



## Daniel Jeremy Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and  
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

### **MS-4850: Daniel Jeremy Silver Papers, 1972-1993.**

Series II: Subject Files, 1956-1993, undated.

---

Reel  
18

Box  
7

Folder  
226b

Council for Economic Opportunities in Greater Cleveland,  
minutes, 1967-1968.

COUNCIL FOR ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES IN GREATER CLEVELAND

1350 West Third Street

Cleveland, Ohio 44113

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

MINUTES

Special Meeting

November 29, 1967

ATTENDANCE:

Mr. Charles P. Lucas, Presiding

Mr. H. E. Boehm  
Mr. D. S. Carmichael  
Mr. A. L. Evans  
Mr. J. C. Fisher  
Mrs. H. Golub  
Rev. D. G. Jacobs  
Dr. J. A. Norton  
Mr. P. J. O'Malley

Rev. R. V. Parks  
Msgr. A. J. Quinn  
Rev. R. Shoup  
Mrs. J. Stubbs  
Mr. J. Tomb  
Mrs. G. Wise  
(Mr. S. Minter sitting in  
attendance for Mr. W. P. Day)

- I. The Special Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Council for Economic Opportunities in Greater Cleveland was called to order by Mr. Charles P. Lucas, Vice President, at 2:09 p.m. on Wednesday, November 29, 1967 in the City Planning Conference Room, City Hall, Cleveland, Ohio with the above members present and constituting a quorum.

Mr. Lucas stated that since this was a special meeting of the Board, it would be appropriate to follow the items listed on the agenda. He stated that the next regular meeting of the Board will be held on Wednesday, December 13th, at which time the balance of the proposals would be presented. He then called on Mrs. Wise to give the report of the Priorities Committee.

II. Report of the Priorities Committee

Mrs. Gwendolyn Wise read the report of the Priorities Committee for Dr. James A. Norton, Chairman:

It was the recommendation of the Priorities Committee that the Community Information Service Program of the Neighborhood Information Service request for Federal funding in the amount of \$41,468 be approved by the Board



Board of Trustees

MINUTES

November 29, 1967

Page 2.

of Trustees according to the amended narrative and budget submitted to and approved by the Proposal Review Subcommittee at its November 27, 1967 meeting, and subject to the following recommendations:

1. That the Community Information Service Specialists should be responsible for their activities to the Neighborhood Opportunity Center Director. The Committee felt that if the Community Information Service Specialists were to operate effectively as consultants to the Neighborhood Opportunity Center, they should also be responsible for their activities to the NOC Director who would be in the best position to coordinate their activities with other activities within the center.
2. That the last paragraph of the amended proposal for the Neighborhood Information Service be deleted. The Committee agreed that the present Community Information Service Aide should become the Outreach Specialist for Intake and that they should continue to receive technical direction from the CIS Specialist. The Committee feels it is very important that they come under the administrative supervision of the Outreach Supervisor and the NOC Director.

Dr. Norton, Chairman of the Priorities Committee, stated that the Community Information Service is an agency of the Welfare Federation and performs a very valuable service in supplying information, personal consultation, and helping in the training of Outreach Workers and others. He stated that there seems to have been a change in the function of the Outreach Worker. The Workers are, many times, going more directly to the heart of the problem than in years past. The initial function of the Outreach Worker was that they would provide information and bring people into the various services and more professional services would be made available. As it stands now, the Outreach Workers are taking care of many of these problems. CIS found that it was not being kept busy with its overall program. They requested that the aides they employed be added to the Outreach staff. This affects some of the coordination that this Committee asked for a year ago. They also have pointed out that they will meet the requirements that were suggested by the Subcommittee on evaluation of programs and they will be used for their training capabilities so that Outreach staff will be granted the opportunity of upgrading.

Mr. Carmichael asked how the requested proposal compares with last year's program. Mr. Cathota replied that the Federal share last year was \$63,811 as to \$41,468 Federal share requested for next year's program. Mr. Carmichael asked if this was a studied reduction or a forced reduction. Dr. Norton replied that this was a studied reduction. He stated that the amount will be added to and increased in the Outreach budget.

Mr. O'Malley asked what the deletion in point (2) was. Dr. Norton stated that the last paragraph was a bit unclear in stating that: "Where possible, these aides will be assigned to the intake function and continue to be supervised by the Neighborhood Information and Intake Specialist. Other aide assignments will include special follow-up to insure needed services are obtained." Dr. Norton further stated that it was the intent of the neighborhood groups that we should be perfectly clear that these aides are transferred so that they are under the NOC and Outreach supervisor. Mr. O'Malley moved that the recommendations be approved. Motion passed.

Mrs. Wise reported that the Priorities Committee recommended that the Neighborhood Opportunity Center/Outreach Program and its request for Federal funding in the amount of \$964,501 be approved by the Board of Trustees according to the amended narrative and budget submitted to the Committee at its November 28, 1967 meeting and subject to the following recommendations of the Proposal Review Subcommittee:

1. That each center have a professional supervisor to direct the activities of the Outreach Workers. The Kinsman Area does not at the present time have a professional supervisor and there is a definite need for someone to supervise the Outreach staff.
2. That there be more and better communication between the Resident Participation staff and the Outreach Workers so that the Outreach Workers will be better informed about community organizations within their area. Many of the Outreach Workers do not know in what Area Conference they are working or what resident organizations serve the area.

Rev. Jacobs asked if the position of supervisor for Outreach staff was a new one. Mrs. Wise replied no, the Kinsman Area position has not been filled; the other poverty areas do have supervisors for Outreach personnel. Mr. Carmichael asked if this reflects the findings of the Battelle Memorial Institute group. Dr. Norton stated yes, there principally will be modifications as time goes on. Mr. Carmichael and Mr. Boehm asked what is the difference in figures. Mr. Whitlatch stated that last year's budget was \$761,000 as compared to \$964,501 being requested for next year. The total amount was \$1,261,000. This will help support other programs under Versatile CAP programs. Mr. Carmichael asked what figure compares with the \$1,261,000 for this year. Mr. Catliota stated that the \$1,261,000 was the total for Federal as well as in-kind. Mr. Carmichael asked what was the total program in the present year. Mr. Whitlatch replied that \$761,000 was for the NOC Program. Dr. Norton asked if that was Federal and local. Mr. Whitlatch replied yes. Mr. Carmichael noted that, last year, there was practically no local contri-



bution. Director Findley stated that there will be 24% local participation next year. Mr. Boehm asked where this local contribution is coming from. Mr. Hall replied that almost \$250,000 of in-kind will come from the Planned Parenthood Center; approximately \$14,000 from the city and \$11,000 from the Pure Nuns. Mr. Carmichael moved, seconded by Mr. O'Malley, that the recommendations for the NOC/Outreach Program be approved. Motion passed.

Mrs. Wise reported that the Priorities Committee heard the presentation of the Title V Work Experience Program and found that this program basically complimented other ongoing anti-poverty programs in the community and will be effectively coordinated with the administration and operation of the Community Action Program and recommends that the proposed activities be financed under Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act. She stated that the Board did not have to approve the Title V budget as they made their request direct. Mr. Lucas then called on Mr. Steven Minter of Title V for his remarks.

Mr. Minter stated that last year's request was for \$2,100,000 as compared to \$2,300,000 being requested for the coming year. He stated that they are going to try to obtain the amount of money they feel they will need during the coming year although they have been told they cannot expect to receive it. He added that Cleveland's program is the first in the nation to request funds for a fourth year. Mr. Carmichael asked if Cleveland's program was the pilot program. Mr. Minter replied yes.

Dr. Norton stated that it was not necessary that the Board approve this request. It is submitted for purposes of notification.

Director Findley stated that the remainder of the proposals to be considered for refunding will be coming up for review at the December 13th meeting of the Board. He stated that we would try to obtain this same meeting room. He added that notices of confirmation would be sent prior to the upcoming meeting.

III. The meeting was adjourned at 2:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mrs. Helen Golub  
Secretary

:mlr

COUNCIL FOR ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES IN GREATER CLEVELAND

1350 West Third Street

Cleveland, Ohio 44113

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

MINUTES

Regular Meeting

December 20, 1967

ATTENDANCE:

Mr. Charles P. Lucas, Presiding

Mr. H. E. Boehm  
Rev. E. S. Branch, Jr.  
Mr. J. C. Fisher  
Mrs. H. Golub  
Mrs. L. Graves  
Mr. P. B. Hamilton

Dr. J. A. Norton  
Very Rev. A. J. Quinn  
Rev. R. Shoup  
Rabbi D. J. Silver  
Mr. R. B. Tallis

- I. The Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Council for Economic Opportunities in Greater Cleveland was called to order by Mr. Charles P. Lucas, Vice President, at 2:17 p.m. on Wednesday, December 20, 1967 in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, Cleveland, Ohio with the above members present and constituting a quorum.
- II. The Minutes of the Regular Meeting of November 15, 1967, as well as the Minutes of the Special Meeting of November 29, 1967, were approved.
- III. There was no correspondence.
- IV. Report of the Executive Director:

Director Findley stated that Mr. Olsen is in Cleveland and will be employed in the office until the end of December. He further stated that Mr. Olsen has kept in touch with the office and hopes to continue to do so.

Director Findley then introduced Commander George Findlay, newly appointed Director of the Finance Department.

Director Findley extended an invitation to all of the Board members to attend the open house at the new Kinsman Neighborhood Opportunity Center to be held on December 21st. He stated that the Council is making every effort to improve its neighborhood centers and to see to it that the Community Opportunity Boards have adequate headquarters. The new location of the Kinsman NOC is at East 93 & Kinsman Avenue.

The Director stated that the Parent/Child Center planning is moving ahead. This will be reviewed by the neighborhood committees the first part of January and will be presented to the Board for action sometime in early February.

Director Findley stated that several staff members, as well as Rev. Branch representing the Board of Trustees, went to Chicago the first part of December to attend the annual meeting of the Regional CAP agencies. He paid tribute to Rev. Branch for his fine participation on behalf of the Board of Trustees. He stated that our Head Start Coordinator was on the panel for Head Start, and he was on the Manpower panel. The Director mentioned the fact that there was Board representation at the meeting last year, including the Mayor, Dr. Clement, Dr. Norton, and Bishop Whealon. He stated that this is a real inspiration and we are always grateful when the Board members can participate.

Director Findley stated that the proposals being presented today are the final proposals that the staff has prepared in keeping with the reviews that have been approved and passed by our resident committees. We have been advised that there will be no extensions of our programs beyond January 31, 1968. We will need the support of the Board in case there are some additional cuts. We were notified that there might be more cuts in the Versatile CAP funds. He stated that we will have all of these proposals off to Chicago for their consideration by the end of the week.

#### V. Committee Reports:

Dr. Norton stated that the Committee owes a great debt of gratitude to certain people in the community. Some people have said that the people in the target areas have not been involved as directly as they should be in the Economic Opportunity Program. We do receive a great deal of support from people who work long and hard on certain committees of the Council. Dr. Norton stated that the Proposal Review Subcommittee looks more closely at programs and examines its implications more effectively than any other instrument that we can use. He then presented the following members of the Proposal Review Subcommittee with a certificate for their outstanding service: Mrs. Samella Carroll, Mrs. Mary Conners, Mrs. Bertha Falkowski, Mrs. Helen Golub, Mrs. Lucinda Graves, Mrs. Elizabeth Jackson, Mrs. Louise Oglesby, Mrs. Edwardina Riggins, and Mrs. Gwendolyn Wise. Dr. Norton stated that the Board appreciates the opportunity to honor these people.

Dr. Norton then presented the Foster Grandparent Program proposal for action:

The Priorities Committee recommends that the Board of Trustees of the Council for Economic Opportunities in Greater Cleveland, approve the Foster Grandparent Program and its request for Federal assistance in the amount of \$113,332 according to the narrative and budget reviewed by the Priorities Committee at



its December 12, 1967 meeting and incorporating the following recommendations which have been accepted by the applicant.

1. The Foster Grandparent Program seeks out a participating institution in the Near West Side Side-Tremont Target Area. This recommendation has been made because all of the participating institutions at the present time are located on the East Side and it is important that an institution in that area be included so as to facilitate greater participation of the elderly poor residing in this area.
2. If any cuts are required in this program, either due to a lack of funds or to accommodate the addition of a participating institution on the West Side, these cuts should be in the form of a reduction in, or perhaps elimination of, the program at the Rosemary Home in Euclid. Everyone agreed with this general recommendation. We would like to recognize that the Rosemary Home has been doing a good job and is a cooperating agency. It was felt, however, that this home is located at a considerable distance from the target area and it is difficult for target area residents to reach. The home is located in an area where volunteers could readily be obtained to perform the functions of the Foster Grandparents.

Rev. Branch made a motion to approve as submitted. The question was asked as to number of participants and children. Mr. Whitlatch replied that there are 38 participants in the Foster Grandparent Program and they serve about 100 children; next year we will have 49 Foster Grandparents and they will serve about 105 children; \$108,000 is present total budget; next year the total budget will be \$141,000. Motion passed.

Dr. Norton then presented the following recommendations for the Neighborhood Legal Services Program:

Discussion has taken place within the Proposal Review Subcommittee and the Priorities Committee with various items related to this program. A new office is being located in the Tremont Area. We have asked them to please put up a sign so that the residents will know that they are there.

Dr. Norton stated that the Priorities Committee recommends that the Board of Trustees approve the Neighborhood Legal Services Program of the Legal Aid Society and its request for Federal assistance in the amount of \$1,181,597, according to the narrative reviewed by the Proposal Review Subcommittee at its December 7, 1967 meeting and the revised budget submitted to CEO on December 18, 1967 and subject to the incorporation of the following recommendations of the Proposal Review Subcommittee that:

Board of Trustees  
MINUTES  
December 20, 1967  
Page 4.

1. A Legal Service Coordinator be placed on the central staff of CEO to monitor the Neighborhood Services Program and that Federal funds in the amount of \$18,000 be requested from nationally earmarked Legal Services funds to support this position. Such a position is needed to properly administer the Legal Services Program, and to develop, monitor and coordinate its legal programs with other CEO funded programs. It was the opinion of the committees that this follows a procedure that has been used in AIM-Jobs and is proper to the Legal Services Program.
2. Legal Aid shall work closely with other Neighborhood Opportunity Center programs to develop a community information program that will publicize the services and facilities of the Neighborhood Legal Services Program and will provide informational material and service training to Outreach workers so that they can better inform the community as to the type of services Legal Aid can provide. Many people feel that Legal Aid has performed an outstanding service in the past two years but many who should avail themselves of these services have not been doing so. This opinion is shared by persons in Legal Aid.
3. That before the Legal Aid Society shall enter into any agreement to lease office space for an expansion or relocation of the Neighborhood Legal Services Program, alternative office locations shall be submitted to the Planning Department of CEO for its comments and the alternative locations along with these comments shall be submitted to the Community Opportunity Board of the target area in which the office will be located for final selection. This procedure will enable better coordination between the location of legal service office and those of other services to the community and will give the residents of the target area a sound basis upon which to make the final decision as to the location of the facilities that will be serving them.

Rev. Branch asked what the relationship would be of the coordinator to the central office staff, if any. Dr. Norton replied that he will be a member of the central office staff with office space provided. The function is coordination and liaison to take care of communications with central office staff and neighborhood Legal Aid staff. Mr. Boehm asked how would Legal Aid feel about this central coordinator. Dr. Norton replied that the Legal Aid Society was not opposed to this idea; however, they do not believe the money should come from their budget. Mr. Boehm asked how does this compare with last years' budget. Mr. Whitlatch replied that last year the program was designed to serve 9,000 people at a cost of \$505,000. This years' budget is designed to serve 18,000 to 20,000 people at a total cost of \$1,476,000. Mr. Boehm asked



how will this request affect other programs. Mr. Whitlatch replied that the Legal Aid Program is a national emphasis program. Their request for funding will not affect the other funds being requested for the City of Cleveland CAP. Dr. Norton stated that our Legal Aid Program has a very high recommendation in Washington and we have been urged to move ahead as rapidly as Washington allows. Rabbi Silver made a motion, seconded by Mr. Boehm, to approve the Legal Services Program. Motion passed.

Dr. Norton then presented the following recommendations for the Resident Participation Program:

The staff has tried to see that this was an effective program. The whole concept of "maximum feasible participation of the poor" is one that has contained a great deal of experimentation. Up to the time the Economic Opportunity Act was passed, there had not been too much attention paid to the ideas that persons who received money to improve their own economic status should be requested to see if they were receiving the help they need.

During the last year, considerable concern has been expressed as to the effectiveness of the present resident participation effort not only by the residents of the target area, but by the Regional Office of OEO as well. The focus of this concern has been the need for sufficient staffing and technical assistance to enable the neighborhood conferences and the Community Opportunity Boards to be an effective and active vehicle through which the low income residents of the target areas could shape the projects and programs of the Neighborhood Opportunity Centers and CEO.

As the background paper which has been distributed to the members of the Board points out, this concern has been given a great deal of consideration by the Citizen Participation Committee, the Priorities Committee, the Proposal Review Subcommittee and the staff of CEO. From this consideration, the Priorities Committee has come to the conclusion that the following relationship between the resident participation effort, the Community Opportunity Boards, and the Neighborhood Opportunity Center Program is not only desirable but also is necessary if there is to be truly meaningful resident involvement in the poverty program.

1. Resident Participation is an integral part of the NOC and the activities of the resident participation effort should be integrated with the other activities of the Center.
2. The policies and priorities of the resident participation effort should be determined by the residents themselves through the COB.

3. In order to achieve the closest possible coordination between resident participation and the other activities of the Center, the Director of the Neighborhood Opportunity Center should be responsible for implementing the policies and priorities for resident participation established by the Community Opportunity Board.

This year we have two resident participation efforts up for consideration by the Board. The first was developed by the Hough Community Council following a request to the Community Participation Committee of the Board. This is to be a locally directed, resident participation effort. The second is the resident participation program of the Greater Cleveland Neighborhood Centers Association which will conduct the resident participation effort in Glenville, Central, Kinsman and the Near West Side-Tremont target areas.

#### Hough Community Council Proposal

The Priorities Committee recommends that the Resident Participation Program of the Hough Community Council, to provide the resident participation effort in the Hough target area, be approved and funded as part of the Neighborhood Opportunity Centers-Outreach Program according to the narrative received by the Proposal Review Subcommittee and incorporating the following recommendations of the Proposal Review Subcommittee:

#### Recommendation I

The president of the Hough Community Council be responsible to the Deputy Director of CEO for the execution of the program according to the proposal. This does not mean that he will be an administrator who will work for the Deputy Director. His responsibility will be to see that the program is executed.

#### Recommendation II

There shall be a full review of this program in three to six months by the Community Participation Committee and the Priorities Committee to determine the degree to which the program has come into conformity with the above stated relationship and how the program should proceed in the future. This will put us in the position of evaluating an ongoing program in the next three to six months with the idea that possibly we will need to make some changes.

Mr. Lucas asked Dr. Norton to specify the relationship with the background document and the two recommendations. Dr. Norton stated that it will be useful to us in answering questions which you might have about the proposals being reviewed in clarifying the history of the program, some of the goals,



etc. Rabbi Silver asked why there are two kinds of programs--one for Hough and one for the other areas. Dr. Norton replied because we are proposing a working experiment. We do not know what relationships can be developed between agencies such as the Hough Community Council and the Community Opportunity Boards of the neighborhoods. Several of the target areas either do not have an agency such as the Hough Area Council or they have two or more agencies which are involved. The question was asked what standards would be used in evaluating or assessing the effectiveness of the program. Dr. Norton answered by referring to page 5 of the background document:

- " (i) The activities of the Resident Participation Program are to be fully integrated with, and supportive of, NOC operations.
- (ii) The policies and priorities of the Resident Participation Program shall be determined by the local Community Opportunity Board with the understanding that the COB will receive primary attention and service.
- (iii) Responsibility for the implementation of operating policies, as set by the COB, shall be vested in the Neighborhood Opportunity Center director.
- (iv) The Resident Participation Program shall relate to the Council's Deputy Executive Director for the purpose of city-wide coordination among programs and among areas."

Dr. Norton stated that one of the problems is a determination of what resident participation should actually be. Money is tight this year; there have been some constraints placed on citizen action by actions of Congress, and our own experience has shown that some gaps are in the program and should be cleared. These guides are some of the standards that should be applied. The question was asked, since this is the first program that we will have a progress report on, if we ought not to make these more specific (referring to part (iii)). Dr. Norton stated that we would not urge operating without care. One of the basic things is, we must have the Resident Participation Program produce for the local CEO a pliable Community Opportunity Board and that it must be serviced in such a manner that committees meet regularly and carry out responsibility to us and relate to the NOC and priorities established in the neighborhood. I think perhaps if we would begin working with them through the Resident Participation Committee, we might be able to spell something out. Dr. Norton also stated that we would hope that it would be a hard working committee. Motion was made by Mr. Hamilton, seconded by Rev. Branch, to approve as recommended. Motion passed.



Dr. Norton then presented the Resident Participation Program for the Greater Cleveland Neighborhood Centers Association:

The Priorities Committee recommends that the Resident Participation Program of the Greater Cleveland Neighborhood Centers Association and its request for Federal assistance to conduct the resident participation effort in the Glenville, Central, Kinsman, and Near West Side-Tremont Areas, be approved according to the narrative and amendment thereto dated December 1, 1967, incorporating the following recommendations of the Proposal Review Subcommittee:

Recommendation I

That the relationship between the resident participation effort of GCNCA, the Community Opportunity Board, and the Neighborhood Opportunity Center Director, shall come into conformity with the following:

- A. The activities of the resident participation effort shall be integrated with other activities of the NOC.
- B. The policies and priorities for the resident participation effort shall be determined by the COB.
- C. The Director of the NOC shall be responsible for the implementation of the policies and priorities established by the COB for resident participation.

Recommendation II

The Director of the Resident Participation Program of the GCNCA shall be responsible to the Deputy Director of CEO for the execution of the approved program. This is not with regard to day-to-day administrative supervision but with regard to general policy.

Recommendation III

There shall be a full review of this program in three to six months by the Community Participation Committee and the Priorities Committee to determine the degree to which the program has come into conformity with the above stated relationship and how the program should proceed in the future. We have been conferring with the people of the GCNCA. They have been very cooperative in their discussions but raise certain questions about the desirability of their participation under the terms of this specific proposal and they wish to have the opportunity to withdraw their application as a delegate agency after we have affected and spelled out the definite terms

and if they do not agree with the approved recommendations of this Board. If this happens, it would be the recommendation of the Committee that this then be a CEO operation with the same objectives and same limitations but be facilitated by our office staff. Director Findley stated that whenever we have been given the responsibility, a way was found to meet it. This was the case when the Board gave us the mandate for the Outreach staff. We moved on that and in this we would do likewise. Mr. Boehm asked what is the probability of the situation occurring. Dr. Norton replied that, in part, it is not a difficulty of disagreement but it is part of an overall effort of the Committee to try to devise the best possible technique in all sorts of citizen committees. We would hope that we can straighten things out. Director Findley has talked to Mr. Bond. Director Findley stated that Mr. Bond agrees with the major objectives. The Center director would have the responsibility in seeing that the objectives were being followed by the fieldworkers of GCNCA. We were not concerned with words like control, but if we moved into this with the spirit of the thing, it was our feeling that the program can really become an integral part of the operation and supportive and responsive to the Community Opportunity Boards and the Neighborhood Opportunity Centers director who would have this responsibility. Rabbi Silver asked what would happen to our budgetary reports if we have to make a re-submission. Director Findley stated that we would not have to do this. It will be a matter of presenting a restructuring to the Great Lakes Regional Office. Mr. Boehm stated that we should try especially hard to work these things out with GCNCA because we don't want to splinter our efforts. The Board should be kept informed and asked for help. Mr. Lucas asked, in the discussions and descriptions of the recommendations, can we achieve what Mr. Boehm suggests. Dr. Norton replied that he would certainly hope so. We see this as a part of a much larger program of the total Cleveland community. That is, the overall citizen participation program. We had hoped that we would have the freedom that would permit us to fund more citizen activities. We are anxious to cooperate to provide the greatest amount of citizen participation. Motion made by Rabbi Silver, seconded by Rev. Shoup, to approve as recommended. Motion passed.

Dr. Norton then presented the recommendations for the Administration and Coordination component:

The Priorities Committee recommends that the Board of Trustees of the Council for Economic Opportunities in Greater Cleveland approve the Administration and Coordination Program and its request for Federal assistance in the amount of \$444,829 according to the summary reviewed by the Committee at its December 19, 1967 meeting. Dr. Norton then called on Mr. John Olsen to briefly review the Administration & Coordination proposal:

Board of Trustees  
MINUTES  
December 20, 1967  
Page 10.

Mr. Olsen stated that, basically, the program remains the same as it was last year. However, our program has expanded considerably. The Comprehensive Family Health Care Center was funded; Project 1060B was operated during the summer, and the Foster Grandparent Program was started. All of these things have affected us. With this expansion we had to keep the same kinds of financial controls and we had to add to the Finance Department. This was the first change that was submitted to OEO and it was approved very quickly. The second change related to the Grants Management Department. We had to have people to monitor the programs. These changes are the only two. Other than that, the program remains the same. We do have more ideas but we are limited by a lack of funds. The budget reflects the same things we had last year.

Motion was made by Rev. Branch, seconded by Mrs. Golub, to approve as recommended. Motion passed.

Rev. Branch suggested that the Board commend Dr. Norton and his Committee for their fine and diligent work.

Director Findley thanked the Board for their fine work during the past year.

VII. The meeting was adjourned at 3:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mrs. Helen Golub  
Secretary

:mlr





COUNCIL FOR ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES IN GREATER CLEVELAND  
1350 West Third Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44113

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Board of Trustees DATE: October 13, 1967  
FROM: Donald S. Carmichael, Chairman  
SUBJECT: Synopsis of Evaluation of "1060B"

Relationship to Evaluation Program

The "1060B" Program was designed and implemented during an "exploratory" phase of the CEO/Battelle Memorial Institute Project when the basic systems analysis approach to program evaluation was being worked out. "1060B" offered an opportunity to test the applicability of this "objective-activities-measures of effectiveness approach".

Further, CEO is developing a schedule for building an evaluation procedure into its programs from the outset, thus providing for the collection of necessary information on program participants during program operation. "1060B", because it came along at a crucial moment in this development and because it was small enough and of a short enough duration to minimize cost and effort, served as a useful test case for built-in evaluation.

Methodology

Four principal methods were selected to obtain the information needed to evaluate the program:

- (1) To measure attitude change that might be attributed to "1060B", three scales were administered to a sample of enrollees prior to program exposure, and again six weeks into the program. The scales measured attitude toward self (how the enrollee felt about how other people saw him), intrafamily conflict (parent-child friction), and attitudes about society in general (estrangement);
- (2) To determine the family background of participants, and how they evaluated the program, two hundred randomly selected enrollees were interviewed.

October 18, 1967

- (3) To identify the population (age, sex, neighborhood of residence, etc.) reached by the "1060B" program, the entire central file was reviewed. Each application was reviewed individually, and the pertinent information transcribed to an alphabetized list.
- (4) To obtain agency assessments of enrollee work performance, and to explore problem areas, a questionnaire was submitted to a sample of agency supervisors.

## FINDINGS

### The Enrollees

2,063 boys and girls were processed and placed on the "1060B" payroll. Of these, 62.4% were male, 37.6% female; although far more girls applied for admittance to the program, the demand for male personnel was far greater than for female.

More than thirty-five percent (36.4%) of the enrollees were 14, 40.5% were 15, and 23.1% were 16 years of age.

More than 90% of the "1060B" enrollees came from the five target areas (Central, Glenville, Hough, Kinsman, Near West-Tremont); over 90% (91.3%) met poverty criteria which required that the source of family income be public funds, or that family size and private income place the family in poverty status.

Further, 88.5% of the enrollees came from families where one or both parents were not employed, and only about 50% (53.5%) of the youngsters came from intact families.

### The Program

The "1060B" Program, intended to provide employment for 1900 young people, eventually processed over 2,000. Of these, only 5.2% dropped out of the program before it was completed.

The jobs performed by "1060B's" fell predominantly into the general maintenance category (62.8%). Some 25% of the enrollees were involved in activities intended to provide cultural enrichment for themselves or others. Slightly over 5% performed clerical tasks and the remainder were engaged in child care activities.

Both agency supervisors and enrollees were asked to evaluate the program. Agency supervisors overwhelmingly approved of enrollee job performance (91%) and felt that the presence of the "1060B's" had contributed materially to the accomplishment of agency tasks (99.9%). The dissatisfactions of the agency supervisors with the program centered on administration and supervision rather than on the enrollees themselves.



October 18, 1967

The enrollees voiced satisfaction with the program, and expressed an interest in participating again (99.5%).

#### The Enrollee in the Program

Two principal evidences of the impact which the program had upon the lives of the enrollees were turned up in the evaluation. When asked how they would have spent the summer if they had not been employed with "1060B", 70% or more of the enrollees' replies indicated that they would likely have remained idle for the summer.

Further, although no significant differences were found between the group's before and after scores on the Parent-Child Friction-Harmony and Anomie attitude scales, a significant improvement in their self-concept was unearthed.

#### INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

There are two vital areas of concern in interpreting these findings--did the program fulfill its stated objectives, and did it have significant impact upon the people it was intended to help?

There were five objectives of the "1060B" program:

Objective (1), to provide employment for 1900 youths 14-16 years of age, was fulfilled beyond expectation. More than 2,000 boys and girls were accepted and employed by "1060B".

Objective (2), to provide these youths with a chance to develop good work habits, seems to have been achieved. The firm approval given the work performance of enrollees by their employers indicates that enrollees' work habits were sound.

Although some effort was made to pursue Objective (3), encourage enrollees to return to school, there is no clear cut evidence as to the effect that the "1060B" program may have had on enrollee intention to return to school.

Objective (4), to provide employment as work team supervisors to 75 neighborhood pupils, was achieved. Seventy-three such individuals were employed. An additional 39 were employed part-time in a similar capacity. Of these 112, 83.4% resided in the five target poverty areas.

Objective (5), to provide needed manpower to public and private non-profit organizations, was achieved. As was noted above, the vast majority of the agency supervisors questioned felt that enrollees contributed to their work output, and that they performed their duties satisfactorily.

The impact of the program on the target population is difficult to gauge; however, the findings of this evaluation indicate that "1060B"

October 18, 1967

provided an opportunity for the enrollees to become involved in productive activities and, at the same time, have an income for the summer of 1967.

Further, there is evidence that the "1060B" program may have had some lasting effect upon the young people who participated in it. The significant improvement in the self-estimate of the enrollees, despite only six weeks' exposure to the program, suggests an implicit, but vital, objective of "1060B" may have been achieved.

#### IMPLICATIONS FROM THE EVALUATION FOR PLANNING

##### Participants

The program administration encountered some difficulties in placing female enrollees and 14 year olds of both sexes. These difficulties in placement can likely be attributed to the lateness of funding--the last-minute funding compelled selection of job sites on the basis of immediate need for enrollees and an ability to accommodate large numbers of enrollees. As a result, many of the job sites selected required the performance of physically taxing of jobs not suited for females. Both younger enrollees and girls stand to benefit as much as older males from exposure to work experience; additional time between funding and the opening of the program would permit the devotion of more effort to developing work sites that are suitable for these difficult-to-place enrollees.

SF:jbt

COUNCIL FOR ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES IN GREATER CLEVELAND

1350 West Third Street

Cleveland, Ohio 44113

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

MINUTES

Regular Meeting

January 17, 1968

ATTENDANCE:

Mr. Charles P. Lucas, Presiding

Mr. H. E. Boehm  
Rev. E. S. Branch, Jr.  
Mr. D. S. Carmichael  
Mrs. S. Carroll  
Mr. J. C. Fisher  
Mrs. H. Golub  
Mr. P. B. Hamilton  
Dr. J. A. Norton  
Very Rev. A. J. Quinn

Rev. R. S. Shoup  
Mr. J. V. Stanton  
Mrs. J. Stubbs  
Mr. R. B. Tullis  
Mrs. G. Wise  
(Mr. John Lee sitting in  
attendance for Mr. G. Dobrea)  
(Mr. John Spezzaferro sitting in  
attendance for Mr. F. Gorman)

- I. The Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Council for Economic Opportunities in Greater Cleveland was called to order by Mr. Charles P. Lucas, Vice President, at 2:19 p.m. on Wednesday, January 17, 1968 in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, Cleveland, Ohio with the above members present and constituting a quorum.
- II. The Minutes of the last Regular Meeting of December 20, 1967 were approved as mailed.
- III. There was no correspondence.
- IV. Report of the Executive Director:

Director Findley referred to an article which appeared in the local press during the past week. The article mentioned the fact that Cleveland had missed out on poverty funds. Director Findley stated that these funds were not the responsibility of the Council. The money would have been funded to the city by the Department of Housing and Urban Development for a Multi-Purpose Social Service Center. These were not funds to the Council. However, the Neighborhood Social Service Center that Cleveland has processed through the Department of Welfare is proceeding and an application has been submitted to the Chicago Regional Office of HUD. Under the



law, the community action agency must be located in the center. Director Findley stated that, under the law, the Council, as the community action agency, must sign saying that we have been involved in the planning of the center. The Director stated that in signing the application, he made a notation on the document that on the Board of 19 neighborhood residents, there would be three residents from the Hough Community Opportunity Board elected by said COB. This was made a part of the sign-off procedure on the application.

Director Findley referred to the progress report on the Parent/Child Center Program which the Board members had received. He stated that there have been few programs made available on the national level that the Council has not been made a part of. He mentioned the fact that the Council has received the planning grant for this program. Director Findley informed the Board that Mrs. Pringle and Mrs. Graves have gone to Washington to attend a meeting relative to the operations of the proposed center. He further stated that this proposal will be brought before the Board in February for action.

Director Findley stated that it has been the sincere desire on the part of the staff to have a fully operational neighborhood opportunity center in each of the target areas; a center that would be a credit to the community. He stated that we were never pleased with the old location of the Kinsman Neighborhood Opportunity Center. The Director stated that the open house which was held at the new Center last month was quite successful. Director Findley then introduced Mr. Paul Jackson, the new Director of the Kinsman NOC and stated that Mr. Jackson had started with the Neighborhood Youth Corps and had also worked as an Outreach Worker and supervisor of Outreach.

Mr. Jackson stated that the reason the open house was such a success was the fact that there was a great deal of cooperation from everyone concerned. He noted that Mr. George Hancin and his staff did a splendid job in giving the Center maximum news coverage; the councilmen from the area were very cooperative; the NOC staff and the Council staff worked especially hard, as did the members of the community. Mr. Jackson stated that the official opening of the Center was December 21st but on December 20th they did have some 900 children come to the Center for distribution of Christmas toys. They also gave away 150 turkeys which were donated to the Center from Fisher-Fazio-Costa Foods. He stated that some 500 people were in attendance for the open house.

Mr. Jackson stated that the Kinsman Neighborhood Opportunity Center will attempt two new projects: one will be job development, and the other will be an area beautification project in conjunction with the councilmen who have constituents in the target area. He further stated that staff morale is high as well as enthusiasm. He stated that they are quite pleased with the new location and they expect great things from the Kinsman NOC.

Director Findley then read the following telegram from Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey: "I am sure that you will be pleased to know that the President's Council on Youth Opportunity has been able to earmark limited funds from the various federal agencies to support the planning for your summer 1968 Youth Opportunity Program. One of the things all of us learned from last summer's experience was that effective planning and management was the key to successful programs.

"Because the President and I feel so strongly about this matter, planning money can be made available to your community action agency by the Office of Economic Opportunity. These funds are to enable you, in consultation with the Mayor, to select a full-time coordinator to assume leadership and responsibility for coordinating the planning and execution of summer youth programs of work, recreation, and learning. It is essential that these planning efforts be closely coordinated with the office of the Mayor in your city. I expect that you will be in contact with the Mayor to arrange to discuss the selection of the coordinator and the program for the city. I am sending a similar telegram to the Mayor on this subject, a copy of which you will receive by regular mail.

"The appointment of a youth coordinator is of crucial importance for five reasons:

He will be a focal point for all of the local efforts undertaken by municipal agencies.

He will be the person to whom voluntary organizations which are willing to make an effort in your community can be referred.

He will be a central liaison officer to whom we can turn for information about local programs and, conversely, to whom we can offer assistance at the national level.

He will stimulate efforts by the private sector and coordinate all youth-oriented activities so that they will achieve maximum impact.

He can provide full involvement of the poor in your community in linking their needs to the resources available.

"What is essential is that a workable and meaningful plan be developed involving the full spectrum of local resources such as your office, the Board of Education, private industry, private agencies, and any other resources available to your community. The Mayor of your community may also establish a Mayor's Council on Youth Opportunity. If so, we are requesting this council to work closely with your agency in executing the program. Your Regional



"Office of the Office of Economic Opportunity will be in touch with you regarding specific application for these planning funds. We expect to have a conference in Washington January 29-31 to discuss these plans. Therefore, we need the name of your designee no later than January 8.

"We expect to lend assistance to your local efforts by securing the commitment of prominent business leaders in mounting effective job programs in industry backed up by national promotion through the President's Council on Youth Opportunity. We also are formalizing plans for the use of military facilities, and are addressing ourselves to the education community in terms of summer use of idle facilities for your programs.

"While the Council is ready and anxious to provide maximum assistance at the national level, as you know the success of programs for poor youth depends upon local leadership and the understanding in your community of what needs doing. We hope you will lend the full support of your office in these efforts to improve the lives of our youngsters."

Director Findley stated that we have been in consultation with the Mayor's office and we have developed a planning grant which has gone to Chicago for funding. He then called on Mr. William Whitlatch, Director of the Planning Department, for further details. Mr. Whitlatch stated that we have received the guidelines for developing the summer program. We have been working with Mr. Seymour Slavin and we have developed a planning grant for about \$45,000. A task force is presently being assembled which will consist of specialists from throughout the community to work with two staff planners and the necessary back-up staff to develop a comprehensive package of programs which will be coordinated to provide a program for the city within the means we have available. The task force should be assembled within the next week.

Director Findley stated that we will go through the usual review and bring the program back to the Board for action. The Director thanked Dr. Norton for the use of Mr. Slavin who is a member of Dr. Norton's staff. He stated that Mr. Slavin is also staffing the task force for the Mayor and is doing an excellent job for all concerned.

#### V. Committee Reports:

In giving the report of the Nominating Committee, Mr. Boehm noted that the Mayor of the City of Cleveland is an ex officio member of the Board of Trustees, and that former Mayor Locher was the President of the Board. He stated that it is, however, within the prerogative of the Board to select its president. It has been the opinion of the Nominating Committee that the Mayor should be the president of our Board as his time available would per-

mit. Mayor Stokes did express his strong interest in the Council at the November 15th meeting of the Board. The Committee has been in communication with the Mayor to determine his situation in view of the time standpoint. A letter has been received indicating his willingness to undertake the assignment but he also indicated that his present schedule is so heavy that he would have to miss some of our meetings. However, on such occasions, he would be represented by staff associates. We do recognize the strains on the Mayor's time but would be hopeful that a top staff person would represent the Mayor. On the basis that we will have the presence of the Mayor when possible, we wish to place for nomination as President of the Board of Trustees of the Council for Economic Opportunities in Greater Cleveland the name of Mayor Carl B. Stokes. Dr. Norton seconded the motion. Mr. Hamilton moved that the nominations be closed. Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Boehm stated that the Nominating Committee has additional work and will report again at the next meeting.

Rev. Branch gave the following report of the Management Committee:

At its last meeting on January 10, 1968, the Management Committee, after discussion and deliberation, passed the following resolution: "...that the Management Committee inform the Board of Trustees of the Council for Economic Opportunities at its next meeting of the gravity and urgency of the refunding situation as it pertains to possible cut-back in funds." Pursuant to this resolution, the following information is reported.

- I. Our present information concerning funding for Fiscal Year 1968, and the Council for Economic Opportunities's Program Year "C", which commences February 1, 1968, is just now becoming clear. As of this time, the OEO Great Lakes Regional Office has not furnished the Council's office with any comments in writing. CEO has been informed verbally, however, that the budgets approved for funding by the Board of Trustees of the Council are being cut in the following manner:
  1. All Versatile Community Action Programs, which includes the Council, Neighborhood Opportunity Centers, the Outreach Program, Community Information Service and Resident Participation will be cut by 15% from the funding level of last year.
  2. All full-year Head Start programs, which includes those delegated to the Council of Churches, the Catholic Diocese and Greater Cleveland Neighborhood Centers Association will be cut 20% from the funding level of last year. The law now



reads to require that the local agency meet it with 20% matching funds. This will mean that these programs will only be able to operate for a ten-month period.

All of this is taking place while the Council is being asked to return or receive a credit for the small amount of unused funds left over from previous programs. This comes to about \$150,000. The Legal Services Program, Foster Grandparent Program and Summer Head Start Program will all remain at the same level as in previous years or might receive a small increase in funds.

The Congress, in its recent appropriation for Fiscal Year 1968, announced that a sufficient amount of monies to continue programs at their previously funded level would be available. However, while on the national level this might be true, it does not necessarily follow for each individual region throughout the nation.

The explanation of the Great Lakes Regional Office for the situation facing Cleveland's poverty program is that the allocation of \$60 million available in Fiscal Year 1967 for Community Action Programs has been, or will be, reduced to approximately \$48 million affecting a 20% cut in monies available throughout the states of Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan and Minnesota. This has not become immediately apparent throughout this region because the refunding of Community Action Programs for Fiscal Year 1968 is phased throughout the year. For example, Cincinnati was funded with similar cuts in November while we are still waiting our funding due beginning Program Year "C" February 1, 1968.

## II. Audits of Program Year "A" - (Ending 1-31-67):

All audits for programs terminating January 31, 1967, have finally been completed. While the reports divulged some administrative and accounting errors, we were resolved and the audits show funds allocated by the Council were used in a manner consistent with OEO regulations. The Council of Churches made a cash refund of an overdrawn account and several other delegates have been informed, unequivocally, that their accounting procedures must conform to OEO guidelines. It is anticipated, with the expanded Finance and Grants Management-Audit Departments, that the fiscal administration of our continuing programs will be greatly strengthened. This is somewhat in jeopardy, however, because of the announced cut in funds.



III. Personnel Policies - Project AIM-Jobs:

It has come to the attention of the Management Committee that the absence of an adequate review procedure with regard to personnel has occasioned some concern among Project AIM-Jobs executive and administrative staff. The Management Committee is aware of the situation and is working with AIM-Jobs to ensure that complete understanding of the jurisdiction of the Council is accomplished.

The Management Committee, of course, will keep the Board of Trustees informed of this development or any others that affect the efficient and orderly conduct of programs coordinated by the Council for Economic Opportunities.

Rev. Branch then requested that staff members further explain the implications of this cutback in funds. Director Findley stated that it was important that this matter be brought to the attention of the Board. He stated that we are in a period of finalizing our Program Year "C" proposal. We were surprised to learn that there would be a 15% cut. We were faced with a similar situation last year with a 50% cut in Versatile CAP funds. However, we were finally able to reduce this cut to 25%. Our community now is trying to face the problems that plague our city. We know what this means to the residents of the target areas. To have to tell these people that we are going to have a 15% cut in funds is not easy. At the suggestion of OEO, we made the Foster Grandparent Program a part of the Council of Churches Head Start Program for Program Year "C". It is now true that we will have to cut back to what we had last year. I can assure you that we have two and three times the number of senior citizens that we had last year who have requested to be included in the program but we will not be able to expand due to the cut in funds.

Director Findley then called on Mr. Frank Catliota and Mr. Curtis Hall to give the specifics relating to the cutback in funds relative to the Neighborhood Opportunity Centers. Mr. Catliota stated that there were 91 Outreach Workers last year but that number had to be reduced to 57. With this cut, we will have to reduce our force to 50 workers. At this same pace, we will be without the resources of the Outreach Program. As you know, Outreach covers five centers and seven satellite offices. The budget is \$700,000. Close to 96% of this is consumed by salaries and space costs; 92% of the personnel come from the target areas.

Mr. Hall stated that, aside from the possible reduction in the Outreach staff, we had a strong mandate from residents for more professional supervisory help. Some of our housekeeping standards are not up to par due to the lack of personnel. This will give you an idea of the kinds of problems that this is

going to create. We have moved into special projects to meet the needs of the community. Due to the cutback, we are trying to rephase these programs in order to keep them going.

Director Findley stated that the Neighborhood Opportunity Centers are the crux of the success of the War on Poverty. Last year we were funded for \$713,000 and were cut back to \$638,000. He further stated that the Community Information Service was funded for \$60,000 last year but will be cut back to \$34,000. Rev. Shoup asked if we have to sit here and take these cuts. Director Findley replied that what we would like to do is use the \$150,000 in unobligated funds committed to us last year. This was part of our funding level last year and we managed our monies well enough to have this left over. We don't like to be penalized for not using this money. Mr. Lucas asked how did we come out last year when we went to Washington. Director Findley replied that we were able to secure about \$300,000 more and, we may have to go to Washington again. Rev. Shoup stated that it does not seem right that we have to share our money with people who have spent theirs. Rev. Branch stated that we need this money and more. Director Findley then called on Mr. Donald L. Martin, Director of the Grants Management Department, to outline the implications of a 20% cut in Head Start-Child Development funds.

Mr. Martin stated that they are exploring the possibility of getting Summer Head Start funds for our full-year program and they will keep the Board informed. In this way, the crisis facing the Head Start Program may not be as great as that facing Versatile CAP. The reductions will affect staff--professionals and non-professionals--the children and the children's parents, and actual program operations. The professionals, especially the much needed and used family service workers and teachers, are already making wage sacrifices to serve in Head Start positions. A further reduction in their already low salaries make their positions a hardship, not just a sacrifice, and very demoralizing. Inevitably, this hardship is going to eventuate in these professionals moving on to other positions. Staff turnover is always disruptive, especially to the children and families. Cuts in the minimal earnings of the non-professionals will create the very problems that the poverty program is intended to alleviate. Any talk or suggestions of the idea that these positions are steps upward and outward into the mainstream of the work world is sorely contradicted by decreases in their earnings rather than expected and deserved increases. Decrease in efforts and skills developed reinforces the often occurring experience that "no matter how constructive my efforts are, I'm going to get no where anyway. Why bother then?"

The number of children served and the children's parents exposure to pre-school experiences will of necessity be substantially reduced. Just as the Head Start Programs have reached the point of being sufficiently mature and experienced to offer more, they would be forced to offer less. Parents are



to be faced with the problem that they encounter too often in other areas of their lives--promises made for a full-year of Head Start experience cannot be honored--and the reasons why come from outside their lives and their powers to effect a reconsideration of the actual needs of the people,

Actual program operations will be greatly affected. Several children currently enrolled in Head Start will have to be dropped from the program in June unless they are eligible for Summer Head Start. There is no money for new equipment or new teaching materials. Both the children and the staff, who are ready to expand their skills, are the losers.

Rev. Shcup asked Director Findley if it is his opinion that Cleveland is being penalized because we did not have a disturbance last year and because Cleveland has elected a Negro mayor. Director Findley replied that he did not believe this to be true. The cities of Detroit and Cincinnati are faced with the same problem. Director Findley stated that a change is needed in the allocation of the funds to be made available--more money for Versatile CAP agencies. On the national level, there is the allocating of funds--Legal Aid, Foster Grandparents. We must be supportive of all of these programs. We are working with new groups and we must have funds in order to carry through. If we can be given the permission to use the \$150,000, we will be able to make it through until next year. Mr. Carmichael stated that it is important that we distinguish between those things which are possible and those things which are not possible. We should support you and your staff in retaining this \$150,000. Some of these cuts are beyond our ability to recover and the only thing that we can do is to raise a rumpous; and, we should build our efforts to retain this \$150,000. Director Findley stated that we should let our congressmen know what our feelings are. Rev. Branch asked if the difficulty lies with the Congress or with the national OEO. Director Findley replied that permission to use the \$150,000 lies with OEO. This is outside of the allocation by Congress. He further stated they will not have to send us any more money but let us use the \$150,000 in unobligated funds. Mr. Hamilton asked if we have already requested the use of this money. Director Findley replied yes, but officially, it will take a motion on the part of the Board. Last Year we were asking for \$400,000 and we did get a little over \$300,000. Rev. Branch asked if he understood correctly that Congress appropriated \$1.7 million for Fiscal Year 1968, maintaining the programs at the same level. Director Findley replied that this is what was reported in the papers. We recognize the problems of the national office; our concern is that we will be able to retain the \$150,000. I think this can be accomplished. Mr. Tullis stated that this is a greater cut than Congress voted. Therefore, if we are being cut more than Congress voted and someone else is being raised, I don't see why we accept this fact that these funds are irretrievable. OEO did this, not Congress. Taking away from us and putting it into some other place is not right. We should question this cut in Washington. Dr. Norton stated that the funds are



Board of Trustees  
MINUTES  
January 17, 1968  
Page 10.

determined by Congress by earmarking. Congress wanted programs put into the areas where programs had not previously been developed. They felt that these areas should be extended. I think we should put a great deal of pressure on the administrative structure of OEO. I think our cause is as just this year as it was last year and we should make every effort to get OEO to take note. Mr. Lucas stated that he remembered the delegation that went to Washington last year which was headed by the Mayor. At that time, we were criticized for not coming sooner. Mrs. Wise made a motion to authorize staff to try to get the \$150,000 in unobligated funds. Mr. Hamilton seconded the motion. Rev. Branch stated that the motion should be more extensive to also include Dr. Norton's statement; namely, that we should put pressure on the national administrative structure of the OEO to acquire the use of the unobligated funds. Motion passed.

VI. There was no correspondence.

VII. The meeting was adjourned at 3:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mrs. Helen Golub  
Secretary

:mlr

COUNCIL FOR ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES IN GREATER CLEVELAND  
1350 West Third Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44113

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

MINUTES

Regular Meeting  
February 21, 1968

ATTENDANCE:

Rev. Emanuel S. Branch, Jr., Presiding

Mr. H. E. Boehm  
Mr. E. F. Burns  
Mr. D. S. Carmichael  
Mr. J. C. Fisher  
Mrs. M. Garnett  
Mrs. H. Golub

Mr. P. B. Hamilton  
Dr. J. A. Norton  
Rev. R. V. Parks  
Rev. R. S. Shoup  
Mr. J. V. Stanton  
Hon. Carl B. Stokes

- I. The Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Council for Economic Opportunities in Greater Cleveland was called to order by Mayor Carl B. Stokes, President, Board of Trustees, at 2:15 p.m. on Wednesday, February 21, 1968 in the City Council Chambers, City Hall, Cleveland, Ohio with the above members present and constituting a quorum.
- II. The Minutes of the last Regular Meeting of January 17, 1968 were approved, as mailed.

Mayor Stokes stated that there will be some very important matters brought before the Council relating to human industrial resources and also other issues. He stated that there will be a detailed report given at the next meeting of the Board. He further stated that his office will need the support of the Board; and, that he wants to be able to resolve any questions which the Board might have. He stated that his office is not interested in putting CEO out of business but rather taking some programs under sponsorship as they can better be operated under a central agency such as the city can offer and, as some of the legislation now suggests, should be done. He stated that this should not reflect on the overall excellent job that the Council has been doing. The Mayor then asked Rev. Branch to preside over the remainder of the meeting as he had to return to his office.

- III. There was no correspondence.

IV. Report of the Executive Director:

Mr. Frank J. Catliota, Deputy Executive Director, gave the following report for Director Findley who could not attend due to a previous commitment. Mr. Catliota stated that Director Findley had not missed a Board meeting previous to today but it was unavoidable.

Mr. Catliota made reference to the conference of the President's Council on Youth Opportunity which was held in Washington, D. C. January 29-31. He stated that it was a working conference relative to youth employment opportunities for the summer and the ensuing months. He stated that Mr. William Whitlatch and Mr. Donald Martin attended that conference along with Director Findley. He further stated that our summer planning grant has been approved in the amount of \$43,291. This will be in concert with the Mayor's Council for Youth Opportunity and other community agencies. Mr. Catliota noted the fact that Mr. Seymour Slavin, who is on loan from Dr. Norton's office, is putting together a task force for the planning of the Summer Youth Opportunity Program. Mr. Catliota then called on Mr. Slavin for a progress report on the Summer Youth Opportunity Program.

Mr. Slavin stated that, right now, the most significant thing is the fact that some planning has taken place at an early date. Previous experience has been for the Federal government to announce grants at the end of June and we would have to very hurriedly mount these programs. He stated that, hopefully, as a result of what is taking place now, of a more orderly process of planning and thinking about what should be done, and most important, of involving people, we will have an opportunity to involve young people in the planning process. He stated that it is very difficult for adults to plan programs for young people. Mr. Slavin stated that we are committed to the fact that no planning can take place with respect to summer youth programs without the full involvement of the young people themselves.

Mr. Slavin stated that the Task Force has been given a deadline. The Federal guidelines have suggested that a compilation of community programs have to be forwarded to the Regional Office of Economic Opportunity and the President's Council on Youth Opportunity by March 15th.

Mr. Slavin named the organizations participating in this Task Force which meets every Friday morning: The Welfare Federation, Catholic Youth Organization, Board of Education, Catholic Board of Education, CORE, Project AIM-Jobs, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Summer Cultural Arts Festival, United Youth Council, and CEOGC. He stated that they are planning to have young people serve as consultants. It was felt that the young people who will be employed on this basis will have a great deal to contribute to this process. We are in a preliminary stage of planning a youth assembly whereby the young



Board of Trustees  
MINUTES  
February 21, 1968  
Page 3.

people will plan their own programs and also run their own conferences in which they will have an opportunity to discuss, among themselves, the kinds of programs they think should be planned in the community. Mr. Slavin announced that a grant has been made available for this purpose so that we do have limited funds with which to proceed. This effort is going forward along with activities of the Mayor's Council on Youth Opportunity. Mr. Dean G. Ostrum of the Ohio Bell Telephone Company is chairman of that Council and is engaged in a city-wide effort to coordinate summer youth recreational and cultural programs.

Rev. Shoup asked why not have five youth consultants from the five target areas. Mr. Slavin stated that it is difficult to say who will be a representative. We have asked the five Neighborhood Opportunity Centers to develop youth assemblies within the Centers. Also, there is the possibility of each of the Centers developing their own programs which can be submitted as part of this package which would provide for direct representation. Mr. Slavin stated that we would like the Centers to do the planning with the young people for these programs. We are mindful of the fact that the Neighborhood Opportunity Centers and the neighborhood groups have to be involved in the planning process. Mr. Hamilton stated that the Cleveland Business League is also involved in this program. Rev. Parks asked if this program will include youth from outside the target areas. Mr. Slavin replied that this is a city-wide program. However, there is a high priority for the target areas. Mr. Catliota then called on Mr. William Whitlatch to give further details relating to the program.

Mr. Whitlatch stated that approximately \$25,000 will be used to hire a full-time, year-round youth coordinator and his staff. The youth coordinator will have primary responsibility for looking out for youth opportunities on a year-round basis. The rest of the money is for the additional planning staff. He stated that we are going out into the community, starting this week, to talk to various groups of young people from the Neighborhood Opportunity Centers so that youth involvement in this planning is a very important part of the process. We are not going to stop after we get this compilation of programs finished. We are going to continue to work with the people in the community to make sure that these programs work.

Mr. Catliota stated that while the Director was in Washington he followed the mandate given him by the Board regarding the reduction in Head Start funds. He stated that, as a result of the fine work of Congressmen Charles Vanik and Michael Feighan, the Head Start cut of 20% was reduced to 6%. The Head Start/Child Development centers will be able to operate on a year-round basis; and, we are still optimistic about the use of unobligated funds.

Board of Trustees  
MINUTES  
February 21, 1968  
Page 4.

Mr. Catliota informed the Board of the following staff changes: Mr. Donald Martin, former Director of the Grants Management Department, has been asked to assume some of the responsibilities of the Asst. Exec. Director and will now serve as Acting Asst. Exec. Director; Mr. Tom Brown, who started as an Outreach Aide and later advanced to Program Specialist, is now serving as Supervisor of the Grants Management Department. Also, Mr. Brown is attending Cuyahoga Community College to complete work toward his degree. Mr. Eddie Stinson, who also started in Outreach and was later promoted to Planning Aide, will be starting, on February 26th, as Supervisor Aide of the Central-West Center.

Mr. Catliota informed the Board that members of the staff will attend a meeting in Chicago next week at which time the 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 will be discussed and the guidelines for implementation explained. This discussion will also include the Green Amendment. He stated also that Director Findley would like to arrange a Board Institute in early March to discuss these items.

Mr. Catliota informed the Board of the Council's preparation of an annual report on the activities of the Council and its delegate agencies. Through the Grants Management Department, we have compiled an excellent Management Information System report. The Regional Office of OEO is so pleased with this report that they have asked our office to meet with representatives from Cincinnati, Columbus and Dayton in order for these cities to learn how this report was put together. Mr. Catliota stated that James Turner, Program Specialist, with the assistance of Mr. Martin, was responsible for putting this report together.

Mr. Catliota stated that we have just completed a Foster Grandparents training program. There are 25 trained Foster Grandparents being readied for placement with various agencies throughout the community that have child centers. We are pleased to announce that these Foster Grandparents will be paid \$1.60 per hour plus their lunches and busfare.

Mr. Catliota stated that the Council is providing staff assistance to Better Homes for Living which is a program sponsored by the Catholic Diocese. This project is located in the Hough Area. He further stated that we are setting up a liaison with the Hough Neighborhood Opportunity Center in order to make staff available to Father Garrity in this project.

Mr. Catliota made reference to the Training Institute which is sponsored by Cleveland College of Case Western Reserve University. He stated that this is a program for non-professional workers; and, within the next



two weeks, our staff will participate in some of the management meetings. Mr. Catliota stated that there were approximately 60 persons in attendance this morning, including aides from Outreach and the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

V. Committee Reports:

Rev. Shoup gave the following report of the Nominating Committee:

The Committee met on Wednesday, February 14, 1968 at 12:00 Noon. All members were present and offered the following nominations to the Board:

For a three-year term:

Mr. Harold E. Boehm  
Rev. Emanuel S. Branch, Jr.  
Mrs. Helen Golub  
Dr. James A. Norton  
Mr. Patrick J. O'Malley  
Very Rev. A. James Quinn

Rev. Shoup moved that these nominations be approved. Motion seconded by Mr. Hamilton. Motion passed.

For the positions of:

First Vice President	Rev. Emanuel S. Branch, Jr.
Second Vice President	Mr. Harold E. Boehm
Secretary	Mrs. Helen Golub
Treasurer	Mr. Paul B. Hamilton

Rev. Shoup moved that these nominations be approved. Motion seconded by Dr. Norton. Motion passed.

Dr. Norton asked the staff to present the report of the Priorities Committee which relates to a special project.

Mr. Whitlatch stated that the Hough Parent/Child Center is a special program which the Council was asked to develop a proposal for. Mrs. Margaret Pringle, the coordinator for this program, developed this proposal with a planning committee from which 50% of the committee members were selected from the Hough Community Opportunity Board.

The Priorities Committee recommends that the Board of Trustees of the Council for Economic Opportunities approve the Hough Parent/Child Center



Board of Trustees  
MINUTES  
February 21, 1968  
Page 6.

Program developed by the Hough Parent/Child Center Planning Committee and its request for federal assistance according to the narrative and budget submitted to the Priorities Committee at its February 7th meeting and subject to the following recommendation: that the delegate agency for this program seek wherever possible to employ target area residents in the program, and make their basis for evaluating the qualifications of applicants for various positions in the program on their ability to perform the required tasks and skills associated with the job, rather than upon the degree which they hold.

Rev. Shoup asked what is the established budget. Mrs. Pringle replied that a final budget has not yet been determined. We have been waiting for the delegate agencies to say what contributions they are going to make to the program. All that we can ask for from federal funds is \$175,000. Motion made by Rev. Shoup, seconded by Mr. Hamilton, to approve. Motion passed.

VI. There was no new business.

VII. The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p. m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mrs. Helen Golub  
Secretary

:mlr

COUNCIL FOR ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES IN GREATER CLEVELAND  
1350 West Third Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44113

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

MINUTES

Regular Meeting  
April 17, 1968

ATTENDANCE:

Rev. Emanuel S. Branch, Jr., Presiding

Mr. H. E. Boehm  
Mr. D. S. Carmichael  
Mr. J. C. Fisher  
Mrs. M. Garnett  
Mrs. H. Golub  
Mrs. L. Graves  
Mr. P. B. Hamilton

Rev. R. V. Parks  
Very Rev. A. J. Quinn  
Rev. R. S. Shoup  
Rabbi D. J. Silver  
Mrs. J. Stubbs  
(Mr. J. A. Spezzaferro sitting in  
attendance for Mr. E. F. Burns)

- I. The Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Council for Economic Opportunities in Greater Cleveland was called to order by Rev. Emanuel S. Branch, Jr., First Vice President, Board of Trustees, at 2:11 p.m. on Wednesday, April 17, 1968 in the Community Service Room of the Cuyahoga Savings & Loan Association Building, Cleveland, Ohio with the above members present and constituting a quorum.
- II. Motion was made by Rev. Shoup, seconded by Rabbi Silver, to approve, as mailed, the minutes of the last Regular Meeting of February 21, 1968. Motion passed.
- III. There was no correspondence.
- IV. Report of the Executive Director:

Director Findley thanked all of the Board members who attended the Board Institute which was held on March 21st in place of the Regular Meeting for the month of March. He said that he trust the Board members were informed and that we were able to answer the questions that they had. He further stated that he also hoped the Board understands how we might proceed in the future.

Director Findley informed the Board of his recent trip to Lima, Ohio where he appeared as guest speaker at their annual meeting. He stated that they

are developing a program, and they look to Cleveland for some of their strengths. Director Findley also informed the Board of James Turner's recent trip to Columbus, Ohio at which time he related to them in helping develop a Management Information System. Director Findley announced that he had attended the annual meeting of the National Association for Community Development which was held in Atlanta, Georgia, and was elected to a three-year term on the Board of Directors. He stated that Mr. McGreal and Mr. Brown also attended and Mr. McGreal participated in the Housing Panel. The Director stated that these meetings are always helpful because we have an opportunity to know what is going on in other parts of the country, to see just how well they are doing, what their problems are, and share in common concerns. He stated that Cleveland stands up very well among other cities. Representatives from other large cities told of their problems with the CEP program for instance. He said we can be proud of some of our accomplishments; that we were able to get our program off the ground and also of the tremendous contribution made by the private business sector.

Director Findley stated that, while in Atlanta, Mr. McGreal, Mr. Brown, and himself, were able to participate in the memorial services for Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. He stated that they were able to go on the march of the funeral procession. Director Findley stated that the morning after Dr. King's death he sent a memo to all of the staff, which included the Outreach workers, in which he made an appeal to them to tell those they work with and the residents of the community to always observe the spirit and teachings of this man who believed in non-violence. A memorial service was also held in our office at 11:00 that Friday morning. The Neighborhood Opportunity Centers were open all night and the Director made a series of rounds during the night and talked with people in the areas. Director Findley paid tribute to the staff for their assistance in helping keep Cleveland "cool".

Director Findley stated that the Neighborhood Opportunity Centers will be kept open longer at night and this will take effect immediately. He noted that this will pose problems as to staffing and funds, but the need is great enough that we will find the resources. Director Findley then called on Mr. Frank Catliota to tell the Board about the upcoming anniversary of the Neighborhood Opportunity Centers.

Mr. Catliota stated this will be the second anniversary of our multi-purpose opportunity centers. The anniversary will be held from May 19th through May 26th. Mayor Stokes will proclaim this Neighborhood Opportunity Center Week. Mr. Catliota stated that formal invitations will be sent to all Board members within the next two weeks. He further stated that most of the plans for the anniversary are being developed by the residents of the NOC. This year we have decided to break up the open houses so that we don't have them



all on one afternoon. He stated that on May 19th open house will be held at Hough & Glenville and on May 26th open house will be held at the West Side, Central, and Kinsman. Mr. Catliota stated that it is the Neighborhood Opportunity Center that provides the neighborhood basis for the diverse services made available in the neighborhoods, plus the community services. The center itself is the vehicle for these programs. Mr. Catliota stated that we do have monthly reports from the Centers and, if desired, we will send the Board the monthly statistical reports. This includes about 20 different services. He further stated that this is largely the central core of the operations in our neighborhoods.

Mr. Catliota informed the Board of the new data processing system which has been set up in our Centers. We are hopeful of going into an IBM type of system. He noted that the data sorting system began on April 1st and it eliminates three records and combines them into one. The new system will be used in the five Centers and seven satellite offices. He stated that a series of meetings will be held in order to teach the staff how to use the new system.

Mr. Catliota informed the Board of the participation of 25 residents and 5 directors in the Community Relations Conference which was held at John Carroll University through the efforts of the NOC and Field Services staff.

Mr. Catliota stated that the Glenville Center has developed an Outreach program at one of the hospitals. The Outreach worker spends one day a week assisting needy persons, informing them of the various services available to them, etc. There is an Outreach staff from Hough that meets with the staff from the Warrensville Workhouse. Central is involved in recruiting for Maternal and Infant Care, the Model Cities Program, Youth Planning, and Buying Clubs Program. The West Side is working on a dental clinic. This is the first area in the city to have this type of service. Tremont is experiencing legal services and job counseling. Mr. Catliota stated that we are beginning to move and develop some of these specialized services in the satellite offices.

Mr. Catliota stated that we are hopeful the Board members will have a chance to visit at least one of the Centers during NOC Anniversary Week.

Director Findley stated that the Centers will definitely remain open in the evenings as well as on Saturdays. He also stated that, along with the anniversary, we will have the annual report. This report will cost approximately \$5,000. The Director stated that he was pleased to announce that The Plain Dealer has agreed to print our annual report without any cost to the Council. He noted that they have assigned many of their people to work on this report and we are grateful to Mr. Vail and The Plain Dealer staff. This kind of involvement has made our program successful. The report will be ready by the start of open house.

Director Findley then called on Mr. William Whitlatch for a brief outline of what the Planning Department is involved in. Mr. Whitlatch stated that they have been working with Project HOPE in developing their proposal for their housing operation. They are also working with Hough Housing Corporation and Better Homes for Living. They are involved in developing a proposal for Project Pride with Mr. Baxter Hill and the Greater Cleveland Associated Foundation and other agencies. Mr. Whitlatch stated that we do have a commitment to provide 400 summer jobs.

Director Findley announced that the Comprehensive Family Health Care Program will soon be up for refunding. The proposal was sent to Washington on Monday. There will be no narrative changes, however, there will be budget changes. He stated that we are quite positive there will be no reduction in funds. The proposal will be processed through the Hough Community Opportunity Board and will go through our usual review committees and come to the Board for approval. We hope that program will be announced as funded prior to the third Monday in May. Director Findley announced also that we might have to ask Board approval by mail for this proposal so as not to delay the announcement of approved grant funds.

Director Findley announced that the Head Start funds would be reduced to 6% instead of the 15% reduction which was originally announced. This 6% cut is about the lowest reduction in Head Start in comparison to other cities around the country. We did receive a 2% reduction in Versatile CAP funds. This, certainly, can be absorbed. Director Findley then gave the following breakdown of the distribution of funds: Conduct & Administration, \$466,356; Neighborhood Opportunity Centers & Community Information Service, \$703,924; Resident Participation, \$128,097; Geauga Day Care, \$24,914; Day Nursery Day Care, \$213,244; Full Year Head Start (Council of Churches, Catholic Diocese, GCNCA), \$831,516; local share, \$655,000; Total - \$3,033,051.00.

Director Findley stated that the Hough Community Council was funded as a neighborhood-based group to be delegated the responsibility of resident participation. We have a commitment of continuing to recommend to the Board of Trustees the delegation of certain programs to neighborhood-based groups. Rabbi Silver stated that we ought to put before the Board an audit of the unmet needs. We should let the community know that we are doing the job up to the level for which we are funded. Rev. Branch replied that this was one of the major points which Professor Moynihan made in his study. His judgment was that agencies had done a disservice to the extent that they had allowed the community to think that we have done an adequate job when actually there was never enough money.

Mr. Whitlatch stated that the Council was asked by the Bureau of the Budget to make an estimate as to what would be the amount of money we would need



to mount the type of program we felt the community needed and would support. We feel that we would need \$100 million to meet the needs of the community. We presently have \$15 million worth of programs.

Mr. Martin stated that, by way of informing the Board as to what progress we are making, we have received, not from the Cleveland papers but papers in the suburban areas, notice that in the GAO final audit report to the Congress, the Cleveland NYC program was commended for its efforts in responding in a very positive and forthright way to the criticisms which were made at that time. Rev. Branch stated that we are going to respond to the kind of negative reporting that has come about recently. Rev. Shoup asked who is in charge of public relations for the Council. Director Findley replied that George Hancin is our public information officer. Mr. Carmichael asked who handles program information. Director Findley replied this is handled by George Hancin.

V. Committee Reports:

Mr. Carmichael gave the following report for the Special Committee for Program Evaluation: The most difficult part of the job is to program what goes into the computer before you can hope for any results. The Research Department has been working with the people from Battelle Memorial Institute and have now produced the systems analysis model which will be used as a basis for evaluating the programs of the Council. We now have the model that can be used with respect to all of the programs that are in the CEO orbit as well as any other kind of social work program. Evaluation of social work programs is a primary project. It is not something that there is a great deal of knowledge about. Cleveland is in the forefront of developing capabilities in this area. Other cities have asked if we will impart what knowledge we have to them. We are considering some sort of seminar in which we will have people in from many cities to review our program and, perhaps, we can set up a model that the country can follow.

Mr. Carmichael stated that they hope to prepare a manual which will tell how to evaluate a program. This will take about two months. We will evaluate the programs that exist and the Research Department will be helpful in future planning. Rev. Branch stated that we hope to get some positive promotion out of this along with the Mayor's office. Mr. Boehm asked if we have had any communication with the research unit of The Welfare Federation in this work. Mr. Carmichael replied the Federation has looked to the work that is being done by the Council as a guide. Mr. Martin stated that members of the Council's staff appeared before the Evaluation Subcommittee of The Welfare Federation and shared all of the work that we have done with that committee. As a result of that meeting, we responded in writing giving, in depth, a number (almost 200) of the various criteria which were valid statements of accomplish-



Board of Trustees

MINUTES

April 17, 1968

Page 6.

ment accounts which the type of program we have been engaged in were measured. We have shared our files and progress with them. Mr. Carmichael stated that The Welfare Federation has not developed much sophistication in their evaluation. Mr. Boehm stated that they do have a fair amount of data in their research unit. This is basic to the beginning of some of the anti-poverty programs. Mr. Garnett stated that we have been in contact with the research department there and this will continue. We will need the type of information they have on certain work that has been done in identifying and developing various indexes of poverty. We will be using their data. Mr. Carmichael stated there is a lot of difference between having the data and knowing how to use it and evaluate it. Rabbi Silver stated he thinks this is the first time Cleveland has had a systems analysis. Could we use this to draw from SASS, The Welfare Federation, Department of Labor, one central unit where this information could be stored on tapes so that each group doesn't go into a brand new field with the making of new models and cost, etc. Mr. Garnett stated that this is an urban data bank but it is difficult to get all of these organizations to cooperate. The Battelle Memorial Institute Urban Studies Center had experience along this line. Director Findley stated that the staff will explore this. Mr. Martin stated that the first step in trying to establish data cooperation is being undertaken with the Legal Aid Society. Mr. Boehm replied that this was an excellent suggestion. We have a problem as an entity that we have less stability of tenor than some other organizations do. We have to work together where it will have best longevity.

Mr. Hamilton then gave the following report of the Priorities Committee: At its April 16, 1968 meeting, the Priorities Committee of the Board of Trustees of the Council for Economic Opportunities reviewed and heard recommendations from the Proposal Review Subcommittee relating to the allocation of OEO funds and the operation of summer programs. Based upon these recommendations and the Committee's review of the programs, the following recommendations were made:

Recommendation I - RE: Youth Employment Program--Summer, 1968 (follow up of 1060A & B). Rev. Parks moved, Mr. Hamilton seconded, that the Youth Employment Program for the summer of 1968 of the Council for Economic Opportunities as presented to the Committee, and its request for federal assistance in the amount of \$62,000 be approved by the Board of Trustees of the Council for Economic Opportunities.

Recommendation II - RE: Community Campership Program. Mr. Hamilton moved, seconded by Rev. Parks, that the Community Campership Program as presented to the Committee, and its request for federal assistance be approved by the Board of Trustees of the Council for Economic Opportunities subject to the availability of federal and local funds.

Board of Trustees

MINUTES

April 17, 1968

Page 7.

to carry out the program and the incorporation of the following amendments to the program:

1. A committee consisting of one resident from each of the target areas be selected to assist the Mayor's Council on Youth Opportunity in the selection of those programs which shall receive campership.
2. In making its selection of the programs to receive camperships, the above mentioned committee shall give priority to those programs which:
  - a. provide residential camping for 10-13 year olds;
  - b. are operated by agencies and organizations from the target area that will have a continuing program in the neighborhood that is served;
  - c. provide camping for the largest number of youth at the minimum cost.

Recommendation III - RE: East Cleveland Board of Education Summer Head Start. The Priorities Committee recommends that the Summer Head Start Program of the East Cleveland Board of Education as presented to the Proposal Review Subcommittee at its March 18, 1968 meeting and its request for federal assistance in the amount of \$25,000 as submitted by the Council be approved by the Board of Trustees of the Council for Economic Opportunities, and that the East Cleveland Board of Education be commended for its efforts to provide and support the opportunities of the Head Start Program to all children in that community regardless of their economic status.

Motion made by Rev. Shoup, seconded by Mr. Carmichael, to approve the recommendations of the Priorities Committee. Motion passed.

VI. New Business

Mr. Martin stated that, in keeping with the new Green Amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Council's Board of Trustees will have to come into conformity with that amendment by providing 1/3 of its seats to residents of the target areas served by the program; 1/3 of its seats have to be made available to public officials (in this instance, appointments would be made by the Mayor); the remaining 1/3 balance of the Board is to be composed of representatives of various social agencies and institutions. This will require us to revise the seating of our Board in order to meet the new guidelines.



Board of Trustees

MINUTES

April 17, 1968

Page 8.

The Board will have to adopt such a structure by July 1, 1968. By May 1st, we have to file a statement with the Office of Economic Opportunity stating just how we intend to come into conformity with the new requirements. Mr. Boehm asked if this is the same structure the Board was told about in February. Mr. Martin replied that the membership of the Board is the same set up, having independent agencies with a governing board. Director Findley stated that the May 1st date does not include names, just the structure. Mr. Martin stated that in the case of the 1/3 representatives from agencies and institutions, we are required to designate various interest groups and agencies. They in turn will select whom they wish to have represent them. Rev. Parks asked if the poverty residents are to be selected by the residents or the Community Opportunity Boards. Mr. Martin replied the procedure has already been certified and approved by the Office of Economic Opportunity as meeting the democratic requirements of election. The Community Opportunity Boards can appoint who they wish to represent them on the Board of Trustees. Rev. Parks asked who is going to select the 1/3 poverty area representatives. Mr. Martin replied each of the COB's will elect two. Mr. Boehm asked if the present law states that the 1/3 public officials have to be selected by the Mayor. Mr. Martin replied yes. Mr. Hamilton asked who says what agencies will be represented. Director Findley replied that this will be up to the Board. Mrs. Golub asked, in regard to the 1/3 residents, must they meet the requirements of the poor. Mr. Martin replied no, they must be residents of the target area. Mrs. Golub stated this should have been cleared up because some discussion was raised on the West Side regarding this point. Mr. Catliota stated they must be representatives of the poor. Rev. Shoup moved that the Board accept this proposal and direct the Nominating Committee to make recommendations to the Board. Rev. Branch moved that a proposal to reorganize the Board be accepted. He stated that the Board would have to be increased by at least six (6) members. Mr. Carmichael asked if this would make it a thirty-six member Board. Rev. Branch replied yes. Motion passed.

Rev. Branch stated that the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees recognizes its responsibility to the poor. He stated that we have to put down in writing the concerns we have and which the Mayor should be apprised of. He stated that we must inform him that there may be some political advantages of the CEO coming under the city and also some built-in liabilities. We are waiting to discuss this with him. We think this is our responsibility. Rev. Shoup asked if we could move that the recommendations of the Executive Committee become the recommendations of the Board. Mr. Carmichael stated that it seems that we ought to have a discussion with the Mayor to find out what he has in mind and formal action ought to wait until we have talked with him. Mr. Boehm stated it would not be out of order to read the recommendations of the Executive Committee just for information. Rev. Branch stated we might be in a better position and the Mayor might find it easier if he does



Board of Trustees  
MINUTES  
April 17, 1963  
Page 9.

not find that this has become public information. Mr. Carmichael stated that the Board is taking steps to inform the Mayor that there are two points of view. Rev. Shoup stated that we don't want to wait until it is too late to effect a change. Rev. Parks agreed with Rev. Branch. He stated that the newspapers are allowed to print too much as it is. Rev. Branch stated that he wanted to let the Board know that the Executive Committee is trying to get to the Mayor to let him know that we are all working for the same thing.

VII. The meeting adjourned at 3:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mrs. Helen Golub  
Secretary

:mlr



COUNCIL FOR ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES IN GREATER CLEVELAND

1350 West Third Street

Cleveland, Ohio 44113

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

MINUTES

Regular Meeting

May 15, 1968

ATTENDANCE:

Mr. Harold E. Boehm, Presiding

Rev. E. S. Branch, Jr.

Mrs. S. Carroll

Mr. J. C. Fisher

Mrs. H. Golub

Mrs. L. Graves

Mr. P. B. Hamilton

Rev. R. V. Parks

Rev. R. S. Shoup

Mrs. G. Wise

(Mr. J. A. Spezzaferro sitting in  
attendance for Mr. E. F. Burns)

(Mr. John Lee sitting in atten-  
dance for Mr. George Dobrea)

- I. The Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Council for Economic Opportunities in Greater Cleveland was called to order by Mr. Harold E. Boehm, Second Vice President, Board of Trustees, at 2:15 p.m. on Wednesday, May 15, 1968 in the Community Service Room of the Cuyahoga Savings & Loan Association Building, Cleveland, Ohio with the above members present and constituting a quorum.
- II. The Minutes of the last Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees of April 17, 1968 were approved, as mailed.
- III. There was no correspondence.
- IV. Committee Reports:

Mr. Paul Hamilton gave the following report of the Priorities Committee:

The Priorities Committee recommends that the Hough-Norwood Family Health Care Center Proposal, as presented to the Proposal Review Subcommittee at its May 13, 1968 meeting, and its request for federal assistance in the amount of \$2,700,000 be approved by the Board of Trustees of the Council for Economic Opportunities subject to the incorporation and acceptance of the following recommendations:

Recommendation #1

That an acceptable set of income criteria for determining who shall receive free service, along with an acceptable fee schedule for those families whose incomes exceed that income criteria, be developed with the Hough Community Opportunity Board.

The reason for this recommendation is that everyone, including lower-middle and middle-income residents are entitled to convenient and good medical care. Because of the lack of medical facilities within the Hough community, all residents should have the opportunity of availing themselves of these new additional facilities. While recognizing that Congress has mandated that OEO funded programs be directed towards low-income families, medical indigency must be conceived in a different light than poverty. While no one wants families who can afford to pay for health services to deprive low-income families of the availability of health services, a fee schedule for families with incomes over the level of indigency must be established that will not discourage area neighborhood residents from availing themselves of the health facilities.

Recommendation #2

That a better means of advertising the Hough-Norwood Family Health Care Center and its program be developed and implemented.

The reason for this recommendation is that too many people who need health care in the area are not aware of the health center and its services.

Recommendation #3

That it be made a condition of the contract between the Council for Economic Opportunities and the Cleveland Neighborhood Health Services, Inc. that 1/3 of its Board of Trustees consist of consumers or potential consumers of the services of the Hough-Norwood Family Health Care Center selected by the Hough Community Opportunity Board.

The reason for this recommendation was to involve those that were to receive the services as much as possible.

Director Findley stated that when the Comprehensive Family Health Care Proposal was funded, the relationship of the CAP agency was limited. It was our feeling that since the CEOGC was the grantee agency and the applicant agency, we had certain responsibilities for the program and that we should be involved in a more meaningful way with the program. He further stated that Mr. James Turner of our staff has been relating with the Neigh-



neighborhood Health Services board as well as with Washington. This proposal has been processed through the Hough Community Opportunity Board, Advisory Committee, Priorities Committee, and now this Board. Our real commitment for the involvement of residents in a meaningful way should be upheld. That is why this third recommendation will involve an appointment of 1/3 residents as members of the governing body.

Rev. Shoup stated that one of the last acts of the Community Participation Committee was to insist that Norwood come into the Hough COB. He asked how has this come about. Rev. Parks replied that this recommendation has been approved. The Hough COB thought this was a good suggestion and they should be cooperating with us. Director Findley stated that another neighborhood conference has been set up and it feeds into the Hough COB. They all come in as one. Rev. Shoup asked if they would have representation on the Hough COB. Director Findley replied yes.

Mr. Fisher stated that Hough should have high priority on this health center but what is being done for the West Side. Director Findley stated that the West Side is getting a new health center. This is from the city and the building is already started. Mr. Fisher asked is CEO involved in this. Director Findley replied no, this is a city project. Mr. Boehm stated there is a comprehensive service center under consideration now as part of the city and Welfare Federation activities. Director Findley stated that it is to be built at East 86 and Hough. We would insist that the corporation have three members of the Hough COB as members. We will move the operations of the Hough NOC into the new building. Mr. Whitlatch stated that Mr. McGreal has worked very closely with them in developing their administrative services.

Mrs. Wise stated that Kinsman should be the second target area having priority for health services. She asked if this is still true. Director Findley replied yes, as money is made available for a new center. This has to be done in cooperation with the city. This would be a good question to take up with the city as we work with them in Fiscal Year 1969 funds. Mr. Hamilton noted that Dr. Finley stated there have been some investigations for a center for the Kinsman Area. Director Findley replied yes, this is part of the Mayor's commitment for expansion of medical care centers. Mr. Boehm stated that these activities indicate that there are many people trying to work together to come to some common results.

Motion was made by Mr. Hamilton, seconded by Mrs. Wise, to approve the recommendations of the Priorities Committee. Motion passed.

V. Report of the Executive Director:

Director Findley stated that the cost of printing an annual report is a very expensive operation and we could not do it within our budget. We were very pleased that, through Mr. Hancin working with the Plain Dealer, we were able to get them to cover the entire cost of printing the 2,000 reports. As noted by Mr. Vail, it has been a difficult task trying to develop and mobilize the kind of involvement that we have had. This testifies to the kind of support the Board has given.

Director Findley stated that we have various programs in our centers that we do not have to use our allocation of Versatile CAP funds for. Maternal and Infant Care was funded out of money from H.E.W., which was designed to be located in the centers. We were pleased in working with Family Planning that \$225,000 was committed for the operation of this program which is located within the Neighborhood Opportunity Centers. Other communities use money from Versatile CAP for the operation of these programs. We received a letter from the Cooperative League of the United States in which they stated: "... We appreciate very much all the help that has been given to our Urban Demonstration in Cleveland. From October to April 1 we were located in the Hough Opportunity Center. During that time we organized a number of buying clubs, but primarily we were interested in locating a group of people who displayed leadership, energy and a will to help themselves. We found this in Hough." When we heard that the Cooperative League was funded by OEO, we contacted them and the first project developed to be used in the urban cities was the one used in our NOC. We take some sense of pride in the development of buying clubs. These programs are not listed in the annual report but we have to keep this in mind. If we were to add on the additional funds, we would have a more complete picture of the impact of our programs. Last year we were able to bring into our city and command the support of the OEO the 7th largest amount of allocation in the country.

Director Findley stated that the monthly report was mailed to the Board and it gives the picture of what is happening in summer planning. The newspaper from the Neighborhood Youth Corp was completely done by the enrollees themselves. There is no censorship by CEO staff. These youngsters are learning a skill and an art that will stand them in good stead. Director Findley stated that he was pleased when two of the NYC reporters interviewed him.

Director Findley stated that we have been working with Mr. Dean Ostrum and the Mayor's committee in developing a coordinated program for the summer. The neighborhood residents have said what they want. Director Findley then referred to a letter which was received from George D. McCarthy, Assistant Director for Congressional Relations, OEO. Mr. McCarthy made a state-



ment that the residents in Cleveland had given low priority to the summer camping program. Director Findley stated this was not the case. What the residents did say was that with the limited amount of funds, out of the \$635,000 made available, \$625,000 should be made available for work experience programs. Director Findley stated that efforts should be made by OEO to find sources of funds for the camping program. Congressman Vanik is helping to try to pry aloose funds that we might have a meaningful involvement in summer camping programs. Hopefully, we will find additional funds.

Director Findley stated that he would like to give the Board an overview of what is taking place in the Neighborhood Opportunity Centers. He stated that the Mayor did sign a proclamation for Neighborhood Opportunity Centers Week. He stated that he hoped all of the Board members would be able to visit one of the Centers during Anniversary Week. He further stated that it is very seldom that a board of trustees will make such sacrifices and contributions as our Board has. We realize this is because you want to help and you do have a commitment and a dedication. Director Findley further stated that the NOC is the focal point for all of the activities that we have. We want the recommendations and suggestions of the Board. Rev. Parks stated that it is his understanding that Mayor Stokes will not be available to attend any of the ceremonies. Director Findley replied that the Mayor does have a very busy schedule. Director Findley then read the following proclamation from Mayor Stokes:

Designating the Week of May 19 - 26, 1968, as  
"NEIGHBORHOOD OPPORTUNITY CENTERS WEEK"

WHEREAS, the five Neighborhood Opportunity Centers are making a vital contribution daily in uplifting the living standards of the city's underprivileged residents in Cleveland's continuing war on poverty; and

WHEREAS, these centers form a united front in helping the less fortunate of all ages toward new opportunities, preventing school dropouts, combating juvenile delinquency, and bettering family life; and

WHEREAS, these centers through their staff members and other volunteers have contributed unselfishly in time and effort in the constant struggle to overcome the social problems of our city; and

WHEREAS, the City of Cleveland desires to pay recognition to the dedication and achievement of the five Neighborhood Opportunity Centers, which are completing their second year of outstanding service to our community.



NOW, THEREFORE, I, Carl B. Stokes, as Mayor of the City of Cleveland, do hereby proclaim the period of May 19-26, 1968, as "NEIGHBORHOOD OPPORTUNITY CENTERS WEEK" in Cleveland and extend congratulations and best wishes to the Neighborhood Opportunity Centers on this occasion.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have  
hereunto set my hand and caused  
the Corporate Seal of the City of  
Cleveland to be affixed this 30th  
day of April, 1968.

(signed) CARL B. STOKES

Director Findley then called on Mr. Curtis Hall, Director, Neighborhood Opportunity Centers, to give a rundown on the activities of the NOC.

Mr. Hall introduced the directors of the NOC, with the exception of Mr. Scott who was unable to attend. Mr. Hall stated that the Neighborhood Opportunity Centers have been officially funded at approximately the same level as last year. Total funding is \$876,212. Of that total \$669,000 is federal and \$207,000 is in-kind.

Mr. Hall stated that the Centers now have new hours. The Centers are open five days a week from 8:30 a.m. until 9:00 p.m. and on Saturdays from 8:30 a.m. until 12: p.m. He further stated that we are not getting a flood of people as yet but the directors are actively working on programs that can be implemented during these new hours. The Center directors have been instructed to concentrate on involving the young people in the areas in Center activities.

Mr. Hall stated that Outreach is involved in many activities. In coordination with the city, Hough and Central Outreach are very much involved with the Model Cities Program. Staff has been assigned to work for the next three months on this project. We are providing them with office space, supplies, telephone service, etc. We are trying to do our part in cooperating with this project.

In regards to resident participation, Mr. Hall stated that recommendations have been followed quite closely. New guidelines have been set forth in writing to the Field Service and they will integrate more with the overall NOC activities. The policies and priorities of Field Service will be determined and set by the Community Opportunity Boards and that the Center director will have the responsibility for seeing that these policies and priorities as set forth by the COE are implemented.

Mr. Hall stated that, with regard to recruitment for summer programs, we currently have 22 Outreach personnel assigned to 11 target area junior high schools. Having learned from last year, we were determined to get the word out early this year.

Mr. Hall informed the Board of a new group in Cleveland which is called the Consumer Information Bureau. This was set up by a group in Cleveland to get more information about credit, credit practices, everything concerned with consumer buying. We did submit a proposal to Dr. Norton and we have received word that this might be funded. We want to teach our Outreach staff about consumer affairs so they will be able to get this information to the general public in their day-to-day work.

Mr. Hall invited the Board members to the graduation exercises of Outreach which will be held on June 14th at 10:00 at the Congregational Church on Euclid Avenue.

Mr. Hall then introduced Rev. Wilbert Jackson, Director, Hough Neighborhood Opportunity Center. Rev. Jackson stated there are some interesting problems in Hough and the Center is aware of the basic needs of that community. He stated that Hough is one of the most severely poverty-ridden areas in the United States where the percentage of crime and vice is one of the highest. Everyday we are brought face to face with some of the worst social problems.

Rev. Jackson stated that they have set up a special pilot project for ex-convicts which is handled through the Outreach staff. The Outreach workers go out to various industries and companies and explain the problems and the needs of the men who want to become law-abiding citizens. We correspond with some of the convicts and, at times, visit them. We talk with probation officers and send letters of recommendation stating that we will try to help these individuals secure employment. We believe in the value of human personality, we believe these people are human being and have had a rough time and have not had the opportunity that some of us have had. We call them in when they are released and we try to counsel them so that they will not get back into the same situation they were in previously.

Rev. Jackson then introduced Mrs. Pinikovar, one of the Hough Area Outreach workers, who displayed some of the merchandise she has been able to obtain by saving coupons, labels, wrappers, etc. She showed how residents could increase their income through taking advantage of not realized opportunities.

Mr. Catliota stated that Mrs. Pinikovar will be teaching a class on making doll clothes on Saturday mornings at the Hough Center.

Mr. Hall then introduced Mr. James Kuth, Director, West Side Opportunity Center. Mr. Kuth stated that most of the Centers have between 8 to 19 services which they offer. He displayed a directory which describes the services offered in the Centers. He stated that the directory will be circulated in several languages. Mr. Kuth stated that the West Side Center has been faced with deep divisions in the community. He further stated that he had great hopes of bringing these community organizations together when he started in July of 1967; however, these divisions have deep roots and the problems are not easily resolved. The West Side Center will, however, do everything possible to serve the people of the community.

Mr. Hall then introduced Mr. Paul Jackson, Director, Kinsman Opportunity Center. Mr. Jackson stated there is much activity going on in the Kinsman Center. He mentioned the employment project which he informed the Board about a few months ago. He stated that it is moving along. Mr. Jackson stated that the four councilmen in the area, the job coordinator from the Kinsman Center, and himself, sent a letter to prospective employers a month ago. They have had a 60% response from these letters. They have placed 14 people with commitments from the balance of the 60% to give them jobs as they become available. The AFL-CIO Appalachia Program has been of help to the Center. This program is geared for people previously denied employment. We have placed about 14 people with 25 actual jobs available right now as soon as the job developers can get those persons who have been screened. These jobs will give the people an opportunity to earn a very decent wage.

Mr. Jackson stated there has been a concentrated effort with OSES, AIM-Jobs, NYC, and himself, to handle all jobs that fall outside of the realm of the Neighborhood Youth Corp. There is complete cooperation within the Kinsman Center with all of the agencies involved in employment. The real bulk of the work has been done by the Outreach workers, the job developers, AIM-Jobs, etc.

Mr. Jackson stated that a new service in the Center is Project Pride as well as additional space for the OSES representatives. Also, because of the atmosphere that prevails, he was contacted by the juvenile court and asked if they could have a representative in the office where they would conduct their counseling of probationers once a week. We have Mrs. Green come in once a week to involve the youngsters in Center activities. We also have an addition to the Field Service staff. We have a person from the Community Relations Board to meet with members of the community to discuss whatever pro-



blems they may have about city services, complaints, etc. We are concerned now that we are not getting the people from the area to come into the Center at night. We hope that we will be able to say that the Center is flourishing in terms of attendance in the evenings as it does during the day.

Mr. Jackson stated that he went to Columbus to attend a seminar on the committee to the aged. We now have an Outreach staff member who is attempting to involve all of the aged people of the Kinsman Area in meaningful programs. We have 15 who have signed up to assist in establishing this program.

Mr. Hall then introduced Mrs. Madeline Cargill, Director, Glenville Opportunity Center. Mrs. Cargill stated that the task before the Glenville Center is not an easy one. During the first week in January, an editorial ran in The Plain Dealer concerning criminals. The article stated that most of the criminals convicted in the Cleveland Area resided in the Glenville Area. Glenville has more juvenile offenders than any other area of the city. Two priority problems in Glenville are housing and recreation. Through our Field Service Program we are able to relate to the problem of housing direct, but the problem of recreation has become a political football. We find ourselves a community of 90,000 with only one facility which requests paid memberships. The Glenville community is a problem community. We want and need attention. About 41% of our population is less than 21 years of age. This supports the fact that we have had seven new schools built in Glenville in the past five years. We have the problem of narcotics. It is quite a big problem with our teenagers. The Glenville Center, however, is making an attempt to meet the challenge of the area. We have a day care program. We are serving 12 mothers--11 of whom have been trained through job training programs. We have 2 who are employed as clerical workers, 1 practical nurse, 1 stenographer, 1 in a training program designed to work with retarded children, 1 teachers aide, 1 Maternal & Infant Care aide, 1 waiting to finish training, 2 unemployed. This is one of the most tangible examples as to how our training programs work to make our people self-sufficient.

Mrs. Cargill stated that the Field Service Program in Glenville came into its own this year, making more than 1,000 service contacts per month. They have two recreation centers that are established and are flourishing. The first center was financed by voluntary contributions. The people solicited the funds themselves. They have received \$8,000 and all of the equipment that they are using in the center. We have a day nursery program through the Werner Methodist Church that is being staffed with people from the area conferences and it reaches out to help the women who are now being trained by AIM-Jobs. The Glenville Field Service Program also boasts of a very thriving tenant union, senior citizens group, and a buying club. The buying club sold 275 dozens of eggs last week alone.

Mrs. Cargill stated that the OSES representatives at the Glenville Center have interviewed over 1,067 applicants over the past year. Thirty-three percent were referred to jobs: 33 went to testing-counseling and job training; 34 went to social services. Most of the people interviewed have not achieved more than an 8th grade education. The Glenville office of CIS had 902 individual families that were served. They have made 2,725 contacts. Mrs. Cargill stated that their contacts are made in a number of different ways. They feel that they have touched 4,685 persons. The Neighborhood Youth Corp indicate they have 78 enrollees. We have a probation officer from the Ohio Youth Commission who sees about 25 youngsters every month for counseling. The probation officer also confers with the parents.

Mrs. Cargill stated that Outreach has been in the Glenville Area about 2 1/2 years. The Outreach workers come across many different kinds of problems. We have been happy to find that our Outreach workers have used their own experiences and resourcefulness to reach beyond the call of duty to assist these people. Two of the workers are assigned to hospitals. As an example of what these two workers do, they have found patients in Forest City Hospital who did not know about food stamps. Even though there are some agencies in Cleveland designed to provide certain basic assistance to welfare clients, the Outreach worker has stepped in and helped in a particular manner. We estimate we have been able to place about 50 pieces of used appliances in homes of needy residents. We have been able to give away a great deal of used clothing.

Mrs. Cargill stated that the Legal Aid office and the food stamp representative have moved out of the Glenville Center. However, these offices were able to locate next door to the Center--we represent a community service complex. We hope that we will, as a complex, show that by working together we can make the services of each agency far more effective than by working alone.

Mr. Boehm commended Director Findley and the staff for the Annual Report.

Rev. Branch then gave the following report of the Executive Committee:

At the April 17th meeting of the Board, the Executive Committee indicated to the Board that the Committee had made some efforts to have a conference with the Mayor. We felt that, as members of the Board, it was our obligation and responsibility to share with the Mayor our own thinking so that his thinking would have the benefit of our experience. We did not feel it was necessary to defend CEO but to tell the Mayor of our intention to serve the poor, to make possible the resources we have, to help the poor

become mobile and get out of poverty. On March 15th the Mayor indicated it was his intention to take the CEO under the aegis of the city. We suggested that we wanted to send a memo to him. We did not make public the contents of that memo because we thought the Mayor should receive this information from us first instead of the newspapers. The Mayor felt it may be better to further examine his decision. He appointed a Task Force with the purpose of reflecting upon this decision; whether or not CEO should be operated as an agency of city government, what agency, public or private, could best administer, etc., to have a maximum impact in resolving the problems and which would benefit the residents of the city of Cleveland. This Task Force divided into two subcommittees. Rev. Branch stated he was appointed to Subcommittee No. 1 which met on May 8th. The conclusions of that Subcommittee and its recommendations to the Mayor were:

The responsibility of this committee, as charged by the co-chairmen of the Task Force was to consider and make recommendations on the following matters:

Whether or not the Cleveland Anti-Poverty Program should be operated as an agency of City Government.

What organization, public or private, can best administer under one chief administrator a fully integrated set of programs in the areas of manpower development, economic development and other social services necessary to have a maximum impact in resolving which besets residents of the City of Cleveland.

After a thorough discussion, pro and con on both questions, the committee agreed and recommends that:

The Mayor of the City of Cleveland should have considerable influence over the Anti-Poverty Program, since as top, local, elected official, he will be credited with the program's success or accountable for its failure, whether or not that program is actually under his jurisdiction.

While the structure of the present agency should be changed, it should, for the time being, remain an independent agency outside the formal governmental structure of the City of Cleveland.

All Anti-Poverty Programs, whether operational or delegated, should be closely coordinated with the city's activities in the field of Human Resources and Economic Development. The lines of jurisdictional authority, however, should remain clear.



Therefore it is recommended:

1. The Anti-Poverty Program Board should be increased to 48 members.
2. The Mayor should be the President of the Board.
3. For that approximate 1/3 of the board who are public officials, the Mayor should consider designating the following agencies to name representation:
  - a) The Board of Education
  - b) County Commissioners
  - c) County Welfare
  - d) Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority
  - e) City of Cleveland including the departments of Community Development, Health, several members of City Council, including the Chairman of the Finance Committee; and the Chairman of the Mayor's Committee on Community Resources, to be succeeded by the Director of the department of Human and Economic Resources, when established.
4. For that approximate 1/3 of the board which consists of Civic Organizations, the Mayor should consider designating the following agencies which will name representatives to the board:
  1. Greater Cleveland Associated Foundation
  2. Greater Cleveland Growth Association
  3. Council of Churches
  4. Catholic Diocese
  5. Jewish Community Federation
  6. Urban League
  7. CORE
  8. NAACP
  9. United Pastors
  10. AFL-CIO
  11. PATH Association
  12. Group 66
  13. Cleveland Bar Association
  14. Cleveland Academy of Medicine
  15. The Welfare Federation
  16. NIEU

5. 1/3 of the board should be representatives of the poor. These should be divided into two categories:
  - a) Area representatives who are poor themselves, according to OEO guidelines. There should be a training program to help equip them to serve and they should be paid while in training. The following areas should be represented:
    1. Mount Pleasant
    2. Kinsman
    3. Hough-East
    4. Hough-West
    5. Glenville-Lakeview & Superior Area
    6. Glenville-105 & St. Clair Area
    7. West Side-Tremont
    8. West Side-Other
    9. Central-West
    10. Central-East
  - b) City-wide organizations such as the following:
    11. Welfare Rights Movement
    12. Circle of Afro-American Unity
    13. Spanish-American Committee
    14. Golden Age Organizations
    15. Youth Organizations
    16. Superior Avenue Community Action Program
6. With the advice and consent of the Board, the Mayor should have the authority to appoint the program's Executive Director.
7. Full participation in the Anti-Poverty Program should be given to neighborhood groups. Each neighborhood should determine for its own area the form and content of the Anti-Poverty Program in that area. They should be consulted about staff assignment in their neighborhood. These groups should be encouraged to form neighborhood corporations so as to carry out these functions more effectively.
8. The Mayor should set hearings on or about June 4, 1968 at a time and place easily accessible to people in poverty. Ten days earlier there should be a well-publicized and widely distributed notice of the hearings which include these pro-

posals. Field Service, Outreach, and Neighborhood Opportunity staff should assist in getting this information to residents in poverty areas.

9. The Task Force should remain in existence in order to assist with the problems of guaranteeing the participation of the poor in the program, and to serve in any other capacity as it may be called upon by the board.

Rev. Branch then read the following report of Subcommittee No. 2 from their meeting of May 9th:

1. The committee recommends that the present target areas be altered to include the West Mount Pleasant and North Broadway areas. In addition, there are pockets of poverty in other parts of the city that should receive anti-poverty services. Of course, the inclusion of these areas should be with the consent of the communities involved.
2. Because of previous anti-poverty services commitments to East Cleveland, Chagrin Falls Park in Geauga County and Oakwood Village, they should continue to receive services.
3. In regard to the representation on the Board of Trustees, the subcommittee makes the following recommendations:
  - a) The present procedure of having the community opportunity boards elected by the entire local community and then they in turn select representatives to be on the Board of Trustees should be continued. The committee recommends that councilmen be included on the local opportunity boards.
  - b) Though the subcommittee recognizes the desire on the part of some communities to want to have their own representatives to the Board of Trustees, the subcommittee nevertheless concluded that the present representation of the five target areas should be retained. Since this is a complex issue, the committee recommends that the idea of representation on the Board of sub-target areas be given further consideration.
  - c) The subcommittee endorses the idea of representation of the poor on the Board according to the numbers of poor in the community, and an equitable formula should be immediately developed.



- d) It is the subcommittee's understanding that the code of regulations of CEO will be modified shortly in order to permit indigenous organizations to petition for Board representation; we recommend that this petition procedure be given wide publicity throughout the community.
  - e) The subcommittee sees value in non-area poor being represented on the Board and suggests that further consideration be given to implementing this.
4. The subcommittee strongly recommends that the community opportunity boards be given major control over the planning, conducting and monitoring of neighborhood programs. In this way the goal of maximum feasible participation of the poor can be achieved. In order to increase resident control, the subcommittee favorably views the development of Neighborhood Governing Boards, Neighborhood Corporations and Neighborhood Final Review Committees. As residents gain control over local program, staff and funds, there will be less need for central review of proposals.

The subcommittee recognizes, of course, that because communities operate at differing levels of readiness to take control over programs, there would be different methods or structures of local decision-making bodies. Moreover, the Board of Trustees should continue to have responsibility for evaluating the extent to which local area boards are capable of taking responsibility for their programs. The subcommittee concludes that the more local residents can be responsible for using the anti-poverty program to meet their specific needs, the more successful the program will be.

Rev. Parks asked if the majority of the committee was in favor of the city taking over this program. Rev. Branch replied no, it was the opposite. Rev. Branch stated it was his understanding there was some disagreement on this particular recommendation. Mr. Hamilton stated that the Cleveland Business League was left off the list of organizations which would have representation on the Board. Rev. Branch so noted.

Rev. Branch stated that a letter from the Executive Committee was delivered to the Mayor. This letter contained recommendations as to whether or not the Cleveland Anti-Poverty Program should be operated as a part of the city of Cleveland. Mr. Hamilton asked when was this letter sent to the Mayor. Rev. Branch replied on May 5th. Rev. Shoup stated that, with regard to the recommendations of the Task Force Subcommittee, he thought that the organization of the Board was complex before, but it is nothing compared to what it is going to be. He further stated there was good representation on the subcommittees but he would disagree with the Mayor's authority to ap-

point the director of the program. There is too much involved in learning how to direct a program of this nature to allow it to be in the hands of a political appointment. It has taken Director Findley too long to organize this program to allow it to go up for grabs. I don't think it should be a political appointment. Perhaps it ought to be the choice of the Board of Trustees. This is far too important a position. Rev. Branch stated that the Executive Committee acquiesced to this as a kind of a compromise. The other committee members seemed strongly of the point of view that the entire operation ought to be under the city. Therefore, we consented that, with the advice and consent of the Board of Trustees, this appointment would be made. We were trying to get some kind of leverage with this point. Rev. Branch stated he agreed the director of the program should not be appointed by the Mayor. It was not the most ideal arrangement but it was more desirable than the one in which we had no say. Rev. Parks stated that the names of the committee members seem to be people working politically with the Mayor. Mrs. Golub stated that some of the people on that committee belong to organizations that have publicly stated they want no part of the CEO. Mrs. Golub further stated she resented this when all of a sudden they have so much to say about the operations of this program. Rev. Shoup stated he realized very well that this represents a compromise. It puts the position of the executive director, however, in a tenuous position. He stated that the executive director ought to have the freedom to make this the most effective program as possible. Rev. Branch stated that the basic stance of the Mayor was that in as much as he has to share the credit or the blame of the success or failure of the program, he ought to have the authority to relate effectively to the termination of the program. Mr. Boehm stated that we have to keep in mind that in the ultimate the Mayor does have the choice of which direction this is going to go. He stated he thinks the Mayor is trying to cooperate and listen and evaluate. He further stated it is our responsibility to give him the benefit of our thinking. Mr. Boehm stated it is his hope that the program will outlive particular personalities. He stated that we are trying to tie in certain controls which will give the large share of the determination of the program to the poor people which the program is designed to help. Mr. Hamilton stated he could appreciate this compromise, but the present Board and the things it has accomplished speaks for itself: the earnest work of all of the Board members; the Board has done an excellent job. He stated that this Board has not failed. A fine job has been done, the money has been allocated without scandal. Mr. Boehm stated that it is his hope that no one thinks any of this discussion is a reflection on the work of this Board. The Green Amendment which triggered a great many things is based on some country-wide experiences that are aside from our local experiences, but we have to work with it. When we get to the point of finally saying this is going to be the change, some of us

might have to decide whether or not this suits the way we think it should be. Rev. Branch and the committee are trying to come up with a good workable solution that embodies the things the Green Amendment has put in. He further stated that this is not an adverse reflection on the staff or the Board.

Rev. Branch stated he would like to appoint Rev. Shoup as chairman of the Community Participation Committee to succeed Dr. Kenneth W. Clement. Rev. Shoup stated he could not accept the position because he would have to resign from the Board. He stated that his duties to his church did not permit him to participate on the Board. He further stated that he would support the Board in an objective manner.

Director Findley stated that this Board, together with the additions that have been approved, is legally responsible for this program until February, 1969. What we set up in the form that we sent to the Regional Office of OEO was a Board structure of 36. Target area church would be represented.

VI. There was no new business.

VII. The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mrs. Helen Golub  
Secretary

:mlr



COUNCIL FOR ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES IN GREATER CLEVELAND  
1350 West Third Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44113

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

MINUTES

Regular Meeting  
June 19, 1968

ATTENDANCE:

Reverend E. S. Branch, Jr., Presiding

Mr. H. E. Boehm

Mrs. S. Carroll

Mr. J. C. Fisher

Mrs. M. Garnett

Mr. P. B. Hamilton

(Mr. John Lee sitting in

attendance for Mr. Arnold Pinkney)

Mr. P. J. O'Malley

Rev. R. S. Shoup

Mrs. J. Stubbs

(Mr. J. S. Spezaferro sitting in  
attendance for Mr. E. F. Burns)

Mrs. G. Wise

- I. The Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Council for Economic Opportunities in Greater Cleveland was called to order by Rev. E. S. Branch, Jr., First Vice President, Board of Trustees, at 2:17 p.m. on Wednesday, June 19, 1968, in the Community Service Room of the Cuyahoga Savings and Loan Association Building, Cleveland, Ohio with the above members present and constituting a quorum.
- II. The Minutes of the last Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees of May 15, 1968, were approved as mailed.
- III. There was no correspondence.
- IV. Report of the Executive Director:

Director Findley announced that Mr. James Grose, from the Ohio Office of Opportunity in Warren, Ohio was present at this meeting.

Mrs. Lois Dupree gave the highlights of the Model Cities' Program (see attached report).

Director Findley stated that CEO is pleased by the Mayor's appointment of Mr. Walter Beach as the Youth Coordinator of CEO. The Mayor's Committee and Cleveland NOW have given \$110,000 for summer camping, and we have a minimum grant of \$50,000 for additional camping to be coordinated through the Welfare Federation. Other agencies have been notified as to which programs will be funded by the \$50,000 and the OEO funds.

Director Findley stated that we have been funded for the Comprehensive Family Health Care Program located at the Newton D. Baker Health Center. It is being planned that the Hough Opportunity Center will have a satellite office set up in it for preliminary medical services. There will also be bus service from the center to the Newton D. Baker Health Center. Details are being worked out. This program also includes dental care.

Director Findley stated that Mr. Hall has been working with the Consumer Protective Association. Mr. Vaughn is Chairman of the Board. This association is funded for \$31,000, but still needs an additional \$5,000. This project will be located in the five Opportunity Centers. Efforts will be made to see what help OEO might give.

Director Findley stated that he had a request from Mr. Edwards, Chairman of Glenville COB to find \$215.00 to run a water line for a tot-lot. Other help would be secured from the Glenville residents. Mr. Findley arranged to have these funds made available by a donor, and a check has been mailed to Mr. Edwards.

Director Findley announced that Mrs. Mildred Reynolds, his Secretary, is leaving as of this date. Director Findley commended Mrs. Reynolds on her competency and loyalty, and presented her with a gift.

A. Report on the Conference Evaluation and the War on Poverty:

Director Findley commented that the Council has a continuing concern with evaluating our programs, and that such evaluation is essential to the constant upgrading of our efforts against poverty. Director Findley called upon Mr. Donald L. Martin, Assistant Executive Director, to report on the Conference on Evaluation, held June 17, 1968.

Mr. Martin stated that CEO has been engaged for approximately 14 months in a joint project with the Battelle Memorial Institute Urban Studies Center. The two organizations were exploring means of evaluating social action programs.

A conference on Evaluation and the War on Poverty was held June 17, 1968, under a joint sponsorship of Battelle and the Council. Attending were interested CAP and academic personnel from all over the country, including representatives of OEO Washington and the Regional Office in Chicago.

The session opened with a keynote address by Dr. Robert A. Levine, Assistant Director for Research, Plans, Programs and Evaluation, Office of Economic Opportunity. Dr. Levine was followed by Dr. Eleanor K. Caplan, Senior Research Sociologist at Battelle, who discussed various approaches to evaluation.

The highlight of the Conference was presentation of the final Report of the Joint Project. Mr. Robert O. Garnett, Senior Research Associate at CEO, discussed the conclusions of the study, emphasizing that evaluation can and should be systematic and an integral part of the planning process.

Board of Trustees

MINUTES

June 19, 1968

Page 3.

The afternoon session consisted of a spirited panel discussion of approaches to and reasons for evaluation, and featured Dr. Tore Tjersland of Western Behavioral Sciences Institute; Dr. William Grigsby, University of Pennsylvania; Mr. John Repolo, Boston CAP; Mr. Curtis Williams, Youngstown CAP; Bob Garnett of our staff.

The session closed with a find and informative presentation by Mr. Fred Hoffman, Assistant Director for Program Budgeting, Bureau of the Budget.

V. Committee Reports:

Mrs. Gwendolyn Wise gave the following report of the Priorities Committee:

Since the last meeting of the Board of Trustees, the Proposal Review Sub-Committee has met several times to review the Housing Programs and Services Program of HOPE Inc. This program was also extensively reviewed by the Hough Community Opportunity Board and Neighborhood Conference No. 5 and the recommendations which have resulted from the review of the program represent a means of coming to grips with the concerns raised on the local level.

At a joing meeting of the Priorities Committee and the Proposal Review Sub-Committee held on June 5, 1968, it was recommended that the Board of Trustees of the Council for Economic Opportunities in Greater Cleveland approve the Housing Programs and Service Program of HOPE, Inc., and its request for federal assistance in the amount of \$126,950 according to the narrative and budget reviewed by the Priorities Committee and the Proposal Review Sub-Committee and subject to the acceptance and incorporation of the following program amendments.

Amendment #1

HOPE, Inc. shall make a concerted effort to employ neighborhood residents in aid and other positions who are able to handle the job and whose family income falls below the poverty level for their family size, with preference given to ADC mothers living in the area.

Reason

Several members of the Hough Community Opportunity Board Proposal Review Committee felt that not all of the persons hired for the entry level were persons who really needed employment or who could not obtain as good, if not better, jobs in the private sector. It was the opinion of the committee that entry level jobs should be reserved for those neighborhood residents who had not been able to find adequate employment in the past.

Amendment #2

The Board of Trustees of HOPE, Inc. shall be reconstituted by November 1, 1968, so that the Board shall:



1. Contain 13 members of which not less than nine members shall reside within the area bounded by East 55th Street, Superior Avenue, East 79th Street and Chester Avenue.
2. Of the nine (9) board members residing in the area served by HOPE, Inc., at least three (3) shall be homeowners and at least three shall be tenants.

The additional area resident added to the Board of Trustees shall be selected by the Hough Community Opportunity Board on the basis of recommendations from the Neighborhood Conferences in which HOPE is now or anticipates undertaking major projects, and other organizations within the area served by HOPE including the Citizens Housing Association, Tenant Council, and Block Clubs.

#### Reason

While the committee supports the idea of HOPE, it was the feeling of the Neighborhood Conference No. 5, the Hough Community Opportunity Board, and the Proposal Review Sub-Committee, that HOPE was out of touch with a considerable portion of the community it was established to assist, and that adding additional neighborhood residents to the Board selected by effected community groups would not only provide a broader base of resident involvement in the decision making relative to the administration of HOPE, but would also make the Board more representative to the community and strengthen the linkage between HOPE and the rest of the community.

#### Amendment #3

The Proposal Review Sub-Committee recommends that HOPE, Inc. make a concerted effort to involve the residents of Chester-Superior area in the planning of the overall rehabilitation of the area, the type of housing HOPE should provide, and the priorities for undertaking specific types of housing development, and that the Board of Trustees of HOPE commit themselves to implement whenever feasible the plans developed with the community. In this regard, it is recommended that:

1. The Citizens Housing Association be provided with sufficient technical assistance to enable them to develop general guidelines as to the general types of housing they want in the area, how in general, certain types of situations should be handled, and the priorities for undertaking housing projects.
2. A major portion of the funds allocated for housing consultants in the budget should be used to provide technical assistance to the Citizens Housing Association to enable them to effectively develop guidelines for HOPE to follow in providing housing in the community.
3. HOPE seek additional funds to supply additional assistance for the Citizens Housing Association and its own Board from the Cleveland Model Neighborhood Program, OEO Research and Development Grants or the America the Beautiful Foundation.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION

While the review of the proposed housing projects by the Neighborhood Conference permits residents of the area to coordinate the proposed housing projects with other activities in the area and to comment on the project, such review is reactionary and only permits residents the opportunity to react for or against what they see. It was the feeling of the committee that if HOPE was to be a community based housing corporation, it must produce the type of housing the community wants. To do this, however, requires a far greater commitment to planning not just with the residents but within the administration of the program as well. While review by the Neighborhood Conference is important, they have too many other general interests to devote themselves exclusively to planning in just one area of concern. HOPE, however, has established a Citizens Housing Association whose orientation and relation to HOPE and the projected Model Neighborhood program makes it a desirable venture through which the residents of the area can say what HOPE should provide in the way of housing in the community.

Motion was made by Mr. Hamilton, seconded by Mr. O'Malley to approve the recommendations with the intended announcements of the Priorities Committee. Motion passed.

Reverend Branch gave the following report of the Management Committee:

Reverend Branch stated that Attorney General Mr. Saxbe ruled that under the present Constitution of the State, it would be illegal for the City to be the community action agency or to designate the community action agency.

The Chairman informed the Board that at a meeting attended by himself and Director Findley in the office of Mr. David Hill with Mr. Sidney Spector present, he was advised that the Mayor would not contest the ruling of Attorney General Saxbe. It was stated that the Mayor would like to suggest increasing CEO Board membership from 36 to 45 members, with the additional members in the public sector to be from the City of Cleveland. The Chairman was also requested to advise the Trustees that he would be more active in his role as Chairman of the Board.

Reverend Branch stated that the Board must now approve in principle changing Board membership from 36 to 45.

Motion was made by Rev. Shoup, and seconded by Mr. Spezaferro to increase the Board membership to 45. Motion passed.

Staff was advised to make necessary changes in By-Laws for final approval at next meeting.

Board of Trustees

MINUTES

June 19, 1968

Page 6.

Reverend Branch stated that modification of By-Laws have been made for increase to 36, and we must go through this exercise. The change in By-Laws as authorized by Board at previous meeting were then read by Mr. Donald Martin.

Motion was made by Rev. Shoup, seconded by Mr. O'Malley to approve the modification of the By-Laws to increase membership to 36.

Mr. Hill pointed out that ex officio members were mentioned in other sections of the By-Laws, and he wondered if the Board would make any changes in other sections, particularly concerning the powers of ex officio members.

Mr. Martin stated that the previous motion eliminated the ex officio members, and that the rest of the By-Laws would have to conform to that modification of the By-Laws.

Motion was made by Mr. O'Malley, seconded by Mrs. Wise, to eliminate Section 2B and any other reference to ex officio members from the By-Laws to conform to modifications just read.

Mr. Boehm suggested getting new pages of the Regulations and By-Laws of the Council run off for the Board members.

VI. New Business:

Mr. William Whitlatch stated that the Summer Youth Program, which was only operating in the summer, now is a youth program operating the entire year around. We have increased the size of the Youth Coordinator's staff, giving him an assistant and additional help so that programs can be conducted on a year around basis. We have been funded \$634,000 for Youth Opportunities Programs year around.

Mr. Whitlatch stated that there are 44 VISTA volunteers working right now. Twenty-four will be working with Karamu House. Twenty will be working a variety of community projects to develop youth councils.

Mr. Whitlatch stated that we have one community development program in each of the target areas for the summer. On the West Side there is a day camp program, which the West Side Community Opportunity Board has developed. This program will be funded out of Cleveland NOW, and developed with a staff from the Summer program grant. There are three new programs in the Kinsman area. In the Hough area there is a new Drop in Center. In the Glenville area there is a Drop in Center, and in the Central area there is a Drop in Center. Young people on the Planning Staff outlined the programs this year.

Mr. Catliots reported that the 1060 Program has been changed to the Youth Employment Program (YEP). This is the third summer for this program. It is a working program for 14, and 15 year olds in Junior High School. There are 100 different agencies with five taking 1,000 and the other 95 taking the balance. Mr. Lou Aiken is the Project Director for the third summer. This is the most significant program that CEO has developed.



Board of Trustees

MINUTES

June 19, 1968

Page 7.

Mr. Lou Aikens stated that this is his third year with the program. Basically we have the same staff of people that we started out with. Most of the persons involved this year are people who have returned from last year. We plan to reach approximately 2,400 children for the program again this year. This year there will be a weekly payroll. There are 80 certified college students working as site supervisors.

Mr. Catliote thanked Mr. John Lee of the Board of Education for the physical examinations that were given right in the schools in May.

It was properly moved and seconded that Board would not meet in July and August. Motion passed.

VII. The meeting was adjourned at 3:24 p.m. The next meeting will be held in September, 1968.

Respectfully submitted,

Mrs. Helen Golub  
Secretary



:rp

High Lights from: MODEL CITIES' PROGRAM

1. Comprehensive attack on social, economic and physical problems of a specific area.
2. Federal, State and Local public and private efforts unite towards solving these problems.
3. It involves two stages: (a) one year planning, (b) Five years to carry out plans.
4. Cleveland's Model Cities' Program area: East 55th Street, West  
East 79th Street, East  
Superior Avenue, North  
Kingsbury Run, South
5. April 15, 1968, Cleveland submitted an application to the Federal Government for money to do a comprehensive Plan for the area.
6. If the application is approved, full time planning will begin in the neighborhood around August 1, 1968.
7. By August 1, 1969: RESIDENTS of the neighborhoods should have a plan -  
(a) how they want their area to be developed,  
(b) how much money it will take to do the job.
8. Another application then must be submitted to the Government for the money to carry out the plans.
9. The Government requires that residents participate in all stages of the program.
10. Mr. Richard Green (Community Development Director) has appointed Mr. Henry Doll, to serve as temporary Project Director.
11. Mr. Doll sub-divided the Model Cities' area:  
(a) the area from Superior Avenue to Euclid Avenue is called "Hough"  
(b) the area from Euclid to Kingsbury Run is called "Central"  
(c) each area has a coordinator.
12. Existing agencies have supplied employees (on loan) to assist the coordinators in getting residents involved.
13. They are meeting with residents on block level and helping them to form Model Cities' Action Committees, which will work toward participating in a constitutional convention.
14. Representatives for the Policy Committee (power committee) must come from the neighborhood, therefore residents are beginning to look around in their specific area for persons that would be likely candidates for the Policy committee.
15. Offices will be located in the Model Cities' areas: and  
Residents of the area will be hired to work with the professionals in the offices.

5/21

Hough office- 7612 Hough - 431-2323

Lois Dupree: Model Cities' Coordinator