

REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OF
THE HUMAN RESOURCES CORPORATION
OF
KANSAS CITY MISSOURI
DECEMBER 4 THROUGH 9, 1977

*John
Look at the
attachment, and you will
note that the national for
the assessment of the special
questions may be who
people are really
looking for
Larry*

I. INTRODUCTION.

The Review (or Assessment) Team was convened by the Kansas City Regional Office of the Community Services Administration (CSA). The Review Team was given its assignment and charge as shown on Attachment A of this report.

The Review Team was composed of four people: Carl W. Shaw, Team Leader, who is Chief of Field Operations at the CSA Regional Office in San Francisco; Ben Dacus, Chief of Administration at the CSA Regional Office in Denver; Edward J. Olson, Assistant Director, Planning, Research, and Evaluation, Community Relations Social Development Commission, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; and Charles Thomas, Administrative Assistant of the Missouri State Office of Economic Opportunity.

The methodology used by the Review Team was limited in scope and time. The Review Team limited itself to an overview of HRC and its relationship to the community and relevant institutions having a concern for or responsibility for programs that impact upon the poor. The information gathered was then assessed and judgements made based on the collective experience and knowledge of the Review Team members in light of CSA's regulations and instructions applicable to Community Action Agencies. Accordingly, it should be noted here that the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations of the Review Team are solely those of the Team and therefore do not necessarily represent the Official view or position of CSA or the Kansas City Regional Office of CSA.

An extensive variety of documents were examined, which were provided to the Team by HRC and CSA, and numerous people were interviewed by the Review Team members. A list of those interviewed is included in Attachment B.

The Review Team appreciates the excellent cooperation and courtesies given by all those with whom it met. Board and Staff were most helpful, and readily made time available from busy schedules to share with the Team their perceptions of HRC.

II. OVERVIEW.

The following report is organized under four subject areas: Planning and Evaluation, Coordination, Program Operations and Citizen Participation, and Resource Mobilization. Each of these four subject areas is further divided into three sections: Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations.

As always, with assessments, reviews, evaluations, and analytical research, the results may not be acceptable to all those concerned with the Review Team's product. The Review Team is acutely aware that this report of its Findings and Recommendations may appear harsh and critical. But the Review Team hopes that HRC and others who read this report will not conclude that the report is a condemnation of HRC. Such a conclusion could not be further from the truth. The Review Team was impressed with the deep concern about the poor and the needs of the poor that permeates HRC.

HRC has rendered and is rendering a valuable service to the poor of Kansas City. More needs to be done. While not the only institution charged with the responsibility for dealing with the plight of poverty, a Community Action Agency such as HRC is the only agency whose primary focus and mission is the eradication of poverty and all its attendant evils.

It is the fervent hope of the Review Team that HRC will again become the major community advocate that it once was. It is to that end and in that spirit that this report is dedicated.

III. PLANNING AND EVALUATION.

The review included an analysis of the original mission statement of the Community Services Administration relative to five content areas: 1 - Planning and Evaluation; 2 - Coordination; 3 - Program Operation; 4 - Resident Participation, and 5 - Resource Mobilization.

The methodology used for this review included an assessment of the HRC's generalized goals and objectives, extensive interviews with administrative staff of the agency, interviews with a diversity of Board members, representatives of elected jurisdictions, representatives of a diversity of community resident advisory boards, service providers, and representatives of local agencies and institutions. This review attempted to analyze relevant documentation available, such as the agency's Minutes, Bylaws, ARP, CAP 81, 419s, etc. with the intent to assess the impact of HRC within Jackson, Platte, and Clay Counties.

A. FINDINGS.

The first content area reviewed was that of HRC's Planning and Evaluation capabilities. The following question was used as a catalyst for this assessment: To what extent has HRC developed a planning and evaluation capability to assess the problems and causes of poverty; to determine available resources; and to set priorities and create programs to meet the greatest needs with the most efficient use of resources?

1. RESEARCH AND DATA.

Attitudinal and objective statistical data are the common measures used to analyze the incidence of poverty within a community and its related effects, such as status of health, education, juvenile delinquency, housing stock, etc. Analyzing the documents available to the Review Team,

such as the PPRs, the problem statements of refunding proposals and new proposals, a community profile statistical document, an HRC internal assessment survey, and the 1976 CAP Form 81, it is evident that although community-wide data is competently utilized, the specific profile of the poverty community seems to be lacking, i.e. generalized population statistics are available, although footnotes do not indicate the statistical base utilized, such as Census Tract and Year. The specific profile date relative to health statistics, incidence of juvenile delinquency, etc. does not seem to be available or utilized to develop a better understanding of the problems of low-income people within smaller geographical areas and/or age groups.

The attitudinal survey, called "HRC Internal Assessment Survey" is not a scientifically drawn survey to determine the "in-house perceptions of the present functioning and future direction of the HRC as an antipoverty agency." A community-wide survey doing a selected random sampling technique would have been a more appropriate process to utilize in order to determine the major problems perceived by the poverty community.

2. PLANNING.

The Planning staff is made up of approximately five individuals. The Planning, Research and Evaluation Director is a member of the major management team which reports directly to the Executive Director. The Planning Director is the key staff person to the Program Committee of HRC. The approximate budget for this component appears to be \$60,000. The major responsibilities of the component seem to be the development of all major refunding documents, new-proposal development, technical assistance, CAP 81, 419s, etc. Upon review of documents made available there seems to be no generalized agency goals and objectives separate from the Summary of Work Programs and Budgets (CSA Form 419). Although the Planning Department had developed internal management goals for itself, these goals have not been approved by top management. There also seems to be no relationship between the 419 programmatic goal statements and any statistical data available.

Although planning is a significant part of the CSA legislation, it would seem that the activities and resources of this component are not utilized effectively. Understaffed and ignored by the HRC leadership, the Planning Component is crisis-oriented, with little or no time for long-range planning. The activities of this Component can best be described as program-development in nature, rather than program-planning.

From discussions with both staff and board, it is evident that the Planning Department is by-passed when felt necessary by other administrators to accomplish their specific objectives. This informal process is destructive of the Planning function. Reviewing some documents which have been of a more technical nature, it is evident that some of the staff have projected futuristic planning strategies. These documents, however, have not been effectively shared or utilized by Management or the Board.

Generating new funding resources is a key element of any planning component. The Minutes of the Program Committee and the Board

confirm that very few new funding proposals have been developed. In order to utilize CSA monies as a catalyst for change, it would seem that **at least** 10 proposals should have been generated to a diversity of funding sources during the past year.

In order to influence local social-service programs to more effectively deal with the problems of the poor, it is imperative that the Planning Component play an active role. Because of the crisis-oriented nature of this Component, it is evident that coordinated planning with the City of Kansas City, Jackson, Platte, and Clay Counties, the United Way, and the Regional Planning Agency (M.A.R.C.) does not occur on a scale worthy of note. Although the Executive Director and the Planning Director are on a number of local planning committees (i.e. MARC, Title XX, etc.), their attendance has not been consistent, and often they lack the more specific technical data to influence key policy decisions.

In talking with local planning and social-service bodies, HRC is not viewed as a technical planning advocate for the poor within the Kansas City community. It is evident that this identity-crisis is the result of a lack of resource commitment and lack of support and understanding by the leadership of HRC.

3. EVALUATION.

Evaluation is a key tool in determining effectiveness of programs. There are a diversity of techniques that can be used in evaluating programs. These techniques can be relatively simple and/or complex in nature. The point of evaluation is to get a measure of the quality of the program relative to the expectations established prior to implementation. To the knowledge of the Review Team, no evaluation processes were utilized during the yearly refunding review process. It would seem that had an evaluation process been instituted a number of years ago, the HRC would today be utilizing its CSA monies in a more creative programmatic way.

B. CONCLUSIONS.

The PRE Department does not effectively operationalize the Research, Planning, and Evaluation tools necessary to impact upon the needs of the poor within the Kansas City area. This can be attributed to a lack of acknowledgement on the part of the key leadership -- both Staff and Board -- that the Planning Department must play a key role in influencing key decisions which impact upon the poor. It is evident that the PRE Department is understaffed, underbudgeted, and not utilized appropriately as a Planning and Management tool for HRC.

It is also evident that there are no broad agency goals and objectives which are used as a catalyst for staff and Board decisions. There is no comprehensive needs-assessment process which analyzes community needs, develops appropriate goals and objectives and then develops specific activities to generate new resources to impact upon the problems identified.

In the area of institutional change, it appears that the HRC does not have the technical base or skills to effectively impact upon more sophisticated arms of Government who are planning or delivering social services within the community.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS.

1. The Management structure of HRC should be reorganized according to the functional lines as cited in the Section on Program Operations.

2. The Planning Component should be structured with three major divisions dealing with three major functions: A long-range Planning and Coordination Division; a Project Development and Technical Assistance Division; and a Research and Evaluation Division. The budget of the Department should represent approximately 3% of the total agency's cash budget. Staffing for this Department should include research technicians, research and planning specialists, and administrators for the respective Divisions. Because of the highly sophisticated planning environment within the Kansas City area, it is imperative to hire a reasonable mix of professionally trained individuals. Potential resources which could be utilized to implement the staffing patterns could include CETA slots, graduate-student field placements from the University of Missouri, and technical resources from the Manpower Program.

3. HRC should immediately impart upon a needs-assessment process, gathering information at a neighborhood, area, and community-wide level. This process should include gathering both statistical data and attitudinal data which quantify the seriousness of the poverty problem locally. This needs-assessment should then be used as a basis for the development of general agency goals and objectives. Upon completion of this process the Board should prioritize its goals and direct staff to develop a Management plan of operations to implement its priorities.

4. HRC should structure its Program Committee in such a way as to possibly include sub-committees in the areas of Health, Welfare, and Aging, Education, Youth and Recreation, Employment and Training, Housing, Energy, and Community Development. The Program Committee should be designated the filtering committee for all the content (sub-committee) recommendations proposed for presentation to the Board. These committees generally should be made up of 1/3 Board Members, 1/3 Advisory Representatives, and 1/3 technical support people.

5. The HRC should impart upon an immediate review of all existing programs with the intent to use CSA funds as seed-monies in order to mobilize HEW, HUD, DOT, LEAA, DOL, Title XX, etc. as well as available Foundation, State, and local funding sources. The Planning Department should assign staff to generate proposals in all the content areas mentioned, and set as its goal the generation of \$1 million worth of new funds for the next Program Year.

6. The HRC (both Staff and Board) should immediately seek membership on all local Planning and Programming bodies, with the intent to influence the decisions of those bodies as they relate to the poor. The HRC should assume an aggressive coordinative planning and programming role, in order to more effectively influence local, County, and State Government decisions as they impact upon the plight of the disadvantaged and disenfranchised within our society.

IV. COORDINATION.

The Review Team assessed the HRC relative to the question of: To what extent has HRC encouraged other anti-poverty agencies in securing assistance and influencing coordination and cooperation in provided unduplicated services focusing upon the unmet needs of the poor.

A. FINDINGS.

In visiting the local planning bodies, social-service provision agencies, and HRC programs, it became evident to the Review Team that minimum coordination is occurring under the umbrella of HRC. Local planning bodies such as MARC, City of Kansas City Departments of Urban Affairs and Community Services, are providing many of the planning and programmatic services that HRC should be providing. These agencies, it would seem, have moved into the vacuum created by the inability of HRC to properly assess many of the legislative changes that have occurred during the past few years. These changes have re-directed categorical funding sources from need-populations like the poor to local governments for general Revenue Sharing purposes. With these trends, many of the priorities of dealing with the elderly, minority and poverty issues have been de-emphasized. One strategy, which could have been used to influence these trends, should have been the development of proposals for community-based organizations seeking monies from these potential funding sources. Relative to this strategy, it is imperative that legislative advocacy occur at a National, State, and local level to assure that those policy decisions that impact upon minority and poverty populations include the **best** interests of these groups in those decisions.

Collaborative funding and planning efforts should be initiated in order to develop models of coalition-building which can serve as a catalyst to future joint ventures. By utilizing a sophisticated data-base the interests of the poor can most effectively be implemented.

The collaboratively funded Employment and Training Program is one example of the uncoordinated activities of HRC. Although mutually funded by the City of Kansas City Department of Urban Affairs, Manpower Planning Council, and the Department of Labor through a subcontract to HRC, there is little internal coordination between the HRC and a separate-but-equal employment program. The confusion of roles, responsibilities, and overlapping administrative functions gives the Review Team the distinct impression that HRC must get its own house in order quickly. The approval of the recently adopted Affirmative Action Plan, with apparent conflicts with the Manpower program, graphically illustrates the problems that can result from lack of close coordination.

HRC has an active, decentralized community resident participation structure. This resident input should be constructively channeled to better acquaint the Planning and Programming functions of HRC with local community needs. Data reports from the 7 multi-service centers, together with nominal group discussions in those areas, would offer HRC an important resource for channeling needs-information into the data-bank of HRC.

B. CONCLUSIONS.

HRC plays a minimum coordinative planning and programmatic role, both within its own agency and within the community. It is apparent that if a more aggressive coordinative planning and programming stance is not taken by HRC its credibility and authority to influence change will further erode.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS.

HRC should reassess its passive role relative to the coordination of existing community resources. It should review its original mandate and assume a more informed and active institutional-change stance within the community. It should seek out the assistance of CSA and other Federal agencies to assure that Equal Rights and poverty and minority needs are properly addressed by all Planning and social-service-provision agencies within its spectrum of influence.

V. PROGRAM OPERATION AND CITIZEN PARTICIPATION.

A. FINDINGS.

The Review Team reviewed Board and Committee Minutes, Organizational Charts, Bylaws, Personnel Policies, Staff Reports, correspondence, Financial documents, Work Programs, Center Board Minutes, the AAP, and other related materials. Additionally the Review Team interviewed a cross-section of the members of the Board, Management staff, community leaders, and program operators both within and outside HRC's program. The Review Team's findings as a result of this review are as follows:

1 - The Board of Directors, with a core membership of 45, together with 45 Alternates, has a potential size of 90 different people. Yet, on the average, it appears that most Board meetings barely -- and sometimes fail -- to achieve the required quorum of not less than 23 Members.

2 - Board Meeting agendas rather consistently follow a fixed format, with most emphasis on Committee Reports. While the Minutes of the Committees are distributed to Board members, the contents of the Committee Reports are often recited again to the full Board.

3 - It appears also that the Executive Committee not only is duplicative of the Board in a dual review of other Committee reports, but, more significantly, it appears that the Executive Committee deals with more substantive issues than does the full Board.

4 - One of the key Committees, the Program Committee of the Board, has consistently less than a quorum at its meetings, and has only 9 members appointed to it, from a potential Board Membership of 90 people -- not including the numerous other people who serve on Center and other Advisory Committees who could be tapped. Yet this Committee has the broadest, most extensive, most crucial responsibilities, and the most essential duties of any Committee of the Board. There are a myriad of issues which this Committee -- or similar committees and sub-committees -- could be dealing with -- such as

housing, aging, utility costs, day care, employment, legislation, to give a few examples.

5 - The Board, in summary, appears disorganized, directionless, and ineffective as the Directorate of a multi-million-dollar Corporation. Inconsistency of attendance, apathy, high turnover, lack of continuity (partially due to annual elections), meetings which deal with minutiae instead of substance and policy, and an ineffective committee structure all appear to contribute to the general malaise of the Board.

6 - What appears to be a contributing factor to the Board's inability to carry out its duties and responsibilities is a staffing structure with confused, conflicting, and overlapping lines of authority. There is no clear division between line or operational functions and support functions. Nor is the division of duties between line and support staff very clear. For example, the Deputy Director appears to be both the second in command under the Executive Director and concurrently a co-equal among the other Divisional Directors. He is a Divisional Director of several programs, and Staff Coordinator of some of the other Divisional Directors -- or at least that is the way it appears to the Review Team. Furthermore, the Deputy position appears to have responsibility for both program development and program operations.

7 - The practice of the Personnel Committee and/or the Board making most of the final decisions on personnel selections is a practice atypical to most personnel procedures in other institutions. The lack of delegation to at least the Divisional Directors to make the final selection from a screened list of eligible and qualified candidates can impair the Divisional Directors in carrying out their responsibilities -- especially if the person chosen was not the one felt to be the person best suited to the needs of the Division.

B. CONCLUSIONS.

The Board, as the saying goes, must get its act together! The Board, as a collective body, is in charge of the Corporation. As such, it is responsible for ensuring that the mission of HRC, as the designated Community Action Agency for Kansas City, and in contractual agreement with the Community Services Administration, is fully implemented.

But it cannot do its job unless the Board organizes itself in such a way that it can properly manage the Agency's affairs. The Board must set policy, establish goals, assess progress, explore unmet needs, and change

with the times. In the opinion of the Review Team, HRC is not the viable and active leader in the community it once was for ensuring that the needs of the poor are dealt with, and that the institutions which oppress them are changed. HRC, instead of being in the forefront, is being outclassed and by-passed by more sophisticated institutions skillful in the development and delivery of programs as well as institutional change. The Review Team honestly believes that unless HRC changes direction it will continue to diminish and become more irrelevant to the plight of the poor.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS.

The Review Team, in careful consideration of the above Findings and Conclusions, offers the following recommendations:

1 - The Board should reduce its membership to a more workable size, such as 15, 18, 21, or 24 (at most) members.

2 - Some form of continuity of terms of office should be effected in lieu of the present one-year terms. For example, the Area Representatives might be elected for two- or three-year terms, with one-half or one-third of the positions elected each year. The Organizational Representatives might be selected on the same basis.

3 - The Board should establish a large Program Committee, with several sub-committees, in functional or subject areas, as recommended in the Section on Planning and Evaluation.

4 - The Executive Committee should deal only with those issues which normally cannot await the regular Board meeting. It should also be responsible for evaluating annually the Executive Director.

5 - The Board agenda should be so designed that substantive issues and policy matters are dealt with. Only the action items being recommended by the Committees should be presented by the Committee Chairperson. The details of the Committee meetings are available in the form of the Committee Minutes, and should not be re-reported verbally to the Board.

6 - While the Committees of the Board may be small in the number of Board members who sit on them, some Committees can and should be **expanded** to include members of the community, such as Center Advisory Boards or others who are interested in the particular issues.

7 - All correspondence addressed to the Board should be considered, or at least brought to the attention of the Board. In most cases such correspondence is then referred to Committees, or to the Executive Director, for appropriate followup. In this way the Board can keep abreast of current issues.

8 - The staff should be reorganized into three basic, functional groupings, each with an Assistant Director reporting to the Executive Director:

a) An Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, and Project Development.

b) An Office of Administrative Support, encompassing Accounting, Property, Supply, Contracting, Training, Personnel, and other related functions.

c) An Office of Operations, which is responsible for the implementation, operation, and coordination of all HRC programs.

9 - There should be more delegation of authority to Department Heads in the selection of their subordinate staff. The Board should confine itself to concurrence only in the Executive Director's choice for top-management staff.

10 - Center Advisory Boards should be given recommending authority in the selection of Center Directors.

11 - The Executive Director, through utilization of his staff, should be directed by the Board to provide the Board with appropriate analyses, options, alternatives, and such other completed staff work as necessary, to enable the Board to make appropriate and enlightened policy decisions, as pointed out in the Recommendations in the Section on Resource Mobilization.

In summary, it is the belief of the Review Team that if the Board institutes the above Recommendations, Board and Committee participation will be more consistent, with better attendance, and be more productive and constructive in its results. Coupling this with a better organizational array of the staff, a beefing-up of the Planning, Evaluation, and Program Development staffs, and an insistence upon staff providing the Board with the information it needs, so that it can make informed decisions, the Review Team believes that the foundation for a revitalized HRC will have been laid.

VI. MOBILIZATION OF RESOURCES.

It is the assessment of the Review Team that several problems exist with HRC mobilization of resources, based upon findings through interviews with staff, Board members, Public officials, and other local organizations and agencies. These problems have not developed over a short period, but have manifested themselves during the past six years, and become increasingly critical as new legislation forced public-official involvement **in** the social service fields. To add confusion to the mobilization of resources area, at a time when HRC should have placed a higher priority on this activity, was the attitude of the National administration, and the attempt to abolish the Office of Economic Opportunity (now CSA) by its National Director at that time (1973).

The strong leadership role of the Board and Management staff waned during this period. Public officials no longer looked to HRC as a vehicle for human resource delivery. New organizations and agencies assumed this role, and became the leading forces which developed and now operate a large part of the program-activities which were formerly operated by HRC.

A. FINDINGS.

A review of the Area Board minutes, Summary of Work Programs and Budgets (CSA Form 419), discussions with Board members, staff, and public officials indicate that mobilization of resources was a part of HRC's Goals. Mobilization of resources has occurred during the years of HRC development. Many of the private companies and agencies within the Kansas City area and the Counties contribute to the in-kind requirement of HRC. Although these contributions are in most cases small, they meet a real need for the low-income residents of the area serviced. The Review Team has no instrument to measure the effectiveness of these resources against a standardized formula, and therefore cannot be judgemental in their value. The fact is: resources are being mobilized.

B. CONCLUSIONS.

Although resources are being mobilized, and low-income residents are being assisted, Board members, public officials, and other organizations and agencies believe the HRC continually lets opportunities pass which would place them in a leadership role rather than a side-lines participant to the real issues and goals of the Kansas City area and surrounding Counties.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS.

1 - The Board must regroup and assume the policy-making role for which they are legally and morally responsible. The Board must take options, consider choices provided by the Executive Director, weigh their value in a factual manner, and analyze their alternatives without the rhetoric and personalities involved. Finding the recommendations not acceptable, it is the Board's responsibility to make their concerns specific, with time-frames, so that the staff can bring the proper documentation back to the Board for their approval. If the Board finds this does not occur, the Review Team recommends that an evaluation of those personnel be done, in order to determine their capabilities and/or the barriers that prevent the requirements from being met.

2 - Mobilization of resources is a very broad area, and requires the most capable Planners, Personnel officers, Fiscal officers, Program Directors, and Committees to operate in a spirit of cooperation and support to reach the goals and objectives of the Corporation, so that it may pursue its overall mission.

3 - The Review Team recommends that the Staff and Board, in a joint effort, take a hard look at where they are, and where they want to go, in an effort to take a leadership role in the community as the resource mobilizers in the area of manpower, law enforcement, early-childhood development, transportation, emergency energy and alternate energy sources, as well as planning, research and evaluation, and other areas of unmet needs.

The overall success of HRC during the next year will reflect how well the Board and staff eliminate barriers within, and reach out with a positive, coordinated approach to take the role of leadership in the community which its low-income residents expect and deserve by the mandate of the Equal Opportunity Act.

4 - It is the responsibility of the Board to determine if this can occur within the present HRC structure. If this is not the case, the Review Team recommends technical assistance be requested from the State Office of Economic Opportunity and the Region VII Office of CSA, in order to review and recommend strategies to deal with these problems.

November 30, 1977

TO: Human Resources Corporation Assessment Team

FROM: Richard Sumpter, Field Representative

Title II of the EOA deals with urban and rural CAAs.

Sec. 201 (a) sets forth the basic purpose of that

Title: The basic purpose is to stimulate a better focusing of all available local, state, private, and Federal resources upon the goal of enabling low-income families and individuals of all ages, in rural and urban areas to attain the skills, knowledge, and motivation and secure the opportunities needed for them to become fully self-sufficient.

The Specific Purposes of Title II are to promote:

- 1) The strengthening of community capabilities for planning and coordinating antipoverty assistance so it is more responsive to local needs;
- 2) Better organization of services related to the needs of the poor;
- 3) Greater use of new types of services and innovative approaches in attacking the causes of poverty;
- 4) Maximum feasible participation of the poor in the development and implementation of programs;

- 5) Broadening the resource base of antipoverty programs by obtaining a more active role by business, labor and professional groups which can influence the quantity and quality of services for the poor.

One of the primary means chosen to accomplish the Basic and Specific Purposes of Title II was the establishment of Community Action Agencies.

According to Sec. 212(b) (1) a CAA is an organization which shall have the authority and responsibility to:

- 1) Plan and evaluate programs. At a minimum this includes:
 - a) Development of in-depth information regarding the problems and causes of poverty in the community
 - b) Do a thorough analysis of the quantity and quality of the assistance currently being provided to deal with those problems.
 - c) Establish priorities for best use of resources.

- 2) Encourage other antipoverty agencies to secure assistance on a common or cooperative basis; foster efforts at coordination which will close service gaps and achieve better focusing of resources.
- 3) Initiate and sponsor projects relating to unmet needs.
- 4) Establish effective policies and procedures which enable the poor to influence the character of the programs; and provide technical assistance to the poor to enable neighborhood groups to secure resources on their own behalf.
- 5) Join with and encourage business and labor and private organizations to actively support the Community Action Program efforts through employment and investment in poverty areas.

Sec. 210(a) states that in carrying out these cited fundamental responsibilities, a CAA must administer projects or programs providing a range of services and activities having a MEASURABLE and potentially major impact on the causes of poverty in the community.

It further states that these projects will be so organized and combined as to carry out ALL the purposes of Title II.

When you combine the five specific purposes of Title II and the five minimal responsibilities of a CAA, the following five general areas of inquiry emerge:

1. Planning and Evaluation
2. Coordination
3. Program Operation
4. Resident Participation
5. Resource Mobilization

These labels have been chosen for ease of identification of fundamental CAA functions. They are meant to be nominal, not definitive.

The coordination of the assessment team is Carl Shaw. As a team member he will be responsible primarily for No. 5, "Resource Mobilization" and jointly for No. 3, "Program Operation."

Ed Olsen will have primary responsibility for No. 1, "Planning and Evaluation." One specific area he will be focusing upon is the Energy Program.

No. 4, "Resident Participation" will be assessed by Druecilla Johnson.

Ben Dacus, who will not be available for the entire time, will combine with Carl Shaw on No. 2, "Program Operation." His primary focus will be administrative and organizational, trying to determine to what extent the structure of HRC contributes to the accomplishment of its mission.

All team members will be asked to assess No. 2, "Coordination" since this function cuts across all lines, and evidence of its existence or lack thereof will be readily available.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Charles Thomas", written over a horizontal line.

At the time of this writing, the Missouri SEOO was uncertain as to their participation. Should they be present, the team leader will determine their area of involvement.

#1. MANDATED CAA FUNCTION: PLANNING & EVALUATION

INFORMATION SOUGHT:

TO WHAT EXTENT HAS HRC DEVELOPED A PLANNING AND EVALUATION
CAPABILITY TO ASSESS THE PROBLEMS AND CAUSES OF POVERTY; TO
DETERMINE AVAILABLE RESOURCES; AND TO SET PRIORITIES AND
CREATE PROGRAMS TO MEET THE GREATEST NEEDS WITH THE MOST
EFFICIENT USE OF RESOURCES?

#2. MANDATED CAA FUNCTION: COORDINATION

INFORMATION SOUGHT:

TO WHAT EXTENT HAS HRC ENCOURAGED OTHER ANTI-POVERTY AGENCIES
IN SECURING ASSISTANCE, AND INFLUENCED COORDINATION AND
COOPERATION IN PROVIDING UNDUPLICATED SERVICES FOCUSING UPON
THE UNMET NEEDS OF THE POOR?

#3. MANDATED CAA FUNCTION: PROGRAM OPERATION

INFORMATION SOUGHT:

TO WHAT EXTENT HAS HRC:

1 - PLANNED ITS PROGRAM OPERATION IN LIGHT OF
UNMET NEEDS?

2 - OPERATED A RANGE OF PROGRAMS AND SERVICE
SUFFICIENT TO HAVE A MEASURABLE IMPACT ON THE
CAUSES OF POVERTY?

3 - THROUGH ITS PROGRAM OPERATION FULFILLED THE
STANDARDS OF EFFECTIVENESS?

4 - ORGANIZED THE ADMINISTRATION OF ITS PROGRAMS
FOR MAXIMUM EFFICIENCY?

5 - SYSTEMATICALLY ATTEMPTED TO DEVELOP INNOVATIVE
APPROACHES TO THE PROBLEMS OF POVERTY?

#4. MANDATED CAA FUNCTION: RESIDENT PARTICIPATION

INFORMATION SOUGHT:

TO WHAT EXTENT DO THE POOR INFLUENCE THE ANTI-POVERTY
PROGRAMS IN THE COMMUNITY, BOTH THOSE ADMINISTERED BY HRC
AND THOSE SPONSORED BY OTHERS?

#5. MANDATED CAA FUNCTION: RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

INFORMATION SOUGHT:

TO WHAT EXTENT DOES HRC BROADEN THE RESOURCE-BASE OF ITS
PROGRAM THROUGH OBTAINING THE ACTIVE INVOLVEMENT OF
BUSINESS, LABOR, AND APPROPRIATE PROFESSIONAL GROUPS?

PERSONS INTERVIEWED

I. BOARD AND COMMUNITY

1 - BACON, Jean	Community
2 - BOSCH, Robert	Community
3 - CARNEY, Cy	Board Member
4 - FARENTHOLD, Sally	Community
5 - GATES, Samella	Community
6 - HILL, Julia	Board and Community
7 - LEVI, Peter S.	Community
8 - REEFER, James	Board and Community
9 - THOMPSON, Vernon	Board and Community
10 - WATTS, James	Board
11 - WILSON, Allen	Board
12 - WILSON, James	Community

II. HRC STAFF.

1 - CARTER, Cecil
2 - DAVIS, Guy
[REDACTED]
4 - HOLIWELL, Sarah
5 - JACKSON, Ruby
6 - MORRIS, Richard
7 - RITTENHOUSE, G.E.
8 - ROSS, Armeta
9 - SASSER, Jefferson
10 - SHIELDS, Arnold
11 - STOVALL, Chester
12 - TOLIVER, Dorothy

III. CSA STAFF

1 - BUCKSTEAD, John
2 - CHELLGREN, Stanley
3 - LILLIS, Pawrence P.
4 - SUMPTER, Richard