EVALUATION OF OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS -- A PROGRESS REPORT

Robert A. Levine, Office of Economic Opportunity

The obvious first question to be asked concerning the evaluation of any operating program is what is it that is being evaluated--what are the program objectives which we are supposed to measure? On one level the answer to this question is obvious. Any program must be evaluated for the achievement of its immediate objectives; a health program must measure the effects on the health of those who participate in it, an education program the educational achievement of those who pass through it and so forth. This type of evaluation is necessary but it is relatively routine, and it is not the sort to which I will be primarily addressing myself in this paper.

Rather, in reporting on the progress of Office of Economic Opportunity programs I will be reporting on the evaluation of their effects in helping to eliminate poverty. Even this is not sufficient however; the objectives of the programs I will be discussing are somewhat more complex than that. The primary objective of the War on Poverty is to change people from "poor" to "non-poor" through their own efforts--to enable them to support themselves above the poverty line through their own earnings. This is the meaning of an "opportunity program." Only secondarily should the objective be to change the state of the poor by giving them money, thus making them less poor or not poor at all. Let me make clear that the overall War on Poverty must do both. There are too many people who are incapable of being reached by opportunity—the aged and the mothers of large families who should be taking care of their families instead of working, for example. If we mean it when we say that we want to eliminate poverty in this country, we must do something for them through direct income maintenance as well as providing for those who can take advantage of opportunity programs. OEO is only a part of the War on Poverty--a part measured by the fact that in fiscal 1967 the President's Budget calls for $24 billion of anti-poverty expenditures of which $1.75 billion are funded through OEO. This $1.75 billion is properly devoted entirely to opportunity programs and this paper will concern itself only with the opportunity objective of increasing the capability for self-support above the poverty line. It will be concerned primarily, although not exclusively, with OEO programs.

This is a progress report and it is therefore interim.

It is a report on what we are doing to evaluate rather than the results of evaluations. The OEO and its programs are not yet two years old. Programs like Job Corps are just now turning out graduates in substantial numbers. Other programs like Community Action could not conceivably work to make measurable changes in poverty communities in these first several years of buildup. This is particularly true if, rather than the effects of an anti-poverty program being proportional to expenditures, below which effects are not visible at all. Expenditures on programs like Community Action are still quite low relative to total needs and we might in some cases consider the current period one of organization in which we should expect nothing measurable. Thus, this is a report on the evaluations we are setting up rather than what our evaluations have told us about our current programs although a bit of the latter will be brought in.

The programs of OEO and associated War on Poverty programs can be divided into three categories according to the evaluation problems they present. In order of increasing difficulty, these are: vocational training and other programs directly connected to jobs and earnings; educational programs directly connected to jobs and earnings but only over the long-run; and programs of the comprehensive Community Action variety which we are convinced are vital to opportunity objectives, but work through a complex system to ultimately affect opportunity.

TRAINING

Of the three, training is conceptually the most simple to evaluate. The objective of an opportunity program is to increase earnings, and the connection of vocational training to earnings is obvious and straightforward. To evaluate a training program our primary data needs are for characteristics of the trainee before entering the program and after passing through it. Such characteristics include both items of the demographic type such as age, race, and education as control variables; and also job-holding experience and earnings as variables of direct interest.

It is, of course, not proper to evaluate the effectiveness of a training program by comparing earnings after to earnings before, because change may be an effect of lapsed time or of other factors outside the program, as well as a direct effect of the program. Just as obviously, even though such before-after comparison is not really legitimate, we do it because we frequently have nothing else to fall back on. But the really important and legitimate form of evaluation compares the before-and-after experience of trainees to the similarly time-phased experience of non-trainees in a carefully selected control group. This makes things a lot less simple, particularly when we talk about youth training. Youth control groups are particularly difficult to come by, both because so many young people between the ages of 16 and 21 have passed through OEO programs, and because the self-selection process for our youth training programs means that the possible members of a control group may differ from the trainees in certain specific (but undefined) characteristics which led them

to avoid the training program. Because of these difficulties we are proceeding rather carefully in setting up the youth control group which is vital to our program evaluation. We are, however, already collecting substantial data on the pre-training characteristics and some data on post-training characteristics of our program participants and are in the process of setting up a youth control sample.

A system has now been established for the collection of individual characteristic data for all enrollees in both Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps. These data include information not only on the enrollees' own education and previous work experience, but also on family characteristics such as family size, number of working members, occupation and work status of family head, estimated family income plus a number of binary items on such things as housing and welfare. The Job Corps also regularly reports some initial aptitude and achievement level tests and the NYC is in the process of experimenting with such instruments.

There have been a few very small sample followups (about 200) of Job Corps graduates and a slightly larger sample followup is to be reported late this summer. There are presently no routine followups of NYC graduates, but a followup procedure is in the developmental stage.

A pilot study is now underway to determine the feasibility of setting up a large national sample of poor youth, 16-21, which could be tested and then reinterviewed and retested two or three years later. The objective is to create a sample which is large enough to allow the establishment of groups of youth which are statistically similar in terms of relevant socio-economic variables, some of whom have participated in training programs, Job Corps, NYC and MDTA, and some of whom have not. Hopefully, such a sample would allow both cross-section and longitudinal comparisons which would provide some of the sort of evaluative information, admittedly crude, which is necessary for realistic judgements about reasonable program mix. Elements of this sample would serve as a control group, so that program effects could be separated to some degree from effects due simply to growth of the youths and to changes in general economic and social conditions. In addition, it may be possible to determine which types of programs are best suited for which types of poor youth and, within programs, which program characteristics seem to be related with favorable results. We are fully aware of the limitations of such an approach to the problems of evaluation -- and this is one of the reasons for proceeding first on a pilot basis -- but it seems to us that the logic of the program evaluation effort leads inevitably to this type of an approach. If the limitations of this type of evaluative method prove too severe, I suppose we must re-examine the logic of program evaluation as it now stands.

Even lacking the control sample at this time, we already have some capability to do the less legitimate sort of before-and-after evaluation, and we have made some still quite hypothetical cost-effectiveness comparisons of our youth programs. It should be pointed out in discussing the cost and effectiveness of training programs, however, that we try to avoid the sort of cost-benefit analysis which states that a training program is justified if discounted future earnings are greater than costs. The program implication of such a cost-benefit calculation is that if discounted earnings are less than costs, transfer payments would be more economical than the training program, but given the hierarchy of objectives mentioned above -- that it is more important to get people out of poverty through their own earnings than it is to give them money -- War on Poverty training may be justified even if costs are higher than estimated benefits. For this reason, we avoid the sort of benefit calculation which compares something to nothing, and rather use such calculations to compare programs with some similarity.

Table 1 shows such a calculation -- highly hypothetical, it should be re-emphasized -- comparing Job Corps and the out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps. What was done was to estimate (on the basis of very sketchy data on before-and-after job-holding and earnings characteristics) the time period which it would take for Job Corpsmen to pay back to the economy with their increased earnings the cost of their Job Corps training. This came to about 5 years on the basis of these data plus some rather conservative assumptions, and the question was then asked what assumptions for the substantially cheaper Neighborhood Youth Corps program would equalize the pay-back period. We came to the obvious conclusion that it takes less change in earnings to pay back the NYC costs simply because these costs are lower than the Job Corps costs.

We also, however, came to the less obvious conclusion that for the higher costs of Job Corps to really justify themselves unambiguously, the Job Corps program should be capable of reaching and helping a group of hard-core youth that Neighborhood Youth Corps cannot reach at all. If a group of youth does exist which cannot be helped by NYC then the pay-back period on NYC costs for them would be infinite; if Job Corps can help these youth with its more intensive programs, then its pay-back period would at any rate be less than infinite. It is this group which Job Corps is trying to reach.

TABLE I

		JOB CORPS*	Out-of-School NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS
I.	Costs:		
	a. Steady State Costs Per Graduate	$6,980	$1,000**
	b. Assumed Success*** Rate Per Graduate	80%	50%
	c. Cost Per Success (Cost per graduate ÷ success rate)	$8,725	$2,200
II.	Computation Equalizing Payback Period for These Costs:		
	d. Equalized Payback Period****	5.1 years	5.1 years
	e. Annual Earnings Gain = Costs/Payback (Rounded)	$1,700	$ 430
	f. Estimated Hourly Wage Gain Due to Program	$ .60 = $ 1.60-$1.00	$ .25 = $ 1.25-$1.00
	g. Assumed Annual Hours Worked Previous to Program	1,500 hours	1,500 hours
	h. Annual Hours Worked After Program (Computed to equalize payback period)	2,000 hours	1,544 hours

*Job Corps data estimated from preliminary sample.

**Because NYC is a Work Experience Program rather than a training program like JC, it is assumed that all enrollees are graduates having received some benefit, therefore the costs per graduate are the same as the costs per enrollee.

***Success is defined as holding a good steady job. A good job is defined as semi-skilled or better.

****Neighborhood Youth Corps payback period set equal to calculated Job Corps period.

This example clearly illustrates the importance of making certain alterations in the conventional form of cost-benefit analysis when it is applied to poverty-type programs.

It is our feeling that in the case of poverty programs the attempt to quantify benefits beyond those directly represented by changes in the lifetime income stream -- sometimes called external or spillover benefits -- is quite important. Most importantly, when looked at from the governmental decision point (where decisions are subject to the governmental budget constraint) the effects of the programs on other social expenditures need to be taken into account. If youth training programs not only raise incomes but also result in lower requirements for public expenditures for such things as welfare, unemployment compensation, health, crime prevention, then an attempt should be made to take these additional "benefits" into account in making program evaluations. We are currently attempting to develop some means of quantifying, at least in order of magnitude, these additional benefits.

EDUCATION

The evaluation of education programs is less straightforward. Remarkably little has been done along the lines of systematic comparative evaluation of different educational techniques for reaching the underprivileged. The Office of Education which disposes of a billion dollars or more a year for the education of the poor under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 is beginning a comprehensive evaluation program, although this will not be simple because the Office of Education statutorily provides monies without being able to control them. Up until this effort, virtually nothing has been done on a systematic basis.

Tables 2 and 3 bring together an inventory of Federal programs which are intended to contribute to the compensatory education effort or which are or can be used to contribute to the compensatory education effort. Table 3 inventories direct program or financial assistance programs that provide support to such programs, i.e., train teachers, provide facilities, fund research and development of new methods, materials, curricula, equipment, etc. In addition to identifying Federal programs, and administering agencies, Tables 2 and 3 estimate the number of beneficiaries and the amount of funding through 1967.

The two left hand columns briefly summarize the kind of evaluation information available about each program. It is important to note that while there are several inventories of Federal educational programs for the poor, this Table represents the first attempt to capsule what is known about the impact of such programs on the amount or rate of learning whether this be measured in cognative, behavioral or attitudinal terms.

Obviously, the findings reflected by this Table do not pretend to be definitive. It is important, however, that it represents the first time evaluative findings to date have been set down, cheek by jowel, with measures of the numbers to be served and dollars to be spent in the Federal effort. We think this Table drives home the need for a major effort to evaluate the essentially experimental programs being funded. We do not think we should stop experimenting or providing programs, but that we should take immediate steps to provide that every program and every experiment should include an evaluation design from the start. Only then will we increase our capacity to know what works, or what works best in compensatory education. As we now stand, the state of evaluation of educational programs is such that we cannot even be sure that when favorable program results are obtained, they are the result of good program design or merely a Hawthorne effect. Given the sums of money now being spent by Federal and other agencies for compensatory education of the poor, this is slightly shocking.

Table 2

SUMMARY OF FEDERALLY FUNDED COMPENSATORY EDUCATIONAL SERVICES AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE POOR

KIND OF PROGRAM	FEDERAL AGENCY AND AUTHORITY	BENEFICIARIES (thousands) 65	66	67	FUNDING (millions) 65	66	67	IMPACT ON LEARNING OF DISADVANTAGED: Experimental (Controls)	Operational (Norms or Judgments)
Pre-School (3-5)		561,000	500,000	500,000					
Head Start	OEO-CAP	20,000	100,000	210,000	$85	$180	$310	Deutsch--modest gains of pre-school year were retained and expanded in K and 1st grade. Control groups suffered cumulative slippage in K & 1st grade.	1% survey showed gains, 5 points on non-verbal tests of intelligence. No retention data available yet.
Other Pre-School programs	OE, Title I, ESEA Pre-School only		60.0	See below	---	See below	See below		
	Pre-School and Kindergarden		348.0						
In-School Children (5-15)									
Compensatory, remedial tutorial programs in schools and complementary to schools	OEO, CAP Education Components (including Upward Bound)			339.0	---	---	77.0		Scattered evaluations, largely subjective. Tutorials and Upward Bound projects show most observers think these experiences beneficial.
OE ESEA	OE-ESEA Title I	---	6,600.0	7,000.0	---	775.0	1,070.0	Systematic evaluation in planning stage. No info. as yet.	Preliminary analyses of 500 project sample showing types of projects only. No big cities included.
In-School Youth (16-21)									
Counseling and Guidance	OE-NDEA, Counseling and Guidance	(2,800.0)	(3,400.0)	(3,600.0)	(156.2)	(209.4)	(209.7)	N/A	Descriptive and judgemental evaluations and periodic administrative assessments.
Vocational Education	OE -Voc. Ed. Act of '63								
NYC in-school work programs	OEO-Labor-EOA	102.2	115.0	125.0	28.4	75.0	81.2	N/A	Increased attendance and retention in school, but slight negative impact on academic achievement.
Work Study -- Voc. Ed.	OE-HEA	114.4	115.0	125.0				N/A	---
		15.0	85.0	---					
Opportunity Grants (HE)	OE-HEA	---	115.0	220.0	---	60.8	122.0	N/A	No information.
Higher Ed. Loans	OE-NDEA	---	(400.0)	(375.0)	---	(179.3)	(190.0)	N/A	No systematic evaluation by income level of recipients.
Guaranteed Student Loans	OE-HEA	---	(132.0)	(775.0)	---	(9.5)	(46.0)	N/A	No systematic evaluation showing impact on entry, retention, or achievement of low-income students.
			110.0	150.0					
Work Study, Higher Education	OE-HEA		60.0	90.0		99.9	134.1		
			150.0	210.0					
Out-of-School Youth (16-21)									
Job Crops	OEO-EOA Men	15.6	325.8	39.0	183.0	310.0	228.0	N/A	Info. on basic educational attainment of enrollees not available yet.
	Women	1.3	4.2	6.0					
NYC out-of-school program	OEO Labor (little basic ed.)	(61.7)	(60.0)	(64.0)	($44.8)	($97.0)	($138.6)		
[1]MDTA Institutional	OE-Labor	10.4	10.4	---					See below MDTA
		(125)	(125)						
OJT	MDTA-Labor	(---)	( )	( )					
Adult Education--(Basic Education Only)									
CAP Adult & Adult Basic Projects	CAP-Sections 206, 207 largely basic literacy or remedial subjects, taught alone as prerequisite to vocational education	23.9	87.5	117.0	---	15.3	47.0		No information.
Adult Basic (literacy) Education	OE-OEO Title II B	---	75.0	100.0	---	21.0	30.0		Preliminary findings by Greenleigh not yet available.
Adult Education -- (Basic Education Combined w/Voc. or other adult Education)									
Work Experience	OEO Welfare Administration, Title V (provides adult basic in absence of II B program).	(88.0)	(109.3)	(105.0)	(110.0)	(150.0)	(158.7)		No information on Basic Educational attainment of enrollees.
		(No information on % receiving basic compensatory education)							
[2]MDTA Institutional Training	OE-Labor	14.5	14.5	---	(No information on funding of programs basic education components)				Four experiments showed average gain of 1.5 grade levels in basic subjects in 15-20 weeks. No systematic information on basic educational attainment of enrollees.
		(125)	(125)						

Table 2
(Continued)

SUMMARY OF FEDERALLY FUNDED COMPENSATORY EDUCATIONAL SERVICES AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE POOR

KIND OF PROGRAM	FEDERAL AGENCY AND AUTHORITY	BENEFICIARIES (thousands) 65	66	67	FUNDING (millions) 65	66	67	IMPACT ON LEARNING OF DISADVANTAGED Experimental (Controls)	Operational (Norms or Judgments)
OJT	Labor								
Vocational Education	OE Voc. Ed. Act of '63 etal	(2,281.0)	---	---	(18% of total funding for adult classes)			None	None

NOTE:/ Numbers in parenthesis are total of beneficiaires or total funding, when it is not known how many enrollees actually receive literacy or or other compensatory education, or are poor.

1/ MDTA institutional programs. About 42% of enrollment is under 21 years of age. Twenty percent of these receive compensatory basic education. All of these latter number were counted as poor.

2/ Adults over 22 years of age accounted for 58% of enrollment in MDTA institutional training programs Again about 20% of these are receiving significant amounts of basic education. All these have been counted as poor in enrollment figures w/o parenthesis.

3/ Does not include basic compensatory. Enrollments often for single evening course.

Table 3

SUMMARY INFORMATION ON DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES FOR PROVIDING COMPENSATOR PROGRAMS TO THE POOR

PROGRAM	FEDERAL AGENCY AUTHORITY	FUNDING (millions) 65	66	67	PARTICIPANTS % of Prog. of Poor	(thousands) 65	66	67	PERFORMER	EVALUATION OF IMPACT ON LEARNING OF DISADVANTAGED Control Groups Experimental	Operational
I. Staff Development-Inservice a. Professional teachers										(Control groups)	(Against norms)
Institutes for in-service teachers Disadvantaged K-12	OE-NDEA Title XI				100		3.0	---	Colleges and Univ. Selected colleges and univer. Teachers Colleges	None	No information how affects poor learners Subjective type evaluation of teachers institutes based on questionnaires to participants.
Subject matter Institutes for teachers, the Sciences, social science, English, other humanities and arts	OE - NDEA Title XI	---	(34.0)	(40.0)	?		24.0	28.0	Colleges and Univer.	None	"
	NSF - general authority		(---)	(---)	?		---	---	Colleges and Univer.	?	?
Advanced Fellowships for Exp. teachers and impr. teacher ed. programs	OE HEA, Title VC		(7.5) 5.0	(7.5) 5.0	60		2.3	5.8	Colleges and Univer.	New	New
Teachers' Corp Training	OE, HEA, Title VB		13.2	31.4	100		3.7	0.08	Colleges and Univer.	New	New
Institutes for Junior Coll. faculty, science, math, social sciences	NSF, general educ. authority		?	?	?		?	?	Universities	No info.	None
Training of community service staff	OE, HEA, Title I		(10.0)	(20.0)			(100.0)	(200.0)	Urban universities	New	New
Training for educational professional staff	OEO - CAP				100					Greenleigh No significant difference between results with prof. & non prof. teachers.	

Table 3
(continued)

Program	Federal Agency Authority	Funding (millions) 65	66	67	Participants: % of Prog. for Poor	(thousands) 65	66	67	Performer	Evaluation of Impact on Learning of Disadvantaged: Experimental	Control Groups: Operational
Staff Development-Inservice											
a. Profess. Teachers (con't)	OEO,-JC		?	?	100	?	?	?	In-house program, 3 staff training centers	?	?
Training for JC prof. teacher staff											
Training grants, teachers of handicapped	OE, Mental Retarda. and Conservation Act		(19.5)	(24.5)	?	(6577)	(6577)	(9132)	Colleges and Univers.	?	?
Teacher Trng for ABE	OE-OEO, Title II B	---	---	1.2	70		(1800)	(2160)	?	?	?
b. Aides	OE, Title I, ESEA	?	?	?							
Institut. for teachers' Aides	Title XI, NDE		?	?					Colleges and Univers.		Greenleigh study showed effect of Volunteer teachers
c. Volunteers	VISTA				100				Colleges and Univers.		
d. Administrators	OE, Title I, HEA '65	--	?	?					Urban Universities		No information
e. Researchers											
Trng. Grants for Advance study for Ed. Researchers	OE, Title IV, ESEA	--	(6.8M)	(8.1)	?	---	(.03)	(20)			No information.
Institutes, Counsellors and guidance personnel	OE-NDEA	---	(7.0)	(7.0)			(.072)	(.07)	Colleges and Univers.		No information.
Institutes for Media specialists	OE, NDEA, Title III	--	0	(2.5)	?		0	(0.9)	Colleges and Univers.		No information.
II. Staff Develop. Pre-Service											
a. Professional teachers											
Graduate fellowships to improve or expand prog.	OE, NDEA, Title IV		(59.0)	(81.0)	10	0	0	0	Universities		
Trng. grants for advanced study in ed. rsh.	Coop Rsh Act.		(?)	(?)					Universities		
Inexperienced teacher Fellowships	HEA, Title VC	--	---	---	?						
III. Curriculum Development											
Compensatory curricula development (including math and science)	OEO Cooperative Research (curriculum projects)	(.05)	(17.5)	(20.0)	?	(Not available)			Universities and pro. for learned societies	No controlled experiments with poor learners.	No general assessment of curricula produced, or effect on learning by socio-econ. deprived.
	NSF Science & Math	(15.9)	(18.2)	(21.0)	?						
	OEO - Job Corps	?	?	?							
	OEO - NYC	?	?	?	100						
	OEO-CAP components	?	?	?	100						
	PHS health education curricula research	(5.0)	(7.5)	(8.9)	?				Universities	No information.	No information.
	OE-OEO II B Adult literacy	---	.093	1.4	100				No information.		
Materials Development											
Adult Basic Education	OEO-OE IIB Ad. Bas.	---	2.3	2.8							
Cooperative Research (compensatory remed. materials)	OE-Coop Rsh & Title IV	?	?	?							
Media Research	OE, NDEA	?	?	?							
IV. Combined Support Services	OE, ESEA, Title III Supplementary Ser-			75.0	1.45	(Not available)			Local School Systems & Cooperating Colleges and Universities.		
V. Facilities & Equip.											
a. Libraries, E&S	OE-ESEA Title II	---	(100.0)	(105.0)	20						
Libraries, Higher Ed.	OE, HEFA & HEA '65		(---)	(---)	10						
b. HE Instruc. Facilities	HEFA - '63										
Grants to community colleges		(47.3)	(103.9)	(100.7)	10						
Grants to other HE institutions		(177.0)	(359.6)	(357.2)	"						
Grants grad. Facil.		(60.0)	(60.0)	(60.0)	"						
Equipment, minor remodeling, E&S Schools	OE-NDEA, Title III	(69.9)	(19.2)	(54.2)							

NOTE: (Figures in parentheses are amounts not disaggregated to show facilities, development or curricula or compensatory type programs directed to needs o poor.)

The major education program run directly by OEO as such, Head Start, is easier to evaluate than some other education programs because it is easier to compare something to the nothing which previously existed in the field of pre-school programs for poor kids than it is to evaluate marginal additions to in-school education.

The basic evaluation data for Summer 1965 Head Start were collected by the Bureau of Census on a representative 1% sample of the children. These data cover parent participation, worker evaluation, medical history, family characteristics information, pre-and-post-testing of cognitive and behavioral gains, and staff information. Planning Research Corporation was contracted to prepare the summary evaluation report on the summer program, incorporating results from a variety of sources, including the Census data.

Other data available include that collected by the National Opinion Research Corporation (NORC) on social history and experience by interviewing 2,500 Head Start families. OEO consultants in the fields of health, education, psychology, sociology, and nutrition visited Head Start projects to evaluate program components. Independent research and evaluation studies were done by 36 private contractors, and PRC also drew upon results of local evaluation projects. These contracted and local evaluation studies investigated such areas as instruments for measuring achievement gains, differential effects of various teaching methods, effects of Head Start experience on social and emotional behavior of children, value of different program mixes, demographic information on children served, follow-up on achievement of children served, follow-up on achievement of children in the first two grades, designs for new techniques in the teaching of disadvantaged pre-school children, and various studies of impact of Head Start on children as compared with non-Head Start control groups.

Evaluation results and statistical data received to date are those on the Summer 1965 program. The highlights of these results are as follows:

1. Head Start children showed definite gains when pre-and-post-tested with instruments to measure cognitive achievement and aptitude. The extent of these gains varied according to the testing instrument.

2. Generally, when pre-and post-testing was administered to a Head Start group and to a non-Head Start group drawn from a similar population, the Head Start group registered significantly higher post-scores than the control group.

3. When Head Start children were compared to a control group of non-Head Start middle-class children, the Head Start group registered greater gains but did not reach the level of the control group even after the Head Start program.

4. Kindergarten and first-grade teachers reported that generally Head Start children began their first school year better adjusted, less shy and withdrawn, more self-confident, more attentive, and more socially oriented than comparable non-Head Start children.

5. Parent participation was particularly heavy. Parent meetings were held in 61% of the roughly 1,000 Centers visited by educational consultants, and teachers were responsible for helping to solve family problems in 74% of the Centers. Ninety-six percent of the programs provided for helping parents with child rearing, and 49% included homemaking education programs. Eighty percent of the parents expressed a new awareness of community concern for their problems. These statistics indicate that a definite national program of parent participation (such as the proposed Adult Head Start program) would meet with favorable response and could easily be organized and expanded.

6. Over 90% of workers were enthusiastic about their experience in Head Start and over 80% expressed interest in participating again. Head Start staff included 46,000 paid non-professionals (25% of total) and 97,520 volunteers (53% of total).

7. Medical testing showed that 31.35% of the children had physical defects which would have gone undetected without the medical examinations conducted through Head Start.

The Bureau of the Census has conducted a data-gathering program this spring from a sample of the centers in the annual 1966 program. The data will cover parent participation, worker evaluation, family characteristics information, medical and dental information follow-up, and staff member information. In addition, PRC has been giving behavioral and cognitive tests to a sub-sample of the Census sample (about 870 children in 72 centers) by varying program lengths. This comparison by length of program should serve as some basis for comparing the Summer and Annual programs. Test results between the Annual and Summer 1966 programs will be compared.

All this shows substantial progress on evaluation of Head Start for its effects on

educational and child development achievement. It is not, however, an anti-poverty evaluation. To compare Head Start to the other programs of the War on Poverty, it is necessary to create a long hypothetical chain going from pre-school programs to in-school achievements to probability of successful completion of school programs at age 18 or thereafter to further earnings. This is something we are now studying, but is not worth carrying through on a quantitative basis until more of the Head Start data are in.

COMMUNITY ACTION

Finally, we come to Community Action. In many ways, this must be considered the most important OEO program over the long haul. We can, as has been suggested, get rid of poverty through basic income maintenance at any time we want. But it seems very unlikely that we can get rid of the fundamental obstacles to opportunity without breaking up the communities of poverty -- the urban and rural slums where bad housing and bad health facilities, lack of intellectual stimulation and just plain injustice conspire to keep the poor down. Such comprehensive programs for ending the various aspects of community poverty are far and away the most difficult to evaluate. What we are out to do is to change the total environment of poverty for the people who now live in these communities. Environmental change has no direct connection to earnings in the way that training and education do. Nonetheless, it is a necessary indirect element supporting all the other elements. A child benefiting from Head Start and from improved in-school education under Title I is far more likely to fail in his total life effort if he has to return to the same slum home and the same depressing family situation every night.

The ultimate measure of effectiveness of Community Action programs is the change in the number of people in poverty who come originally from the slum communities which are CAP's prime target areas. (The change in the numbers living in these communities is not by itself sufficient because such a change could indicate merely dispersion of the poverty problem rather than cure.) To get such an ultimate measure of change we have a number of evaluation projects underway. We have augmented the Current Population Survey taken by the Census Bureau with an additional sample of 30,000 people whom we asked additional questions helping us to get at the root of the difficulties between the poor and the non-poor. The total augmented CPS sample of 80,000 enables us to get further information never before obtained. Of particular interest in evaluation of Community Action programs, it will give us an up-to-date record of the number of poor in pre-selected Census tracts designated as poverty tracts according to their characteristics. Taken each year it will give us a measure of the effectiveness of Community Action in reducing number of poor without merely shifting them into non-poverty tracts. The 80,000 sample is not large enough to give us information on any specific geographic areas with the possible exceptions of New York, Chicago and Los Angeles, but we hope in 1968 to have taken a much larger sample Census with enough observations to make specific area-by-area comparisons with the 1960 Census and ultimately with the 1970 Census. This will give us some real measure of progress in individual Community Action programs as well as in Community Action taken as a whole.

While measures of this sort which count changes in the numbers of people in poverty are the ultimate necessity, however, they do not suffice for short-run evaluation. Community Action programs are bound to be slow-acting because of their attempt to change fundamental conditions which have existed for centuries. In order to measure current progress, we will need proxy variables measuring changes of conditions which precede the ultimate change in the poverty count in the subject communities. Such variables can include employment in the slum areas, participation of residents in Community Action programs, and other factors such as health improvement, etc. But to tie them together into a comprehensive picture of the change taking place in these communities is an extremely complex matter. We are trying to measure this change at several levels.

The CAP monitoring function, as part of the overall Grants Management operation, has two major aspects, (1) operational evaluation of the programs of CAP grantees, and (2) a general and continuous overseeing of programs funded under Sections 204, 205 and 209(b) of the Economic Opportunity Act.

The objectives of this effort are to learn about the performance of individual grantees, to systematically collect and examine information about the individual grantee programs so as to determine general problems and concerns which may be applicable to the entire CAP program, to spot potential trouble areas, and to learn of modifications which CAP might make in its own operations to facilitate program improvement. In examining the performance of individual grantees, questions such as the following are covered: the overall objectives of local Community Action Authority as originally preceived and as modified, relationships of the CAA to established institutions in the community and coordination with other Federal programs, relative program priorities of the CAA, internal management mechanism of the CAA and overall, the eligibility of the CAA for refunding.

In accomplishing its task, the monitoring function relies on a variety of sources ranging from internal reporting forms to on-site visits by in-house observation teams. It is the on-site visit which provides the most comprehensive effort describing the depth and quality of service rendered by the CAA during its period of service.

The major problem which the monitoring function now faces is the development of a system for effective use of all the monitoring inputs.

In addition to the CAP monitoring evaluations being carried out, OEO now has comprehensive evaluations underway in seven Community Action Agencies choosen to represent different types of communities (Knox County, McDowell County, Atlanta, Kansas City, Seattle, San Diego, Baltimore, Austin). These are being carried out under contract with universities and private research firms. The contractor independently designs and executes a research plan. He studies the organizational structure of the CAA and seeks to determine the impact of CAP on poverty. As such the research will look at the CAP and its individual programs; analyze not only the components themselves but their relationship to one another; study the non-CAP elements which influence the CAP and the influences which the CAP makes on these elements. These evaluations will be interdisciplinary efforts, utilizing research teams composed of economists, political scientists, sociologists and other social scientists.

The final question, of course, is how do we evaluate the overall War on Poverty. Here I am afraid that nothing but the Census and survey method will do. If we are serious about ending poverty in the United States we can do so -- we can do so by 1976. If we are serious about measuring this end to poverty -- and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity as well as its Office of Research, Plans, Programs and Evaluation is quite serious about it -- then we can do so. We expect to be able to carry on such measurement from year to year and we think that in the final analysis this sort of measurement is the ultimate evaluation of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the War on Poverty.