigenous
and self-directed, Colonias is the only project that utilizes
this programmatic device as their major participant activity. As
noted in the R&D plan, included as Section IV of this report, we
believe that there is considerable viability in this approach.

The material previously submitted describing the Colonias project
substantiates this belief experientially. The notion of service
has been viably deomonstrated by such programs as VISTA and Peace
Corps,and has always been a part of our noblesse oblige tradition.
Such a notion,when applied to self-directed youth programs, is much
different and much more relevant to these times because youth
programs serving their own communities provide a most potent ex-
perience in the efficacy of the community process.

As indicated in the various descriptive reports, program
activities are not discrete since one can readily see various
program elements appearing in most projects. The sub-divisions and
the examples utilized in this section are a device by which some
of the functions and dysfunctions of various options can be identified
and illustrated.

103

PROJECT RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PLAN

(COMMUNITY RESTORATION)

I HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Generally speaking, until 1961, the federal government's
national policy regarding youth was directed towards influencing
the services of the states in the areas of child care and pro-
tection, welfare, education and recreation. In 1961, with the pass-
age of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act, there
was formal recognition by the federal government of the need for
programs for "deviant" youth between the ages of 16 and 24.

The Office of Juvenile Delinquency in the Department of
Health, Education and Welfare was established as an outgrowth of
the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency created by
President John F. Kennedy in 1961. This office had the responsi-
bility of administering the funds of the Juvenile Delinquency
Prevention and Control Act. Based on the assumption that juvenile
delinquency was a result of community problems rather than indivi-
dual pathology, the policy of this office was to fund programs
attempting to change the community and its institutions rather than
the individual, and it moved from an emphasis on juvenile delin-
quency to one of youth development. While the office had a commit-
ment to the principle of community participation in the develop-
ment and implementation of youth programs, it did not have a

105

formal policy of youth involvement. However, due to the personal position of some staff members, the principle of youth involvement was a central theme of many of the programs funded. One of the first examples of this was the programs of HARYOU,where youth demanded a voice in the planning of the programs under threat of refusing to participate.

The first program funded by OJD which,by deliberate design, incorporated the basic principle of youth involvement in its proposal,was the youth component of East Columbus Citizen's Organization (ECCO). In this case, the parent organization received funds (the youth were not incorporated) but gave formal sanction to the youth to determine policy and administer the program.

In the summer of 1966,in response to the riots of that year and the previous year, OEO, through White House direction, spent $35 million dollars on summer-only youth programs. This was a crash effort with no lead-time given to the obligation of funds and with a mandatory cut-off date of September 1, 1966,for expenditure of funds. The Community Action Agencies (CAAs), which were responsible for program development and disbursement of these funds,did not look favorably upon these programs. The following year (1967), the same funding procedure existed, again with three months' programming only.

In 1968,this policy was modified to allow CAAs to retain

116

25% of their funds for year-round programs. However, the remaining 75% still had to be spent within the three-month period. Few, if any, CAAs took advantage of this leeway because the percentage was not sufficient to allow for an adequate continuation of the programs.

In the same fiscal year, headquarters staff retained $2 million dollars of the $35 million to fund the current series of youth demonstration programs covered by the Youth Monitoring and Self-Evaluation Contract. This was done in order to experiment with the concept of youth involvement. The basis of this experiment resulted from the informal experiences of OJD/HEW in testing the basic concept. One primary criterion for the selection of programs to be funded with Research and Demonstration monies was the inclusion of youth involvement as the operating principle of the proposed program. As a result, this series represents various models that ensure that youth plan and implement the programs.

In 1969, OEO guidelines were again changed to require youth involvement in programs funded by the CAAs by establishing a youth advisory council under the structure of the Community Action Agency. This council has responsibility for recommending youth programs to be funded by the CAA, for evaluating the programs, and also for administering those programs where appropriate.

The theme of the following suggested Research and Demonstration plan is carried forward from the work currently being

107

done in OEO-sponsored youth projects. It represents a contin-

uing effort in what has been a unique and distinctive contribu-

tion by OEO to youth program development.

118

II THE PROBLEM

Self-sufficiency, the ability to cope with the exigencies of daily living, pride in one's self and in one's people, the sense of worth that accompanies the knowledge that one can influence ones future--these and hope and optimism regarding the future are the elements which enable young people to participate effect-ively in the political and social processes of their communities. For a variety of well-known reasons, this hope, ability, and promise have been denied in many communities. The natural abili-ties and enthusiasms of young people have been eroded as problems of racism, industrialization, urbanization and bureaucratization have become endemic in our contemporary, technical society. The energies and talents of the young are palpable; even when suppressed, the resilience of youth permits these virtues to be quickly restored.

Failure to allow young people access to conventional socie-tal roles forces them into such individual social maladjustments as drugs, criminality and other forms of social withdrawal. Col-lectively, youth's response to their exclusion from communal life has resulted in a widespread alienation which we have euphemis-tically labeled "the generation gap." This alienation, which has taken myriad forms, is best characterized by the inability of the adult community to perceive and appreciate the problems of young people. It is clear that responsibility for the distance

119

between the youth and adult communities does not lie with the youth.

That is to say, youth are alienated by adult indifference, exclusion or misunderstanding; they are not by choice or inclination anti-adult, anti-social, or anti-community. Providing youth an opportunity for meaningful participation in the total community, or, better yet, restoring the traditional options of an open society, will effectively demonstrate the basic desire of the young for active participation. It will in effect demonstrate that the generation gap is an adult characterization of youthful intransigence which covers up the exclusions imposed on the young by the larger community.

Our hypothesis then, is that youth estrangement is caused by adult exclusion. Because it is not ingrained or long suffered, it is easily rectified and is a problem whose solution lends itself to demonstration programming. Community Restoration, the theme under which it is proposed that this R & D program be subsumed, is simply the opening of opportunities for the meaningful involvement of youth in the ongoing dynamics of their communities. The strength of such Community Restoration lies not in its complexity or inventiveness, but rather in its directness and its simplicity. It is not suggested that new social inventions must be created in order to accommodate the needs of youth in contemporary society. Rather, it is the obvious notion that those access routes which have served to integrate young people in the past be utilized in the present. It is recognized that access to the community has been differentially available, that youth from minority backgrounds, youth with poor education, youth whose health has been

110

impaired, rural youth and others have been particularly discrim-
inated against by community institutions. The notion of Commun-
ity Restoration does not presume to supersede or deny the need
for strategems to deal with such pervasive contemporary problems
as listed above. Such problems clearly do require significant
social inventions. What is argued, however, is the simplistic,
but not naive, notion that there are less basic options which,
while they do not deal with problems of housing, employment,
education, health care, and the like, will substantially serve
youth and the communities in which they live by working to re-
store a wholeness, an esprit de corps, and continuing participa-
tion in on-going managerial and policy-making activities. This
commitment entails a change in orientation regarding the reasons
young people fail to become integrated into the community. For
decades, workers in all phases of youth programming have focused
on the provision of services geared to treatment, enrichment, the
teaching of skills and socialization. Such programs were provid-
ed to rehabilitate youngsters seen as disturbed, pathological or
anti-social. This approach, endemic to correctional, recreational and
treatment agencies, focused on changing the individual so that
he could more effectively cope with his social, educational and
vocational environment.

Through successful participation in Community Restoration
management and policy making, youth may very well be encouraged
to venture into other aspects of the democratic process. If

111

federally-sponsored programs can adhere to the tenants of the plural-
istic democratic process, young people may be encouraged to seek
similar experiences in other social and political spheres. Such
participation and experience is the essence of social reform and
gradualism. Youth project members will understand that the changes
called forth by their efforts will be modest. They will know, too,
when tokenism and the illusion of change are substituted for sub-
stantive concessions. Community Restoration efforts are modest
measures, conducted on a local level, to enhance opportunities
for social success. Such projects should not be seen by their
federal sponsors as shaking the social structure of the nation
or redistributing its resources, even when they press for a sub-
stantive reordering of local priorities.

Through Youth Involvement in Community Restoration, partici-
pants will have a commitment to, and stake in, programs which
they helped form. In contrast, they remain uninvolved and untouch-
ed by programs imposed and managed by adults and institutional
officers. Young people know themselves and their problems. Given
the opportunity, they will introduce relevant program components
which reflect their life experience. The wisdom and insight that
comes from being indigenous to the community and its problems
cannot be found in expertise or officialdom. This in no way
denigrates the substantial contribution to be made by trained
personnel; it is rather complimentary to the expertise of adult
resources. Youth are most receptive to help provided on their terms

and reflective of their own priorities. What has sometimes appeared to be resistance to outside help, is, in fact, resistance to the unrelatedness, not the competence of the helper. Youth involvement avoids this pitfall and provides a basis on which adult technical assistance can be effectively used.

The young people whom we seek to reach through Community Restoration are those who, as a result of unsatisfactory experiences with existing local institutions, have withdrawn from conventional community life into understandable (and often justifiable) alienation and hostility. These young people will ordinarily not respond to the very institutions and adults whom they see as having rejected them or blocked their access to opportunity. Even with the incentives and innovations of a federal R & D grant, the local institution remains suspect on the basis of its past performance. Youth involvement deals with this impasse in two ways; first, it is tangible evidence that the existing arrangements are being modified; second, and even more important, it provides a vehicle whereby youth can approach other youth, thus bridging the gap of distrust and hostility which often separates programs from those who will use them.

The democratic process, in and of itself, is fraught with risk and uncertainties. Totalitarianism and oligarchy can guarantee, though only for a time, stability and predictability. Youth involvement unquestionably introduces an element of risk into a project. Such risk, however, can be avoided only at the expense of the project's ability to reach and affect young people. Youth involvement is, after all,

113

only another designation for the democratic ethic which will in-
evitably determine the success of any social institution in
American society. To seek such meaningful participation by
young people in their programs is only to ask that they fulfill
their basic responsibilities as citizens. Providing such op-
portunities to youth who may have reason to believe that they do
not exist is surely the way to induct them into community life.
Denying such opportunities to youth who may have reason to be-
lieve they do not exist, and thereby confirming their belief,
is even more certainly increasing their alienation.

While the concept of youth involvement has been validated,
further knowledge is necessary before it can be integrated into
a widespread community institutional approach whose objective is
Community Restoration. This approach, which will elicit support
and commitment from adult institutions, requires from them a
commitment to Community Restoration evidenced by the inclusion of
youth in their direction and operation. Joint adult-youth com-
mitment and the total community as beneficiaries are the distinc-
tive elements which Community Restoration adds to the youth pro-
ject experience garnered over the years. If there has been any
learning gotten from the experience of the past decade, it has
been that the benefits of successful youth programs do not accrue
to the youth alone. Unfortunately, this learning has taken place
out of the negative or obverse of the preceding statement; namely,
that the social, economic and political deficits which are gener-
ated by the exclusion and alienation of youth are borne by the

124

total community, not by the youth alone.   This again is the

generalization upon which Community Restoration is predicated.

The major theme of the suggested R & D Plan is represented
by the creation of a new partnership between youth and adults.
For years,we have been experimenting with adult-run programs
for youth, and within the past two years,OEO has tested the con-
cept of youth involvement and youth-run programs. There is
every indication that youth-run programs can be successful.
However, the past two years have also made clear that there
are certain technical skills required by any program which
youth cannot reasonably be expected to possess. In many situ-
ations,successes have been hampered by problems around the pro-
vision of services provided in support of the program implementation.
These include administration, fiscal management, development
of Boards, and the funding policies of the grantor. In fact,
in those cases where programs have been viewed as a failure,
there is a high probability that the basic program concept has
not failed, but, rather,it hasn't even been tested because of
the failure of adequate supportive services. We are now sug-
gesting that there be a direct new partnership between youth and
sensitive adults in developing, administering, and operating
youth programs.

The Community Restoration Demonstration Program is predi-
cated on the definition contained in the Thomas Glennon Memorandum

116

(Director of Research, OEO memorandum of April 7, 1970): "Demonstration
projects are primarily a means of demonstrating a program concept.
Their function is, in large part, the dissemination of informa-
tion concerning these concepts."

Three general principles lie at the heart of the concept
of Community Restoration. One is the creation of a new partner-
ship between youth and adults; that is, youth and adult involve-
ment. Two is that these programs should be directed specifically
toward social and community improvement. Third, a willingness
is necessary on the part of the Federal Government to enter into
the partnership as a supportive third party, meaning the develop-
ment of policies which foster the implementation of such programs.

TYPE OF GRANTEE   (FIRST PRINCIPLE)

As stated earlier, the past two years' experience of OEO in
providing Research and Demonstration funds to youth programs has
indicated that severe limitations have been imposed on program imple-
mentation where certain supportive services are not present. These
services have been identified above. Experience also indicates
that in programs where youth involvement was not the central theme,
the ability to meet youth needs was greatly diminished. Thus,
those adult agencies which are directed towards youth services
or the changing of social institutions serving youth also operat-
ed ineffectively. Given this set of circumstances, the obvious
conclusion is that the grantee selected for these demonstration

117

programs should genuinely reflect that which the adult world is
best capable of giving, in addition to that which the youth world can
best contribute. The agency or group funded should be a com-
bination of youth and adult participation in the management, oper-
ation, and governance of youth programs. This would probably
represent the emergence of a set of new institutions specifically
organized to carry out the mandate of youth-adult partnership.
For example, one such combination is exemplified in the recent
experience of the Real Great Society and the Puerto Rican Forum
of New York City. In attempting to implement the Fashion Indus-
tries Program,which required considerable technical knowledge
to determine program feasibility and to implement program objec-
tives, R.G.S. turned to the Puerto Rican Forum for high-
ly specialized technical assistance related to the Fashion Indus-
tries. The basic idea, momentum,and thrust were generated by the
youth themselves. However, it readily became apparent to the youth
that the technical knowledge required for full program implementa-
tion was beyond their capabilities. The Puerto Rican Forum thus
entered a partnership with RGS on a purely voluntary basis which
provided program support in terms of fiscal management, administra-
tion, and substantive consultation (in banking procedures, market-
ing research, legal assistance).

Although this was not a formal arrangement, the basis of
youth/adult partnership is illustrated and this has led to the
fulfillment of stated program objectives. Other examples of

128

this partnership can readily be found in the third quarterly

report of the Youth Monitoring and Self-Evaluation Services

Contract.

In summary, we are suggesting that new entities be found

whereby the nature of this partnership can be formally structured

to the design prior to funding, or that, if planning grants

are contemplated, the objectives of these plans should be to

accomplish this goal.

PROGRAMS FOR FUNDING (SECOND PRINCIPLE)

Community Restoration programs should be primarily directed

toward community and social improvement using the new, creative

partnership between youth and adults as the sponsoring agency

as well as the program implementors. High priority in terms of

the granting of federal dollars should be given to programs which

reflect community problems in which the process of survival is

the major theme. For example, the program objectives of Colonias

del Valle in San Juan, Texas,is organized around the resolution

of social and community problems related to sanitation, the acqui-

sition of running water, adequate housing,and education. This

program is housed in a rural area of the U.S. It should be

understood that though the urban areas of the country have dif-

ferent kinds of survival problems, the issues inherent in the

129

Colonias program could be readily transferred to any urban center.
(For example, sanitation, housing, and education are problems of
survival in the cities as well.) The urgency of establishing
creative educational and training programs within urban centers
is represented by the Tampa youth program. In this situation,
vital factors related to racial discrimination and lack of eco-
nomic opportunity gave rise to a youth program which attempts to
address these problems.

In summary, the basic principle underlying this formulation
is that of systematically determining community problems and issues
which are critical for poor youth within a specific geographical
area, and then assisting them to develop programs which will
directly lead to working out the problems identified.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SUPPORT OF YOUTH ADULT PROGRAMS (THIRD PRINCIPLE)

The following are ways the Federal Government can give direct
support to these types of programs:

First: A determination should be made of the number of
comprehensive programs that can be supported for approximately
three years' period of time. It is recommended that approximately
ten new Community Restoration Programs be funded using the basic
principles outlined above as bench marks for program development
and organization structure. Second: The structure and mechanism

120

for funding should be the same for each program. For example,

each program should be awarded a planning grant <u>covering a period</u>

<u>of six months to a year</u>,during which time a systematic process of

program development can occur. This planning period will allow

each program ample time to develop not only program concepts, but

to recruit staff, develop management procedures, finalize work

plans, and develop sources of technical assistance. These plan-

ning grants would carry with them a guarantee of operational funds

for a minimum of two years, so that the grantee is not burdened

by the uncertainty of future funding. The counterproductiveness

of this fear is clearly demonstrated in those youth programs

funded the last fiscal year. <u>Third</u>: <u>A disciplined system of</u>

<u>research and evaluation services</u> should be developed so that

these tasks are not the direct responsibility of the grantee. That

is, arrangements should be made with third parties, mutually

acceptable to the grantee and the agency, to carry out these func-

tions. These arrangements should be completed by the end of the

planning period. <u>Fourth</u>: <u>A panel of private citizens, represent-</u>

<u>ing the professions, the community, youth and adults</u>, should be

developed which has responsibility for making recommendations to

the agency regarding the approval of both planning and operational

grants. This structure should be limited to eleven persons re-

presenting all aspects of community life. This recommendation

seems to be particularly relevant since it is consistent with

the policy of a partnership between youth and adults cooperating

in major decision-making activities affecting agency policy.

121

131

And, the use of an outside panel is also consistent with the
quest for objectivity in determining whether such programs are
truly responsive to community needs. Fifth: An interagency
committee of youth program analysts should be set up and model-
ed after the informal committee of analysts established in 1969
which concerned itself with intergovernmental development of
youth programs. This committee would be formally recognized
and be responsible for reviewing guidelines, joint funding of
demonstration efforts, and making joint recommendations on legisla-
tion· regarding youth programs and policy. This committee would
encourage the dissemination of information between various depart-
ments charged with youth programming. The purpose of this committee
is to provide the analysts of the various agencies opportunity to
review their everyday efforts and problems and make appropriate
recommendations to their own agencies based on the results of
joint deliberations. Sixth: A system for the review and dissemina-
tion of information should be structured into the research and demon-
stration division of the agency. This structure would support the
evaluation and research effort undertaken throughout the program
year and allow for the distribution and analysis of information which
may have national transferability. This would also provide OEO an
opportunity to develop new legislative directions supported by
concrete program experiences.

132

APPENDICES

133

APPENDIX "A"

MEMORANDUM

TO   : All Staff of Youth Monitoring Project

FROM   : Cal Fenton

DATE   : June 15, 1970

SUBJECT : Collection of Hard Data

As we have mentioned many times before, Appendix "A" of our first
quarterly report, (X1) provides some information regarding the kind
of data we are looking for; however, we would like to be a little more
explicit at this time.

    I. The data to be collected should include elements of program
       functioning from 7/1/69 through 6/30/70 (a period of one year).

   II. Data collected should include reporting of program participants
      who may or may not now be related to the program. If persons
      have dropped out, graduated to other programs, or referred else-
      where, some effort should be made to explain why and where
      these persons went.

*III. Each project should be reported within the following context.

      A.   Staff (includes consultants' rates of pay), professional
          background, name, age, job assignment (stress decision-
          making responsibility if any).

      B.   Volunteers--name, age, work assignment

      C.   Board of Directors--name, age, position on Board,
          income level.

      D.   Program Participants

         1. Number of program participants 7/1/69 - 6/30/70 and
            number in program now.

         2. Ages

         3. Sex of participants

         4. Marital status

125

5. Length of association with program, and why dropped out, etc. (if known).

6. Socio-Economic status and source of income (employment, public assistance, etc.).

7. Ethnic background

8. School attendance

9. Previous work experience

10. Nature of program participation

It should be noted that projects with a relatively large number of program participants makes data collection difficult. Possibly a sample population could be used to give evidence of certain program participation tendencies. Example--Dayton Youth Patrol.

It is also extremely important to report:

The results of training and job placement programs wherever they exist. That is, what happened to specific individuals following training and how many job placements were made, where, at what salary and HOW DID THE TRAINING OR JOB PLACEMENT AFFECT THE ECONOMIC OR SOCIAL STATUS OF THE PROGRAM PARTICIPANT. This is a difficult task and may not be feasible in all cases.
  a. More money and better job?
  b. More skills?
  c. Better education ?
  d. Better leadership qualities (how and why; example, ECCO).

If the program is designed to affect social problems or create change in general, some effort should be made to trace the nature of the change, if in fact something has changed. If not, reasons should be given.

In many situations, certain programs have not been able to become fully operational and, thus, have made no substantial impact of any kind, either in terms of the numbers of people involved or its impact on social problems. In such cases, whatever data available should be reported, however, a brief description of the barriers to full operation should also be reported (examples, Richmond, Calif., and Yuma, Arizona).

---

* Some aspects of this may have already been reported in our 1st or 2nd quarterly report. However, it should be repeated and changes noted.

135

Please send in your reports promptly so that we will be capable of carrying out a preliminary review of what is coming through.

We realize that we have not offered a specific format or structure to collect data. However, the vast differences among various programs negates the usefulness of such a disciplined approach.

If we find that these are enough common components for the systematic collection of data, we will develop a more specific outline which may be more helpful in carrying out this task.

If for any reason no data can be collected for a specific project, a clear statement should be made indicating why this situation exists and every effort should be made to assist the project in developing reporting mechanisms.

136

APPENDIX "B"

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CORPORATION
YOUTH MONITORING CONTRACT
CONTRACT NO. 4998

Project Director - Calvin Fenton

PROJECT PROFILE

PROGRAM CONSULTANT   :

NAME OF PROJECT   :

ADDRESS   :

REGIONAL COORDINATOR   :

DATE COMPLETED   :

REGION SERVED   :

DATES OF SITE VISITS   :

PERSONS INTERVIEWED AND
POSITION WITH PROGRAM   :

128

PROJECT PROFILE

(NAME OF PROGRAM)

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Briefly describe background of program and any general informa-
tion which may be helpful.

I. PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Describe the overall program objectives as viewed by the
Project Director, staff, and program participants. Discuss the
degree to which the perceptions of program objectives are con-
sistent with, or differ from, the project proposal funded by OEO.

II. PROGRAM ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION

Describe the organizational structure used to carry out
the program objectives, the various program components, and
the nature of program operations. Describe the nature of all
training activities. (What is the program -- and how does the
program function ?)

129

III. STAFF FUNCTIONING

General description of staff and staff functioning in carrying out daily work tasks. Give names and work assignment of each staff member -- list vacant positions. (Implications for training and/or other forms of Technical Assistance should be considered.)

IV. PROGRAM LEADERSHIP

Describe the major source of program leadership and other major personalities related to the project. (Role of Board of Directors, special advisory groups, Project Director's leadership, etc.)

V. YOUTH INVOLVEMENT

Describe the formal and informal structures established to encourage youth involvement. Example: Youth Council, Advisory Committees, participation on regular agency Board, Youth in Leadership positions, program supervisors or directors. Also, describe the extent to which these structures and positions are working.

139

VI. PROGRAM PROBLEMS

Discuss the major operational and/or staff problems as
viewed by the Project Director and others in the Program.

VII. PROGRAM EVALUATION PLAN

Describe mechanisms developed or planned to be under-
taken for self-evaluation and/or third party program eval-
uation.

VIII. FISCAL MANAGEMENT

General description of Fiscal Management procedures
and current financial statute. (Use of time sheets, vouchers,
etc; bookkeeping, auditing assistance; financial reporting
mechanisms, fiscal management problems, etc.) NOTE: A
copy of a most recent budget should be attached to report.

IX. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

Discuss Program Administration. This includes report-
ing procedures, use of staff conferences, inservice training,
supervision, etc.

140

X. BOARD OF DIRECTORS

General description of the Board of Directors and their
function in relationship to the project. (Frequency of
meetings, membership, weak or strong posture, paper or actual
existence, youth membership on board, decision-making role
of youth on board.) List names and employment position of
Board members, and indicate youth membership.

XI. BASE-LINE DATA

Preliminary determination of base-line data obtainable
from the program. Review the nature of record-keeping pro-
cedures as they relate to program participation. Can data be
collected, as presently organized, which will provide the
following information:

1)   Number of program participants

2)   Age of participants

3)   Sex

4)   Length of association with program

5)   Socio-economic status

6)   Ethnic background

7)   School attendance

8)   Previous work experience

9)   Source of family income

10)   Nature of program participation (staff, organ-
      izational member, client, etc.).

NOTE: No attempt should be made to collect this data while
undertaking the task of developing program profile. However,
a determination should be made as to whether this data is
currently available and will remain available throughout
the project year. (Need clear statement as to what data will
be available.)

XII. COMMUNITY RESPONSE TO PROGRAM

How is the project viewed by the community in general?

1)   Is it controversial ?

2)   Is it overlooked by, or does it seem to threaten,
     establishment agencies ?

3)   What is the response of mass media, if any ?

4)   Is it the target of abuse by other community agencies ?

5)   What is the relationship to other community agencies ?

6)   Is it viewed as an advocate of ghetto causes ?

XIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

● What are your recommendations for assisting this Program
  to carry out its objectives ?

● How best can this organization be assisted under the terms
  of OEO Contract ?

133

APPENDIX "C"

UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CORPORATION
YOUTH MONITORING CONTRACT
CONTRACT NO. 4998

Project Director - Calvin Fenton

SITE VISIT REPORT

PROGRAM CONSULTANT   :

NAME OF PROJECT   :

ADDRESS   :

REGIONAL COORDINATOR   :

DATE COMPLETED   :

REGION SERVED   :

DATES OF SITE VISITS   :

PERSONS INTERVIEWED AND
POSITION WITH PROGRAM   :

134

SITE VISIT REPORT

(NAME OF PROGRAM)

(A report should be completed for each site visit made)

==

· Each Site Visit Report should be completed within the
frame of reference provided by the Project Profile. Topical
headings will remain consistent with those offered in the
Project Profile, and comments should be limited to the degree
to which major program and other changes have occurred through-
out the project experience.

An assumption will be made that <u>no</u> major change has
occurred in areas which are not addressed in the Site Visit
Report (using Project Profile as a general frame of refer-
ence). If for any reason the Consultant's assessment differs
with the opinion offered in the Project Profile, at any point
in time, this difference should be clearly noted. Changes
in personnel, program operations, Board of Director memberships,
financial status and other major areas of concern should be
reported.

135

Consultants should also be aware that each month of operation brings with it new problems, and different perceptions of program progress. These areas should be carefully reviewed and reported.

The following represents general areas of major concern in reporting site visit experiences (to be used only where major changes have occurred).

I.   PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

II.   PROGRAM ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION

III.   STAFF FUNCTIONING

IV.   PROGRAM LEADERSHIP

V.   YOUTH INVOLVEMENT

VI.   PROGRAM PROBLEMS

VII.   PROGRAM EVALUATION PLAN -- If consultation is being provided in the general area of self-evaluation, it is expected that all site visit reports will include evaluation of on-going progress being made in this area

VIII.   FISCAL MANAGEMENT

IX.   PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

X.   BOARD OF DIRECTORS

145

XI.   BASELINE DATA

     a)   Collection of base-line data when available

     b)   Evaluation of significant changes in data

          collected

XII. COMMUNITY RESPONSE TO PROGRAM

XIII. SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS -- This section should in-

clude an overview of the service provided by the

Project Consultant, a summary of his impressions

of the program, and recommendations for future

program technical assistance which can be provid-

ed by URC or directly by OEO.

146

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Project Staff   DATE: January 14, 1970

FROM: Calvin Fenton, Charles Grosser and Elaine Hudson

SUBJECT: Progress Report, Self-Evaluation, and January 21 and 22
Staff Conference.

At our October 17 and 18 staff conference we spent considerable
time attempting to develop a self-evaluation model which would define
and identify the youth involvement component in each of the projects.
In addition, the model was to incorporate information pertaining to
the various other aspects of program success and failure, and was
to be applicable to each of the fifteen constituent programs. At the same
time, it was to be used to provide a means whereby aggregate informa-
tion about youth programs in general could be collated. To meet these
requirements it became necessary for us to try and develop an outline
which would define youth involvement in both generic and specific
terms. We also had to develop a perspective which could identify those
program elements which constituted real or genuine involvement, in
contrast to token or illusionary involvement. These issues, coupled
with the problem of specifying the project's program objectives, de-
termining if they were to be implemented and if not, why not, made our
task virtually impossible. Though we struggled with the issues, it
became clear that each time we modified or extended our outline to in-
clude specific contingencies related either to youth involvement, self-

evaluation program goals or the idiosyncratic qualities of a given project we precluded other possible options.*

It seems clear from our experience in October that generating a single model for the program analysis of a group of projects as diverse as ours is not viable. This is reinforced by recent developments in OEO and within the various projects themselves. As you know, continued funding of many youth programs by OEO is now a matter of considerable uncertainty. In some cases, decisions to terminate or not to renew have already been made. In the case of some individual projects, such as the three cities under the National Recreation and Parks Association, the programs have developed so differently from the original proposal as to change the basis for evaluation completely. Because of the diversity of the various projects, the unique factors which have influenced their development and their various stages with regard to funding, we believe that it will be necessary to develop individual assessments and self-evaluation schemes for each project. We are bringing staff together for a two day meeting January 21 and 22 to undertake this task.

The following is a brief rundown on the program status and termination dates on each of the youth development projects.

1. <u>Syracuse</u> (URC Consultant: Lloyd Johnson.   Extension to January, 1970)

a. Proposal requesting refunding is now under consideration in

---

*The memo we used for discussion, Consultant's Outline for Program Analysis:A Statement on Youth Involvement, submitted to OEO and the first round of reports from the Western Region are included for your information.

Washington, D. C. Our task would be to build a self-evaluation component if it is refunded.

b. Consultant activity held up pending funding decision or upon special request by OEO and/or the youth program.

2. <u>Real Great Society</u> (URC Consultant: Conrad Graves.   Funded to August, 1970, possible extension to October, 1970, by accruals.)

a. Will operate for the balance of the contract year. Self-evaluation and youth involvement is built into the current program. Will not be refunded.

b. Consultant activity in ongoing program. (Self-evaluation and general technical assistance.)

3. <u>Commission on Community Relations, Tampa</u> (URC Consultant: Lloyd Johnson. Funded thru June 1, 1970, possible two month extension by accruals.)

a. Self-evaluation and youth involvement by URC staff has really just begun. Project needs a self-evaluation model and day-to-day technical assistance.

b. Consultant activity as above.

4. <u>Hartranft</u> (URC Consultant: Conrad Graves.   Funded thru May 30, 1970.)

a. Project's program is undiscernible and its status uncertain. OEO now considering withdrawal of funds.

b. No consultant activity pending outcome.

5. <u>12th and Oxford</u> (URC Consultant: Conrad Graves.   Will probably be extended to June 30, 1970.)

a. It is likely that this program will receive continued support from OEO.

b. Consultant has just made initial contact. Project's needs are open. Presumably will require the introduction of a self-evaluation scheme. Youth involvement in the past appears to have been substantial.

6. <u>National Recreation and Parks Association</u>

   Baltimore (URC Consultant: Shirley Jones)

   Yuma   (URC Consultant: Dan Robbin)

   Cincinnati (URC Consultant: Bill Pickard)   Funded thru April 30, 1970.

   a. In all three of these projects,NRPA has failed to operation-
      alize its proposal and test its premises. The only viable
      option appears to be in direct funding to the local neigh-
      borhood groups for the operation of local self-controlled,
      recreation-park facilities.

   b Consultants' tasks should be the development of individual
      proposals for direct funding (as per above) including self-
      evaluation and youth involvement components.

7. <u>Mission Rebels</u>   (URC Consultant: Dan Robbin.   Funded until January, 1970.)

   a. Status uncertain, the likelihood is that the program will be
      discontinued.

   b. Consultant activity in abeyance.

8. <u>Colonias del Valle, San Juan, Texas</u> (URC Consultant: Dan Robbin.
   University of Utah planning proposal until January, 1970.)

   a. Project has been funded to develop a proposal which is forthcoming.

   b. Consultant is assisting in constructing the proposal which will
      include self-evaluation and youth involvement components.

9. <u>Mid-Columbia Youth for Progress, The Dalles</u> (URC Consultant: Dan Robbin
   and James Goodman. Planning proposal until January, 1970.)

   a. Proposal for funding has been completed. We have not seen
      the proposal as yet. It should have a self-evaluation com-
      ponent built into it.

   b. Consultant to facilitate the inclusion and operationalization

150

of self-evaluation component in the proposal.

10. Neighborhood House, Richmond   (URC Consultant: Dan Robbin.
    Funded until July, 1970.)

    a. Operational problems, particularly with parent agency, have
       affected this project.

    b. Consultant needs to develop an approach which will circum-
       vent the parent agency should this be necessary to provide
       meaningful youth involvement and self-evaluation.

11. Youth Civic Center, Columbus (ECCO)   (URC Consultant: Bill Pickard.
    Funded until May 1, 1970.)

    a. The project's current task is to develop a new proposal for
       refunding which should be the product of a self-evaluation
       process. This should commence immediately.

    b. Consultant has just contacted the project. Relationship and
       tasks to be evolved.

12. Dayton Youth Patrol, Dayton   (URC Consultant: Bill Pickard.
    Funded through October, 1970.)

    a. Program is well established and active. They are ready for,
       and have accepted the concept of, self-evaluation; what they
       need is a specific design.

    b. Consultant has just contacted the project. After establishing
       rapport, he will need to help them induce an on-going scheme
       for self-evaluation.

As can be seen from the above, our assumptions regarding project

differences are most valid. Some of our programs are terminating, others

are ongoing, and some (as many as five) are actually at the point of devel-

oping original proposals. All the projects are so distinctive that our

142

charge to facilitate youth involvement and introduce self-evaluation
can only be implemented through plans individually tailored to each
particular program.

For example, a major problem in Richmond is the intransigence of
the parent agency. We have seen Neighborhood House stifle all attempts
the youth project has made to act independently. The youth in program
appear reluctant to engage in self-governance and evaluation. We are,
however, unable to make any judgement as to whether this unwillingness
is genuine disinterest on the part of the young people. Their reluct-
ance may very well be a result of an accurate appraisal of the lack of
any genuine option for independent action. Perhaps it would be possi-
ble to develop an independent URC youth committee whose responsibilities
to the project would be carried out through our sponsorship, thus
bypassing the obstacles presented by the parent agency.

Evaluating such a possibility and/or developing other options
to accomplish our objectives will be the kind of task we shall undertake
at our upcoming meeting. All staff will address each project's parti-
cular problems individually.

The enclosed materials and previous reports and proposals in your
possession will provide you with the necessary background information. We
would ask you to take reponsibility for thinking through possible approaches
to your own programs. These ideas can then be shared with the group and
this will be the basis for developing discussion.

We look forward to seeing you on January 21st.